Ensuring Equity and Inclusivity in Faculty Hiring

The Office of Equity, Inclusion, and Compliance

Our Mission

To ensure an equitable and inclusive hiring process from the initial stages to completion. To work collaboratively with search committees and provide information regarding affirmative action practices and procedures necessary for an equal employment opportunity. To affirm and promote the University's commitment to the core principles of diversity and **equal opportunity** in education and employment, to the policies   and practices that ensure equitable **consideration**, and to a culture that embraces a **community**   of students, faculty, and staff who encompass an array of human qualities and varying personal   and professional experiences.

This Guide

This guide is intended to provide you with information useful for the faculty search process, particularly with respect to establishing and maintaining an equitable process for all applicants in furtherance of Cal Poly Pomona's commitment to equity and inclusion. For further guidance and in response to more specific inquiries, please contact The Office of Equity, Inclusion, and Compliance at (909) 869-2708.

Affirmative Action and Proposition 209

Affirmative Action is a federal mandate. As a matter of federal law, all employers receiving federal contract money must take action (i.e., implement and enforce policies) to ensure equal employment opportunity. If discrepancies are found between department profiles and the labor market availability of qualified candidates, Cal Poly Pomona must show it made a good faith effort to reduce or eliminate the discrepancy. Affirmative Action is one measure used to show such good faith.

Affirmative Action relates to the **RECRUITMENT** phase of the search and appointment process.

- ✓ Search committee should reflect diversity in its composition.
- ✓ Search committee should search and recruit broadly.
- ✓ Availability data should be noted.
- ✓ Applicant pool and search process should be reviewed to ensure outreach has been broad and inclusive.

Proposition 209 is a California State law implemented in 1997 which prohibits discrimination against or preferential treatment for any individual or group on the basis of race, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, education, or contracting."

Proposition 209 relates primarily to the **SELECTION** phase of the search and appointment process.

- ✓ Evaluation of applicants and rationale for selection may not take into consideration their membership in a protected group (i.e., race, gender, national origin, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation).
- ✓ No preferential treatment during the search process on the basis of a protected category.

Develop the Position Announcement

A.   A "diversity criterion" should appear in all position announcements. As a general rule, **the   diversity criterion should be included in the "Qualifications" section**. Specified in this way as an   explicit qualification for the position, this criterion can be considered directly in the screening, evaluation, interview and final selection phases of the process.

B.   Whenever possible, tailor the diversity criterion to the specific position, to the extent possible based upon the specific discipline and specialization of the position. In positions involving disciplines or highly-specialized content areas that would seem to mitigate the possibility of developing content-specific diversity criteria, emphasize diversity in relation to teaching and pedagogy (*i.e.*, the ability and commitment to teaching and mentoring a diverse student population).

C.   Emphasize potential and actual contributions to diversity in terms of applicants' "demonstrated knowledge, skills and experience" in a generic diversity criterion. The diversity criterion can be extended to engender teaching effectiveness, advisement and mentoring, scholarship/research and potential service contributions both on and off campus. Potential or actual contributions to diversity should be considered as **<u>integral</u>** and not peripheral or supplemental to any discussion of merit.

D.   Consider requiring as part of the application materials a **Contributions to Diversity Statement** which includes a discussion on their past contributions to diversity and future plans for continuing this effort as part of their application for an academic appointment. For example, the announcement could state, "In addition to research, teaching, and general professional and public service, candidates will also be evaluated on the basis of the candidate's contributions in promoting diversity and inclusion. Examples may include, but are not limited to, developing strategies for the educational or professional advancement of students from underrepresented groups; efforts to advance equitable access and   diversity in education; and activities such as recruitment, retention, and mentoring of underrepresented   students or new faculty." The purpose of the statement is to identify candidates who have professional skills, experience, and willingness to engage in activities that would enhance campus diversity efforts.

E.   Evaluate all candidates with diversity contributions as a minimum qualification (i.e., evaluation instrument) and then throughout the search.

Recruitment Strategies

"Developing and aggressively implementing a comprehensive recruitment plan that uses multiple recruitment strategies simultaneously will significantly increase the diversity of the applicant pool."
-- Association of American Colleges and Universities

A. **Use your search committee's Equity Liaison in proactive ways**, serving as a direct liaison to the Office of Equity and Diversity.

B. **Go beyond the "usual" range of institutions, organizations and associations from which you recruit.** Use the resources available to you through the Office of Equity, Inclusion, and Compliance.

C. **Engage the assistance of resources early in your outreach and recruitment phase**: When contacting colleagues at Cal Poly Pomona or other institutions and organizations, specifically ask for recommendations of qualified candidates from groups that are underrepresented in your department, in addition to other recommendations. Take advantage of your individual faculty contacts. Attend conferences and networking events that provide recruiting opportunities.

