



SEARCHING FOR EXCELLENCE AND DIVERSITY:
A WORKSHOP FOR SEARCH COMMITTEES
EVALUATION OF SESSION FOR
CROSS-COLLEGE UNITS (1B)
PRESENTED SEPTEMBER 30, 2014

Submitted to:

Eve Fine

Researcher and Curriculum Director, WISELI

Jennifer Sheridan

Executive and Research Director, WISELI

Molly Carnes

Co-Director, WISELI

Director, UW Center for Women's Health Research
Jean Manchester Biddick Professor of Women's Health Research
Professor, Departments of Medicine, Psychiatry,
and Industrial & Systems Engineering

Submitted by:

Julia Nelson Savoy

Research Specialist, WISELI

Christine Maida Pribbenow

Evaluation Director, WISELI

Associate Scientist, Wisconsin Center for Education Research

October 20, 2014

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS	1
RESPONDENT INFORMATION	1
RESULTS	2
OVERALL WORKSHOP AND INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT RATINGS	2
OVERALL WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATION	3
IMPLEMENTATION OF MATERIALS AND INFORMATION.....	3
RESPONDENT SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
GENERAL COMMENTS.....	5
APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	6

Introduction

This report describes the results of a survey evaluating the workshop, “Searching for Excellence and Diversity: A Workshop for Search Committees.” The workshop was held on September 30, 2014 and was conducted by Eve Fine, WISELI Researcher and Curriculum Developer; Molly Carnes, Professor of Medicine and Co-Director of WISELI; and Michael Bernard-Donals, Professor of English and Jewish Studies and Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff Programs.

The purpose of the survey is to assess three areas related to the workshop: the perceived value or usefulness of different components from the perspectives of the participants, the ways in which participants anticipate using the information and materials provided in the workshop, and suggestions from participants about future workshop planning and implementation.

Methods

The attached survey (see Appendix) was deployed on September 30, 2014 to a list of 20 workshop attendees. The survey population included all registered workshop attendees who signed an informed consent agreement. One reminder email was sent on October 10; the survey was closed on October 16.

For tables displaying quantitative data, we include both the percentage and the number of respondents to each item. For open-ended items, we report all responses provided for each question, coded and presented according to theme. Some responses have been edited for grammar, typographic errors, and to maintain the anonymity of the respondents or others. Furthermore, the respondents may have addressed multiple points or concerns in their open-ended answers, which were then grouped thematically. Therefore, the number of comments is not reflective of the number of people who responded to any given item.

Respondent Information

Out of 20 invitees, 10 people responded to this survey for a response rate of 50%. We asked respondents to share their title or role on campus, and their role on the search committee or in the search process.

Survey respondents’ roles included faculty members and staff members (Table 1). Three respondents did not include a campus position.

	% (n)
Faculty member	86% (6)
Staff member	14% (1)
Total	100% (7)

Table 1: Campus position by percentage and frequency, $n=7$.

Survey respondents identified a range of responsibilities in the search process, including committee member, committee chair, and administrative staff support (Table 2). Three respondents did not include their role on the search committee.

	% (n)
Member of search committee	% (5)
Search committee chair	% (1)
Administrative and resource support	% (1)
Total	100% (7)

Table 2: Role on search committee by percentage and frequency, $n=7$.

When asked, most respondents indicated that they found out about the workshop through marketing emails, their department chair or the search committee chair, and their colleagues (Table 3).

	% (n)
From the search committee or department chair	11% (1)
From a dean or other administrator	67% (6)
Marketing or other email message	11% (1)
Attendance required	11% (1)
Total	100% (9)

Table 3: Source of workshop information by percentage and frequency, $n=9$.

