

*YOU are important! As a member of a faculty search committee, or as a leader who will make hiring decisions, you are creating institutional history for The Ohio State University.*

## Recruiting Diverse Faculty

*Joan Herbers, Ph.D.*

*Professor, EEOB, and PI, Comprehensive Equity at Ohio State*

*Anne Massaro, Ph.D.*

*Director, Human Resources, and co-PI, Comprehensive Equity at Ohio State*



### Recruiting Best Practices

#### *Ongoing Recruitment*

- Recruitment begins before you have an open position. A long-term recruitment strategy helps build a diverse applicant pool when a specific position is available.
- As their careers advance, cultivate your own students.
- When attending national conferences, make a list of possible future candidates. Personally follow-up with each and encourage their interest in Ohio State.
- Invite potential candidates to visit and present their research prior to a job announcement.

#### *Active Recruitment for a Specific Position*

- Diversify your search committee. If necessary, involve people from outside of your unit.
- Designate someone as Diversity Advocate. Page 7 (of this handout) defines this role.
- Show: Recruiting Diverse Faculty, Part 1:  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UZHxFU7TYo4&feature=plcp>
- Candidly discuss schemas and strategies for actively recruiting underrepresented minorities.
- Encourage committee members to take the Implicit Association Test:  
<https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/>.
- Develop broad hiring goals. Focusing too narrowly on sub-fields may be limiting.
- Discuss and commit to multiple, specific criteria which relate to the essential requirements of the position. Avoid “global” judgments.
- Assess the relevance of all criteria to ensure they are not limiting your applicant pool.
- Review the national applicant pool for your field to assess number of potential candidates. See more information on page 8 of this packet.
- Determine marketing venues for job announcements that are aimed specifically at women and underrepresented groups, e.g. Association for Women in Science, Black Issues in Higher Education, and The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education.
- Use proactive language in advertisements such as: “The Ohio State University prioritizes diversity as an institutional value. We encourage applications from individuals with disabilities, minorities, veterans, and women. EEO/AA employer.”
- In all committee discussions about applicants, focus on issues of scholarship, qualifications and their potential contribution to your department.

- Consider candidates who may currently be thriving at less well-ranked institutions.
- To create your “short list” of those to invite to campus, use a candidate screening rubric.
- Re-open or intensify the search if the applicant pool does not include diverse candidates.

### **Broad Hiring Goals and Multiple, Specific Selection Criteria**

The broader the hiring goals, the larger and more diverse your applicant pool will be. As we all know, fields have larger applicant pools than subfields. In some cases, it is essential to hire for a specific subfield --- the “best practice” is to be intentional about your advertisement and the “desired” position description. If advertising and hiring for a specific subfield is critical, do that. If you have the opportunity to hire more broadly, then clearly state that in your position announcements and more candidates will consider applying.

With multiple, specific selection criteria, you will avoid general or global impressions such as “he/she is not good enough for us.” In addition, with multiple criteria, you can add:

- “Ability to add intellectual diversity to the department” and/or
- “Demonstrated ability to work with diverse students and colleagues.”

The most important practice is to make sure that all criteria are relevant. “Years of experience” narrows your candidate pool. While more years of experience are helpful, they may not be absolutely necessary.

Wherever possible, use “preferred” instead of “required” and “should” instead of “must.”

A recent example on [www.jobsatosu.com](http://www.jobsatosu.com):

#### **“Open Faculty Search**

...This position may be filled from among candidates representing a variety of disciplines or from cross-disciplinary programs. Being a senior scholar with a strong research program and strength in teaching is essential. Applicants must have completed all Ph.D. degree requirements...To build a diverse workforce, Ohio State encourages applications from individuals with disabilities, minorities, veterans, and women. EEO/AA employer.”

**Candidate Screening Tool – An Example**

A screening device can help the search committee quickly verify each candidate's possession of the required qualifications. The qualifications listed in the table should reflect the minimum qualifications listed in the position description.