D. **Hold search committees and administrators accountable in carefully and fully considering the diversity criterion throughout the search and screen process.** Remember that the diversity criterion ought to be addressed explicitly as a qualification, co-equal with all other specified requirements.

E. **Based upon all of the above, design a thorough but realistic recruitment plan**. **Be active and aggressive in your recruitment efforts.** Outreach must be "inclusive" in soliciting potential applicants from as broad a range of sources and communities as possible. Recruitment plans should avoid efforts aimed at narrowly "targeted" or "focused" advertising and should cast as wide a net as possible. Recruitment and outreach conducted principally through advertisements (hard copy, and/or virtual) do not often yield exceptionally diverse pools of applicants, short lists, or final selections. Networking in person, on the phone, and/or via email frequently results in recruiting a broadly diverse, qualified pool of applicants.

F. **Allow sufficient time in your recruitment period** (generally 6 weeks).

Once you've successfully recruited a broad pool of candidates, it's time to conduct the initial screening of minimum qualifications and interview those candidates in whom you have the most interest. The following are some general guidelines concerning interview questions.

HOW DO YOU DETERMINE
IF A CANDIDATE MEETS THE DIVERSITY CRITERION?

Some of the considerations below may be helpful in determining if a candidate meets the "diversity criterion." A more in-depth evaluation of a candidate's demonstrated commitment to diversity should be acquired through follow-up inquiries or interviews.

Search committees may consider the following as contributions to diversity:

- candidates who have engaged in service to increase participation in science, engineering, arts, humanities, education, social sciences, medicine, management or other related fields by groups historically underrepresented in these areas or in higher education. For example:
  - participation as undergraduates, graduates, postdocs or faculty in academic preparation, outreach, tutoring or other programs designed to remove barriers facing women, minorities, veterans, people with disabilities or other individuals who are members of group historically excluded from higher education;
  - serving as an advisor to programs which advance women and/or historically underrepresented minorities in the field or discipline;
  - exceptional record mentoring students and junior faculty from groups underrepresented in their field or historically underrepresented in higher education;
  - candidates who have made a contribution to pedagogies addressing different learning styles. For example:
    - developing courses or curricula designed to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged students;
    - developing effective teaching strategies for the educational advancement of students from groups underrepresented in higher education

- candidates who have significant experience teaching students who are underrepresented in higher education. For example:
  - teaching at a minority serving institution;
  - record of success advising women and minority graduate students;
  - experience teaching students with disabilities and/or veterans

- candidates who evidence drive and motivation to persist and succeed in their careers in spite of barriers in higher education that disproportionately disadvantage them;

- candidates with the potential to bring to their research the creative critical discourse that comes from their non-traditional educational background or experience as a member of a group underrepresented in higher education;

- candidates who, in addition to their primary field of research, have made research contributions to understanding the barriers facing women and underrepresented minorities in science and other academic disciplines. For example:
    - studying patterns of participation and advancement of women and minorities in fields where they are underrepresented;
    - studying socio-cultural issues confronting underrepresented students in college preparation curricula;
    - evaluating programs, curricula and teaching strategies designed to enhance participation of under-represented students in higher education;

- candidates who have the communication skills and cross-cultural abilities to maximize effective collaboration with a diverse community of campus and external colleagues;

- candidates who have research interests in subjects that will contribute to diversity and equal opportunity in higher education. For example,
    - research that addresses issues of diversity and inclusion;
    - research that addresses health disparities, educational access and achievement, political engagement, economic justice, social mobility, or civil and human rights;
    - research that addresses questions of interest to communities historically excluded by or underserved by higher education;
    - artistic expression and cultural production that reflects culturally diverse communities or voices not well represented in the arts and humanities.

Screening/Evaluating Applications

(Adapted from the University of California Santa Cruz, Fair Hiring Guide)

The objective of this process is to select the best-qualified applicants for interview.

- Decide what qualifications you can evaluate from information provided in application materials - don't try to evaluate qualifications that can't be assessed from the application alone.
- Determine whether there are certain qualifications or sets of qualifications that are more important than others.
- Narrow the pool to the best-qualified applicants for interview.
- If there are a large number of well-qualified applicants, it may not be to your advantage to screen out candidates based on small qualification differences. You should always focus on the most important qualifications.
- Try to resolve differences of opinion among search committee members regarding a candidate's qualifications through discussion, rather than resorting to artificial means (e.g., averaging committee's numerical ratings of a candidate), which may not result in selection of the best-qualified applicant.
- After screening applications it is recommended that all applicants no longer under consideration receive some type of communication from the hiring manager regarding their status in the recruitment.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

1. **What process works best?**

   A process that includes both people evaluating applications alone and people discussing their judgments together.