Results

Overall Workshop and Individual Component Ratings

We asked respondents to provide an overall rating of the workshop's usefulness, to rate the value of specific workshop components, and to provide comments about the workshop's components. The response choices for the item assessing the workshop's usefulness included **Not at all Useful** (assigned a value of 1), **Somewhat Useful** (2), and **Very Useful** (3). The response choices for the items about the individual workshop components included **Not at all Valuable** (assigned a value of 1), **Somewhat Valuable** (2), and **Very Valuable** (3). The item assessing individual workshop components also included an **NA** response choice, which was analyzed as missing data.

Most respondents rated the overall workshop as **Somewhat Useful** or **Very Useful** (Table 4), and most of the workshop components as **Somewhat Valuable** or **Very Valuable** (Table 5).

	% (n)	Mean (SD)
Not at all Useful (1)	10% (1)	2.60 (0.70)
Somewhat Useful (2)	20% (2)	
Very Useful (3)	70% (7)	
Total	100% (10)	

Table 4: Overall workshop rating by percentage, frequency, and mean, $n=10$.

Respondents rated the workshop components about evaluating the pool of applicants and ensuring a fair and thorough review of candidates as the most valuable (Table 5).

	Not at all Valuable (1) % (n)	Somewhat Valuable (2) % (n)	Very Valuable (3) % (n)	NA % (n)	Mean (SD)
Introduction (Carnes)	0% (0)	50% (5)	30% (3)	20% (2)	2.70 (0.82)
Run an Effective and Efficient Search Committee (Fine)	10% (1)	40% (4)	50% (5)	0% (0)	2.40 (0.70)
Actively Recruit an Excellent and Diverse Pool of Candidates (Fine, Bernard-Donals)	10% (1)	10% (1)	80% (8)	0% (0)	2.70 (0.67)
Evaluating the Pool of Applicants (Carnes)	0% (0)	20% (2)	70% (7)	0% (1)	2.90 (0.57)
Ensure a Fair and Thorough Review of Candidates (Fine)	0% (0)	20% (2)	70% (7)	10% (1)	2.90 (0.57)
Group Discussions	0% (0)	40% (4)	50% (5)	10% (1)	2.70 (0.67)

Table 5: Workshop component ratings by percentage, frequency, and mean, $n=10$.

We also invited respondents to provide comments about the ratings they assigned to particular components. Three respondents provided additional information, as shown below and grouped by theme.

- Great workshop. Nice combination of research presentation and practical advice.
- I think the workshop overall is very valuable. However, I don't think I got much more out of it by coming again this year than I already had from 3 years ago.
- To be frank, I am not sure what the actual intent of the workshop is.

Overall Workshop Recommendation

When asked, the majority of respondents reported that they would recommend the workshop to others (Table 6).

	% (n)
Yes	90% (9)
No	10% (1)
Total	100% (10)

Table 6: Would/would not recommend workshop to others by percentage and frequency, $n=10$.

When asked why or why not, one respondent, who would not recommend the workshop, provided additional information.

- Again, I'm not sure what purpose it is supposed to achieve.

Implementation of Materials and Information

We then asked respondents to indicate what actions they had already taken or planned to do regarding searches due to their participation in the workshop (Table 7). The actions that most respondents planned to do included using the resources provided by the Provost's office, sharing information about biases and assumptions with others, and relying on the advice in the Searching for Excellence Guidebook for Search Committees.

	Plan to Do % (n)
Consider the membership of the search committee and adjust accordingly.	22% (2)
Consult with the workshop presenters or others on campus about conducting an effective search process.	22% (2)
Discuss and/or establish ground rules for the search committee (e.g., about decision-making, attendance, expectations).	67% (6)
Publicize the position in different venues (compared to previous searches).	33% (3)
Use networking and other means to recruit a diverse pool of candidates.	56% (5)
Use "Recruiting Resources" on WISELI's website.	56% (5)
Use resources in the HR Recruitment Toolkit.	56% (5)
Use resources provided by the Provost's Faculty Diversity Initiative (Strategic Pipeline and Recruitment Fund).	78% (7)
Distribute the brochure, "Reviewing Applicants: Research on Bias and Assumptions," to others.	33% (3)
Share information about biases and assumptions with others.	78% (7)
Develop and prioritize specific criteria for evaluation of candidates.	56% (5)
Spend more time reviewing applications.	44% (4)
Rely on advice/resources in WISELI's Guidebook for Search Committees.	78% (4)
Refer another person to this workshop.	56% (5)

Table 7. Respondent actions planned by percentage and frequency, $n=9$.