Candidate's Name:	Qual 1	Qual 2	Qual 3	Etc.
Jane Smith	YES	YES	No	
John Rogers	NO	YES	YES	
	YES	YES	YES	

### **Diversity Advocate** (from the Human Resources' *Guide to Effective Searches*)

All members of a search committee are advocates for affirmative action. In addition, each committee must designate a member to act in the role of Diversity Advocate. In order to add value and ensure that all affirmative action issues are addressed, the roles and responsibilities of the advocate are outlined below.

#### **Who should be in this role?**

It is highly recommended that your Affirmative Action Advocate be a tenured faculty person and/or an individual with extensive experience on search committees and one who has shown commitment to affirmative action. Consider non-minority as well as minority individuals for this role.

#### **Responsibilities of the Diversity Advocate**

1. Evaluate the search process on a continuing basis, keeping in mind the goals and principles of affirmative action and diversity as defined by the university in its mission statement.
2. Lead discussions with committee in identifying benefits of diversity and in developing a diverse pool that could lead to hiring a member of an underrepresented group for the department or administrative unit.
3. Assist the committee in self-scrutiny about its own potential biases.
4. Provide committee with department profile and hiring goals. Contact specific college and/or department designee for more information.
5. Bring process gaps to the attention of the search committee and/or the Chairperson for immediate action. Process gaps may include the following:
  - Bias, prejudice or stereotyping in verbal or written communications, such as meetings, written correspondence, and interview questions;
  - Inadequate representation of underutilized groups in pool of candidates;
  - Bias, prejudice or stereotyping of candidates during evaluation period; and/or
  - Giving little or no weight to the affirmative action goals of the university as a factor in the hiring process.
6. Review all search committee activities to ensure that differences are cultivated and respected and that fairness is the norm. These activities include:
  - Developing job descriptions and minimum qualifications to cast the widest possible net;
  - Utilizing multiple and creative recruitment methods;
  - Using criteria for evaluation that do not preclude persons with non-traditional career patterns or equivalent education and experience;
  - Conducting interviews that are consistent and legal for all applicants;
  - Facilitating campus visits that provide similar opportunities for each candidate;
  - Developing a final slate of candidates that, whenever possible, gives the hiring official the opportunity to select from a diverse pool.

### **National Applicant Pools**

The National Research Council coordinates the Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED). The SED gathers information annually from approximately 48,000 new U.S. research doctorate graduates about their educational histories, funding sources, and post-doctoral plans. Each year the SED data are added to a larger historical record of doctorate-degree graduates, the Doctorate Records File (DRF). Begun in 1920, the DRF contains annual information used to track the number of graduates in various fields; the educational paths of scientists, engineers, and humanists; movement of graduates into the labor market; and similar information. See: [www.norc.org/Research/Projects/Pages/survey-of-earned-doctorates-%28sed%29.aspx](http://www.norc.org/Research/Projects/Pages/survey-of-earned-doctorates-%28sed%29.aspx).

The National Science Foundation reports such data annually for STEM doctorates (including social sciences). See: <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvydoctoratework/>.

### Interviewing Best Practices

- Bring in more than one female and/or minority candidate. This can disproportionately increase the likelihood that a woman and/or minority will be hired.
- Treat female and minority faculty applicants as scholars and educators, not as valuable because they are *female* or *minority* scholars and educators.
- Give all candidates who come for a campus interview:
  - The Status Report on Women from The Women's Place. See: [http://womensplace.osu.edu/assets/files/Status\\_Report\\_2011.pdf](http://womensplace.osu.edu/assets/files/Status_Report_2011.pdf).
  - The Comprehensive Equity at Ohio State (CEOS) brochure. See: <http://www.ceos.osu.edu/>.
  - The Faculty Rule on exclusion of time, or stopping the tenure clock. See: Chapter 6, 6-03 D and 6-03 F [http://trustees.osu.edu/assets/files/rules6/3335-6-03\\_000.pdf](http://trustees.osu.edu/assets/files/rules6/3335-6-03_000.pdf).
- Review the guidelines for appropriate (i.e. legal) questions to ask candidates. These guidelines can be found on page 16 in the Human Resources' *Guide to Effective Searches*. See: <http://hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>.
- Avoid asking questions about personal matters.
- Use a consistent set of questions in the interview to allow fair comparisons.
- Ask all who interact with candidates to complete a candidate evaluation sheet/tool.
- Create opportunities for diverse candidates to meet with faculty or community members who share important personal characteristics as themselves.