   Most people find it easiest to do a quick screening to eliminate applicants who don't have the absolute necessary qualifications, then take a more careful look through the rest. As extra insurance, you can have someone else look through the "rejects" with the sole goal of identifying people who might have been overlooked because their background isn't typical.

   Do use the criteria as a guide, to make sure you are consistent, evaluating each applicant against the same criteria (some people like to use a rating matrix, to record which applicants have which qualifications; others just take notes).

   If you have a large search committee, you may want to have two people volunteer to do the first screening, and everyone involved in more carefully evaluating the rest. If you have a large pool, it's fine to split up the applications among pairs of people, who take responsibility for presenting them to the rest of the group.

2. **Deciding on a 'short list' (interviewees and alternates)?**

You will make better decisions if you use a search committee to discuss the applicant's qualifications, rather than just averaging numerical ratings. If you cut off debate too quickly, you waste the benefit that different perspectives can bring to the difficult task of evaluating qualifications.

3. **How can you tell if people really have the abilities that they claim to have?**

   At the application screening stage, you have to take their word for it. You may get a better idea in an interview or a reference check.

4. **To what extent can one assess interpersonal skills from a written application?**

   At best, you may see that an applicant has done work that probably required those skills; you cannot tell how good the person's skills are. Interpersonal skills are best assessed through interviews and reference checks.

5. **Does the recency of a person's education or job experience matter?**

   It may, but only in fields that have changed significantly in recent years, and remember that the applicant may have kept him or herself current in other ways.

6. **When is more experience better?**

   It depends, and you can't always tell. More isn't always better -- twenty years of experience may mean a person is extremely knowledgeable and skilled, or it may mean the person got stuck and couldn't move out of that job.

7. **What should be done with an "overqualified" person?**

   There are good reasons why a person might choose to take a job with a lower level of responsibility than they've had in the past. If you find yourself making assumptions about the person's motivation, check them out at the interview, or call the person and make sure they understand that the job will not be at a higher level than advertised.

   Don't assume that holding a higher-level job necessarily means that a person can do lower-level tasks. You need to assess each person's qualifications for this position. If the person's application suggests that they can do the job, our policy is to hire the best-qualified person.

8. **Is it appropriate to make judgments about a person's skills from the way they fill out the application (or other application materials)?**

   If the job requires good spelling and grammar and the application is filled with errors, it's appropriate to assume they don't have these skills. But don't screen out applicants for trivial reasons just to reduce the pile -- you may be missing a great employee.

9. **How should patterns in a person's job history be evaluated?**

Be careful not to make unwarranted assumptions. People may have reasons for changing jobs or taking time between jobs that have nothing to do with how good they are as an employee. When checking references, check whether the reason for leaving stated on the application is consistent with that given by the reference.

Progressively responsible job experience can be a positive indication of the applicant's ability to adapt to new situations and grow within a job.

10. **What should you do when you have more information about one applicant than another? -- e.g. if one person submits a lot of extra material with their application?**

    Just remember that having more evidence about a person's qualifications doesn't necessarily mean they are better qualified. You can always take steps to get more information on applicants -- e.g. with a phone call or request for more written information -- as long as you don't give anyone an unfair advantage.

11. **How much weight should letters of reference be given?**

    Letters of reference should not be taken at face value. Letters of reference, which speak to an individual's specific accomplishments, can generally be given more consideration. Remember that a letter of reference does not replace the need for a reference check, should the candidate be selected.

12. **What if the applicant is currently making a higher salary than you are able to offer?**

    If you are concerned that if selected, the applicant may not accept the position because of salary limitations, you may advise the applicant when they are contacted for an interview that you are concerned about a potential salary issue and then reiterate the salary. This allows the applicant to make the decision as to whether s/he is still interested in the position.

13. **What if the applicant has a disability?**

    It is illegal to discount an otherwise qualified individual because s/he has a disability. The Americans with Disabilities Act requires that the University take steps to reasonably accommodate individuals with disabilities so they may perform the essential functions of a position. Keep the focus on whether the individual has the skills to perform the position.

14. **What if a current employee applies for the job and you know more about them (positive or negative)?**

    You don't need to try to forget what you know, but only reliable information (not rumors or reputation) about their actual job performance is appropriate to use.

    You should evaluate the information in terms of the qualifications established for the position. If the information influences your decision to interview or not interview the applicant you should document the information for your own recruitment notes.