Two respondents shared additional activities that they planned to do. These comments included:

- Get the hiring committee together as early as possible. We have not met yet; and we should.
- To be honest, it is too late for us to change our publicizing strategies or our search committee composition now. All of us had hoped there would be an earlier meeting of the workshop!

Respondent Suggestions and Recommendations

In this section of the evaluation, we asked respondents for their feedback on the workshop and for suggestions about how to improve it in the future. We invited them to share ideas or suggestions that would have improved their experience in the workshop, and whether there were any topics they would have liked addressed in the workshop, but were not. We also asked whether they would recommend the workshop to others, and to explain why or why not.

We first invited respondents to provide ideas or suggestions for that would have improved their experiences in the workshop. One respondent provided feedback for this item.

- Start out with a systematic explanation of why we're there and what the concrete aims of the workshop are. For me, it was telling me things I already knew, and confirming practices my department already undertakes. The goal is laudable, but I am not sure that the workshop will help to meet the goals.

We also asked respondents about topics that they would have liked addressed in the workshop, yet were not. One respondent provided an additional topic area.

- The session was focused on gender bias. It would be nice to focus on other types of bias that may come up in the search and screen process.

General Comments

Finally, we asked respondents to share any other comments they might have about the workshop or their experience overall. One respondent provided feedback for this item.

- Great job!

Appendix: Survey Instrument

Default Question Block

Searching for Excellence and Diversity: A Workshop for Search Committees



Thank you!

Please take a few minutes to click on the button below and complete a survey. Results from you and your colleagues are reported in aggregate and are used to improve the workshop and to identify any outcomes from your participation. Thank you, in advance, for the time it takes you to complete this and for your candid feedback. Any questions? Please contact: Christine Pribbenow, (608) 263-4256; cmpribbenow@wisc.edu

Your title or role on campus:

Your role on the search committee or in the search process:

Please rate the value of each of the aspects of the workshop using the scale below (Not at all valuable, Somewhat valuable, Very valuable). Also, feel free to include additional comments.

	Not at all valuable	Somewhat valuable	Very valuable	N/A
Introduction (Carnes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run an Effective and Efficient Search Committee (Fine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Actively Recruit an Excellent and Diverse Pool of Candidates (Fine, Bernard-Donals)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluate the Pool of Applicants (Carnes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensure a Fair and Thorough Review of Candidates (Fine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Group Discussions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please use this space for comments about any of the workshop's components:

Which of the following do you plan to do because of attending this workshop?

	Plan to do
Consider the membership of the search committee and adjust accordingly.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Consult the workshop presenters or others on campus about conducting an effective search process.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discuss and/or establish ground rules for the search committee (e.g., about decision-making, attendance, expectations).	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publicize the position in different venues (compared to previous searches).	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use networking and other means to recruit a diverse pool of candidates.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use "Recruiting Resources" on WISELI's website.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use resources in the HR Recruitment Toolkit.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use resources provided by the Provost's Faculty Diversity Initiative (Strategic Pipeline and Recruitment Fund).	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distribute the	

Please describe other activities you plan to do because of this workshop:

Please provide us with ideas or suggestions that would have improved your experience in this workshop:

What topics did you hope would be covered in this session, yet were not?

Please provide an overall rating for this session.

- Not at all useful
- Somewhat useful
- Very useful

How did you hear about this workshop?

Would you recommend this workshop to others?

- Yes
- No
- Why or why not?

Any other comments?

Survey Powered By **Qualtrics**