**Candidate Evaluation**

A candidate evaluation is used to consistently evaluate candidates who come to campus for an interview. An example is provided below.

**Department of Knowledge  
Candidate Evaluation**

Please indicate which are true for you (check all that apply):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's CV                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Met with candidate                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's scholarship               | <input type="checkbox"/> Had lunch or dinner with candidate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's letters of recommendation | <input type="checkbox"/> Attended candidate's job talk      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____              |   |

Please rate the candidate on each of the following:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No basis to judge
Potential for (evidence of) scholarly impact					
Potential for (evidence of) research productivity					
Potential for (evidence of) research funding					
Potential for (evidence of) collaboration					
Fit with departmental priorities					
Fit with departmental values					
Ability to make positive contribution to department's climate					
Potential (demonstrated ability) to attract and sustain graduate students					
Potential (demonstrated ability) to teach and supervise undergraduates					
Potential (demonstrated ability) to be a conscientious university community member					

### **Top Mistakes in Recruitment and Campus Interviews**

- Committee does not have a diverse applicant pool.
- The committee discusses information about the candidate that is inappropriate.
- Candidates are asked questions of a personal nature.
- A woman or underrepresented minority candidate is told, “we want you because we need diversity.”
- The campus visit is narrowly structured, and candidates are not given opportunities to meet others like themselves during the campus visit.
- Committee members or other faculty make summary judgments about candidates without using specific criteria.

### Resources

Associate Vice President for Gender Initiatives in STEMM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Medicine): Mary Juhas, [Juhas.1@osu.edu](mailto:Juhas.1@osu.edu). (Reports to the Vice President for Research, Carol Whitacre.)

Associate Vice President for Talent Acquisition: David Green, 688-1048, [green.1348@osu.edu](mailto:green.1348@osu.edu). (Reports to the Vice President for Human Resources, Kathleen McCutcheon.)

CEOS (Comprehensive Equity at Ohio State): 247-1876

Dual career hiring program: 1.4.3 in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook Volume 1, rev. June 2012, <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>

Guide to Effective Searches: <http://hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>

Office of Academic Affairs: 292-5881

Policy on affirmative action, equal employment opportunity:  
<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>

Policy on faculty appointments:  
<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf>

Policy on faculty recruitment and selection:  
<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyrecruitment.pdf>

Rules of the University Faculty: <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>

Sample appointment letters: <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampleddocuments.html>

Video Part 1 (Schemas): <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UZHxFU7TYo4&feature=plcp>

Video Part 2 (Recruitment Practices):  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QGtQsJUiaxk&feature=youtu.be>

### References

University of Michigan STRIDE program:

<http://www.advance.rackham.umich.edu/handbook.pdf>

University of Rhode Island Faculty Recruitment Handbook:

[http://www.uri.edu/advance/files/pdf/Recruit\\_Handbook\\_Web.pdf](http://www.uri.edu/advance/files/pdf/Recruit_Handbook_Web.pdf)

Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991-1013.

Chang, A. (2012). How universities fail women inventors, confirm gender bias.

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/women2/2012/01/01/how-universities-fail-women-inventors-confirm-gender-bias/>

National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. (2007). *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering*. The National Academies Press.

Russ, T., Simonds, C. & Hunt, S. (2002). Coming out in the classroom... an occupational hazard? The influence of sexual orientation on teacher credibility and perceived student learning. *Communication Education*, 51:3, 311-324.

Smith, D.G., Wolf, L.E. & Busenberg, B.E. (1996). *Achieving Faculty Diversity: Debunking the Myths*. AAC&U Report.

Steinpreis, R.E., Anders, K.A. & Ritzke, D. (1999). The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study. *Sex Roles*, 41, 7/8, 509-528.

Trix, F. & Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. *Discourse & Society* 14(2), 191-220.

Valian, V. (1998). *Why so Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.