15. **What should be done when, after screening on the criteria, there are too many well-qualified applicants to interview?**

It may not be to your advantage to screen out candidates based on small qualification differences. You should always focus on the most important qualifications. If there are not significant differences on the application that allow you to screen your pool further, consider gathering additional information on the best qualified applicants by using one of the following tools to assist you in selecting interviewees:

- Brief phone interviews
- Pre-interview reference checks
- Supplemental application
- Work sample request

16. **What should one do with perceived pressure for a "courtesy interview"?**

It is important to apply the criteria selected for evaluating applicants consistently to all applicants. Interviewing someone who is not as qualified as other applicants on a 'courtesy' basis can raise unrealistic expectations on the part of the interviewee and may form a basis for a complaint of discrimination by other applicants. This includes internal applicants that you know are not qualified based on personal prior knowledge of the applicant's performance.

You may wish to offer an informal meeting with the individual to discuss their interest in the position and explain why they were not selected for an interview.

17. **How many applicants should I select for Interview?**

The number of applicants you select for interview will depend on many things: how large to pool is, how qualified the applicants are, how much time you can make for interviews, etc. If you find that you have too many well-qualified candidates to interview, consider using the tools mentioned in FAQ#15 to narrow them down to manageable number.

18. **What should one do about affirmative action?**

You should try to maximize the diversity of the pool by advertising as widely as possible and making use of the outreach program for positions where there is underutilization. When screening applications, you will not receive information on applicant's sex/ethnicity since you may not use an applicant's sex/ethnicity as a basis for selection for interview.

Sample Interview Questions to Probe Cultural Competencies and Contributions to Diversity

1. We expect a high level of performance from everyone at Cal Poly Pomona, no matter their position. We build teams of really bright people, and we empower each other and value our diversity, celebrate and reward our success. What is your model of success and how will you fit into this culture?

2. Cal Poly Pomona is one of the most diverse campuses in the nation. On our campus you will encounter students from a multitude of backgrounds, races, nationalities, socio-economic classes, religions,   gender identities, sexual orientations—including the second largest deaf/hard of hearing student population in the country. What skills do you have that will enable you to succeed in this environment?

3. Describe how you, as a faculty member, function and communicate effectively and respectfully within the context of varying beliefs, behaviors, and backgrounds.

4. What opportunities have you had working and collaborating in diverse, multicultural and inclusive settings and how would you continue that at Cal Poly Pomona?

5. What is your definition of diversity? How do you encourage people to honor the uniqueness of each individual? How do you challenge stereotypes and promote inclusion and understanding differences?

6. How do you seek opportunities to improve the learning environment to better meet the needs of students from all over the world and from students who have been historically marginalized, such as Native Americans, African Americans, Latinos, Asians, and other communities such as students with disabilities and veterans?

7. What is your method of communication with students who are different from you?   How do you convey thoughts, ideas, or adverse conclusions?

8. Describe your experience or explain how you have been educated to understand the history of African Americans, Latinos, Asians, Native Americans and other historically marginalized communities? How have such knowledge and experiences shaped your teaching philosophy and/or practices?

9. Describe a situation in which you utilized your multicultural skills and competencies to solve a problem.

10. What ideas do you have for educating students about diversity?

EMPLOYMENT INQUIRIES

WHAT CAN EMPLOYERS ASK APPLICANTS AND EMPLOYEES?

The Department of Fair Employment and Housing has developed this guide to provide employers with guidance relating to inquiries that can be made to applicants and employees

The California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) prohibits any non-job-related inquiries of applicants or employees, either verbally or through the use of an application form, that express, directly or indirectly a limitation, specification or discrimination as to race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, sex, age, or sexual orientation, or any intent to

make such a limitation, specification, or discrimination.

The regulations of Fair Employment and Housing Commission indicate that inquiries that, directly or indirectly, identify an individual on a basis enumerated in the Act are **unlawful.** However, it is not unlawful for an employer to collect applicant flow data and other record keeping data for statistical purposes. Misuse of this data constitutes a violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act.

APPLICANTS

The FEHA also prohibits an employer from requiring any medical or psychological examination or inquiry of any applicant or to make any inquiry whether an applicant has a mental or physical disability or medical condition. It is also unlawful to make an inquiry regarding the nature and severity of a mental or physical disability or medical condition. However, an employer may inquire into the ability of an applicant to perform job-related functions and may respond to an applicant's request for reasonable accommodation.

Once an employment offer has been made to an applicant, but prior to the commencement of employment duties, an employer may require a medical or psychological examination provided that:

* the examination or inquiry is job-related and consistent with business necessity and;
  that all entering employees in the same job classification are subject to the same examination or inquiry.

EMPLOYEES

An employer may not require any medical or psychological examination or make any inquiry of an employee, or inquire whether an employee has a mental or physical disability or medical condition or inquire into the severity of the disability or condition.

However, an employer may require any medical or psychological examination or make inquiries that it can show are job-related and consistent with business necessity. An employer may conduct voluntary medical examinations, including medical histories, which are part of an employee health program available to the employee at the work site.

EMPLOYMENT INQUIRIES

ACCEPTABLE	SUBJECT	UNACCEPTABLE
Name Place of residence	NAME RESIDENCE	• Maiden name . Questions regarding owning or
Statements that hire is subject to verification that applicants meet legal age requirements.	AGE	Age Birth date • Date of attendance/completion of school • Questions which tend to identify
Statements/inquiries regarding verification of legal right to work in the United States.	BIRTHPLACE, CITIZENSHIP	. Birthplace of applicant or applicant's parents, spouse or other relatives. • Requirements that applicant produce naturalization or alien card prior too employment.
Languages applicant reads, speaks or writes if use of language other than English is relevant to the job for which applicant is applying. Statement by employer of regular days, hours, or shifts to be worked.	NATIONAL ORIGIN RELIGION	• Questions as to nationality, lineage, ancestry, national origin, descent or parentage of applicant, applicant's spouse, parent or relative. Questions regarding applicant's religion. + Religious days observed.
Name and address of parent or guardian if applicant is a minor. Statement of company policy regarding work assignment of employees who are related.	SEX, MARITAL STATUS, FAMILY	• Questions to indicate applicant's sex, marital status, number/ages of children or dependents. • Questions regarding pregnancy, child birth, or birth control Name/address of relative, spouse or children of adult applicant.
	RACE, COLOR, SEXUAL ORIENTATION	Questions to applicant's race, color, or sexual orientation. • Questions regarding applicant's complexion, color of eyes, hair or sexual orientation.
	CREDIT REPORT	• Any report which would indicate information which is otherwise illegal to ask, e.g , marital status, age, residency, etc.
Statement that a photograph may be required after employment.	PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION, PHOTOGRAPHS, FINGERPRINTS	Questions as to applicant's height/weight. • Requiring applicant to affix a photograph to application or submit one at his/her option. • Require a photograph after interview
Employer may inquire if applicant can perform job-related functions. Statement that employment offer may be made contingent upon passing a job-related mental/physical examination.	MENTAL/PHYSICAL DISABILITY, MENTAL CONDITION (APPLICANTS)	• Any inquiry into the applicant's general health, medical condition, or mental/physical disability. . Requiring a psychological/medical examination of any applicant.

	MENTAL/PHYSICAL DISABILITY MEDICAL CONDITION (POST- OFFER/IPRE-EMPLOYMENT)	
A medical/psychological examination/ inquiry may be made as long as the examination/inquiry is job-related and consistent with business necessity and all applicants for the same job classification are subject to the same examination/inquiry.	MENTALIPHYSICAL DISABILITY MEDICAL CONDITION (POST- OFFER/IPRE-EMPLOYMENT)	Any inquiry into the applicant's general health, medical condition, or physical/mental disability, if not job-related and consistent with business necessity.
A medical/psychological examination/inquiry may be made as long as the examination is job-related and consistent with business necessity. Job-related questions about convictions, except those convictions which have been sealed, or expunged, or statutorily eradicated. Questions regarding relevant skills acquired during U.S. military service.	MENTAL/PHYSICAL DISABILITY MEDICAL CONDITION ARREST CRIMINAL RECORD MILITARY SERVICE	Any inquiry into the employee's general health, medical condition, or mental/physical disability, if not job-related and consistent with business necessity. • General questions regarding arrest record. General questions regarding military service such as dates/type of discharge. • Questions regarding service in a foreign military.
Requesting lists of job-related organizations, clubs or professional societies omitting indications of protected bases. Name of persons willing to provide professional and/or character references for applicant.	ORGANIZATIONS, ACTIVITIES REFERENCES	General questions regarding organizations, clubs, societies and lodges. • Questions of applicant's former employers or acquaintances which elicit information specifying applicant's race, etc.
Name and address of person to be notified in case of accident or emergency.	NOTICE IN CASE OF EMERGENCY	Name, address, and relationship of relative to be notified in case of accident or emergency.

NOTE: Any inquiry, even though neutral on its face, which has an adverse impact on persons on a basis enumerated in the Fair Employment and Housing Act, is permissible only if it is sufficiently related to an essential job function to **warrant** its use.

For more information, contact the Department
toll free at: **(800) 884-1684**

TTY Number: **(800) 700-2320**

or visit our Web site at: www.dfeh.ca.gov

This publication can be made available in Braille, large print, computer disk, and tape cassette.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING
2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100
Elk Grove, CA, 95758

DFEH-161 (8/01)

Additional Questions to Avoid

The following is a list of additional prohibited questions <u>as well as some exceptions</u>:

a. Transportation arrangements
b. Childcare arrangements
c. Personal dress, grooming or related practices
d. Spouse's employment status or position
e. Political affiliation or views on local, national or world affairs
f. Membership in clubs, societies, lodges or organizations which might indicate race, religion, etc., except professional ones. You **may**, however, ask about membership in any union or professional or trade organization, unless it would indicate the applicant's religion, gender, age, race, etc.
g. The lowest salary the applicant will accept.
h. Whether observance of religious holidays will prevent applicant from working.
i. The fact of a change of name or the original name of an applicant whose name has been changed. You **may**, however, ask about an assumed or nickname if it is necessary to enable a check on the applicant's work record.
j. Living arrangements, e.g., "Do you live with your parents?"
k. Child support obligations
l. Language: Applicant's native langue; language commonly used by applicant at applicant's home; how the applicant acquired the ability to read, write or speak a foreign language. You **may** ask what language the applicant speaks and writes fluently, and reads or understands, but only if a language other than English is relevant to the job being applied for.
m. Relatives: You **may** ask the name and position of any relatives already employed by the employer.
n. Age: You **may** state/ask whether the applicant is over 18 years of age.
o. Military Service: You **may** ask whether separation from the military service was for any reason other than an honorable discharge. You may also ask whether applicant has received any notice to report for duty in the Armed Forces.

Research on Bias and Assumptions Shape the Review Process

(Adapted from the Faculty Search Committee Toolkit, ULCA Office of Faculty Diversity and Development)

We all like to think that we are objective scholars who judge people based entirely on their experience and achievements, but copious research shows that every one of us brings a lifetime of experience and cultural history that shapes the review process.

The results from controlled studies in which people were asked to make judgments about subjects demonstrate the potentially prejudicial nature of the many implicit or unconscious assumptions we can make. Examples range from physical and social expectations or assumptions to those that have a clear connection to hiring, even for faculty positions.

It is important to note that in most of these studies, the gender of the evaluator was not significant, indicating that both men and women share and apply the same assumptions about gender. Recognizing biases and other influences not related to the quality of candidates can help reduce their impact on your search and review of candidates. Spending sufficient time on evaluation (15-20 minutes per application) can also reduce the influence of assumptions.

Individuals May Not Fit the Generalization

- When shown photographs of people of the same height, evaluators overestimated the heights of male subjects and underestimated the heights of female subjects, even though a reference point, such as a doorway, was provided (Biernat et al.).
- When shown photographs of men with similar athletic abilities, evaluators rated the athletic ability of African American men higher than that of white men (Biernat et al.).

These studies show how generalizations that may or may not be valid can be applied to the evaluation of individuals (Bielby and Baron). In the study on height, evaluators applied the statistically accurate generalization that men are usually taller than women to their estimates of the height of individuals who did not necessarily conform to the generalization. If we can inaccurately apply generalizations to characteristics as objective and easily measured as height, what happens when the qualities we are evaluating are not as objective or as easily measured? What happens when the generalizations are not accurate?

Evaluation Bias

- When rating the quality of verbal skills as indicated by vocabulary definitions, evaluators rated the skills lower if they were told an African American provided the definitions than if they were told that a white person provided them (Biernat et al.).

- When asked to assess the contribution of skill and luck to successful performance of a task, evaluators more frequently attributed success to skill for males and to luck for females, even though males and females succeeded equally. (Deaux and Emswiller).

- Evidence shows that perceived incongruities between the female gender role and leadership roles cause two types of disadvantage for women: (1) ideas about the female gender role cause women to be perceived as having less leadership ability than men and consequently diminish women's rise to leadership positions, and (2) women in leadership positions receive less favorable evaluations because they are perceived to be violating gender norms. These perceived incongruities lead to attitudes that are less positive toward female than male leaders (Eagly and Karau; Ridgeway).

- Evaluators who were busy, distracted by other tasks, and under time pressure gave women lower ratings than men for the same written evaluation of job performance. Sex bias decreased when they were able to give all their time and attention to their judgments, which rarely occurs in actual work settings. This study indicates that evaluators are more likely to rely upon underlying assumptions and biases when they cannot/do not give sufficient time and attention to their evaluations (Martell).

Biases in Academic Contexts

- A study of postdoctoral fellowships awarded by the Medical Research Council in Sweden, found that women candidates needed substantially more publications (the equivalent of 3 more papers in Nature or Science, or 20 more papers in specialty journals such as Infection and Immunity or Neuroscience) to achieve the same rating as men, unless they personally knew someone on the panel (Wenneras and Wold).

- A study of over 300 recommendation letters for medical faculty at a large American medical school in the 1990s found that letters for female applicants differed systematically from those for males. Letters written for women were shorter, provided "minimal assurance" rather than solid recommendation, raised more doubts, and portrayed women as students and teachers while portraying men as researchers and professionals. All letters studied were written for successful candidates only. (Trix and Psenka).

- Another study showed that the preference for males was greater when women represented a small proportion of the pool of candidates, as is typical in many academic fields (Heilman).

- In a national study, 238 academic psychologists (118 male, 120 female) evaluated a résumé randomly assigned a male or a female name. Both male and female participants gave the male applicant better evaluations for teaching, research, and service experience and both were more

likely to hire the male than the female applicant. (Steinpries, et.al.)

Assumptions and Biases in the Search Process

Biases and assumptions can influence your search in the following ways:

- Women and minority candidates may be subject to different expectations in areas such as numbers of publications, name recognition, or personal acquaintance with a committee member. (Recall the example of the Swedish Medical Research Council.)
- Candidates from institutions other than the major research universities that have trained most of our faculty may be under-valued.
- The work, ideas, and findings of women or minorities may be undervalued or unfairly attributed to a research director or collaborators despite contrary evidence in publications or letters of reference. (Recall the biases seen in evaluations of written descriptions of job performance, and the attribution of success to luck rather than skill.)
- The ability of females or minorities to run a research group, raise funds, and supervise students and staff of different gender or ethnicity may be underestimated. (Recall social assumptions about leadership abilities.)
- Assumptions about possible family responsibilities and their effect on the candidate's career path may negatively influence evaluation of a candidate's merit, despite evidence of productivity. (Recall studies of the influence of generalizations on evaluation.)
- Negative assumptions about whether female or minority candidates will "fit in" to the existing environment can influence evaluation.

Practices to Enable Equity—Reviewing Applicants

- Learn about research on biases and assumptions. Consciously strive to minimize their influence on your evaluation of candidates.
- Develop criteria for evaluating candidates and apply them consistently to all applicants.
- Spend sufficient time (15-20 minutes) evaluating each applicant.
- Evaluate each candidate's entire application; don't depend too heavily on only one element such as the letters of recommendation, or the prestige of the degree-granting institution or postdoctoral program.
- Be able to defend every decision for rejecting or retaining a candidate.
- Periodically evaluate your decisions and consider whether qualified women and underrepresented minorities are included. If not, consider whether evaluation biases and assumptions are influencing your decisions.

References

Bielby, W.T. & Baron, J.N., "Sex segregation and statistical discrimination," American Journal of Sociology 91(1986): 759-799.

Biernat, M., Manis, M., & Nelson, T., "Stereotypes and standards of judgment," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 66(1991): 5-20.

Deaux, K. & Emswiller, T., "Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 29(1974): 80- 85.

Dovidio, J.F. & Gaertner, S.L., "Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999," Psychological Science 11(2000): 315-319.

Eagly, A.H.; Karau, S.J., "Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders," Psychological Review 109, no. 3 (July 2002): 573-597.

Heilman, M. E., "The impact of situational factors on personnel decisions concerning women: varying the sex composition of the applicant pool," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 26 (1980): 386-395.

Martell, R.F., "Sex bias at work: The effects of attentional and memory demands on performance ratings for men and women," Journal of Applied Social Psychology 21(1991): 1939-60. Ridgeway C.L., "Gender, status, and leadership," Journal of Social Issues 57(2001): 637-655. Steinpreis, R., Anders, K.A., & Ritzke, D., "The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study," Sex Roles 41(1999): 509-528. Trix, F. & Psenka, C., "Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty," Discourse & Society 14(2003): 191-220.

Turner, C.S.V., Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees (Washington, DC: AACU, 2002), 16.

Valian, V., Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999), 303- 306.

Wenneras, C. & Wold, A., "Nepotism and sexism in peer-review," Nature. 387(1997): 341-43.

NOTE: This information came from an informational packet developed by WISELI at the University of Wisconsin, Madison

Practices to Enable Equity
(Adapted from the Faculty Search Committee Toolkit, UCLA)

Search Committee Composition

- Include faculty who are committed to diversity and excellence.

- Ensure that women and minority faculty members have equal opportunity to serve on search committees.

- Include faculty members from other fields to enhance equity and create a more explicit and open discussion.

The Interview

- Avoid illegal and discriminatory questions.

- Use a standard protocol for each campus visit.

- Give candidates the opportunity to talk with others — not the search committee and not even in the same department — about gender and climate issues.

- Provide information about family friendly policies and partner hiring to all candidates.

Job Description/Position Announcement

- Include language that expresses an interest in candidates who will advance our commitment to diversity.

- Broaden the job description to attract the widest possible range of qualified candidates.

- Advertise in venues that reach women and underrepresented minorities, such as special subgroups of professional organizations or focused conferences.

- Note in the ad that UCLA has family friendly policies.

Active Recruiting

- Go beyond the 'usual' range of institutions from which you recruit.

- When contacting colleagues, specifically ask for recommendations of candidates from groups that are underrepresented in your department, in addition to other recommendations.

- Consider candidates who may be currently under-placed and thriving at less well-ranked institutions.

- If multiple searches are taking place in your department, consider using a single search committee for all positions, to allow the consideration of a broader range of applicants.

- Consider hiring outstanding former students after they have had experience elsewhere.

Evaluating Candidates

- Self-Correction — be aware of the possibility of your own unconscious bias.

- Agree upon **evaluation criteria** and **ground rules** for the search committee and stick to them.
  - Agree on rules of discussion and how to handle disagreement.
  - Agree on a method for determining who will be invited to campus.

- Develop evaluation and interview tools to enable consistency.

- Slow down.
  - Make time to review the entire application.
  - Look for non-stereotypical evidence.

- Calibrate the committee.
  - Review and discuss one or two CVs before beginning the review process.

- Do not rank immediately.
  - Consider alternatives to rank ordering, such as summaries of each finalist or creating multiple lists.

- Insist on the evidence.
  - Require faculty members to back up statements and opinions with facts and evidence.
  - Avoid speculation or "crystal ball gazing."

Diversity and Faculty Recruitment: Myths and Reality

(Adapted from "Diversity and Faculty Recruitment: Myths and Reality," by Marlene Zuk, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Equity & Diversity, UC Riverside.)

It is very important that every person hired at UCR knows that they were hired because they were the best person for the job. Ensuring that the pool is large and diverse also means that the best candidate for the position will be more likely to be from a group that may have been under-represented in the past.

Diversity is an issue that comes up in every search. Building a diverse pool of candidates requires conscious effort from the very beginning of the process. It is too late to discuss diversity when and if you are asked, "Why are there no women or minorities on your short list?" Frequently, search committees answer such questions by claiming that "there were no women or minority applicants" or "there were no good ones". But a goal of every search should be to ensure that there are outstanding women and minority candidates in the pool. Think broadly and creatively. In virtually all fields, simply placing an ad in one or two journals and waiting for applications is not enough; that route will miss some of the best candidates for the position, regardless of their gender or ethnicity.

People harbor several myths about hiring and diversity. Some of the most common are addressed below.

1. **"We are focused on quality as our criterion for hiring. Adding diversity means compromising quality."**

   No one recommends sacrificing quality for diversity, and no qualified candidate wants to be considered on the basis of diversity alone. But our current practices may unintentionally exclude highly qualified people because we act on our biases (see material on "Bias and faculty recruitment"). By recruiting a pool that reflects the availability of candidates from all groups, and by ensuring that we do not use criteria that may disadvantage women or minority candidates, quality will increase, not decrease. Furthermore, remember that the "best" candidate has skills and talents that will benefit many aspects of the university, including its students and faculty. Diverse faculty members can enhance the educational experience of all students, an important goal of the university.

2. **"Relatively few qualified women or minority candidates are available, and these are highly sought-after, so we are unlikely to recruit them."**

   Although the availability of women and minorities varies across fields, in many areas we are currently hiring well below that availability. And as the studies detailed in the articles on "How to Diversify the Faculty" and "Interrupting the Usual" show, many highly qualified minority postdoctoral scholars were not actively recruited by academic institutions.

   Institutions do not seem to be "fighting over" a few candidates. Search committees have every reason to expect to be successful in finding qualified women and minority candidates for their pool.

3. **"The problem will solve itself as more women and minorities move through the pipeline and the "old guard" retires. (Corollary: we really don't have to do anything new or different now.)"**

Although the numbers of minorities and particularly women obtaining Ph.D.s and entering the workforce has steadily increased over the last several decades, hiring and advancement of these groups (i.e., promotion to tenure and full professor) has not kept pace, and it essential that we take proactive measures to address this. Faculty who are being hired are still disproportionately white males, and business as usual is not solving the problem.