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Why should we care about the diversity of the faculty at Anoka Colleges?

Why work with faculty search committees?

How might bias impact hiring of faculty?

- Search committee processes
- Recruitment of candidates
- Review of candidates
- Interview processes
- “Closing the deal”
Why do you think it is important to develop a diversity faculty, or a diverse workforce, at Anoka Colleges?
Benefits of Diversity

- Diverse working groups are more productive, creative, and innovative than homogeneous groups


Benefits of Diversity

- Diverse groups engage in a higher level of critical analysis than do homogenous groups


Benefits of Diversity

- Diverse scholars and professionals can invigorate and expand disciplines and fields
  - New approaches to teaching
  - New research questions
  - New perspectives and interpretations
  - New concerns
And of course:

- Fairness & Equity
- Role models and mentors for a diverse student body
Employees and Students of Color, ARCC

Source: Accountability Dashboard, 4/27/18.
Employees and Students of Color, ATC

Source: Accountability Dashboard, 4/27/18.
Why Faculty Search Committees?

- Faculty hire faculty
- Faculty are not trained in good hiring practices
  - “The way we’ve always done it”
  - Wide variety of procedures
  - Time pressure
- Failed searches are expensive (time and money)
- Opportunity to shape demographics of faculty for coming decades
6 ELEMENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL SEARCH

I. Run an effective and efficient search committee
II. Actively recruit an excellent and diverse pool of candidates
III. Raise awareness of unconscious assumptions and their influence on evaluation of applicants
IV. Ensure a fair and thorough review of applicants
V. Develop and implement an effective interview process
VI. Close the deal: Successfully hire your selected candidate
RUN AN EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SEARCH COMMITTEE
Run an effective and efficient search committee

- Procedures can be used to enhance the search...they are not always bureaucratic “red tape”!
  - Set ground rules and expectations (e.g., attendance, decision-making, role of the committee, time commitment involved)
  - Consider the composition of the search committee (hint: diverse is better!)
  - Confidentiality
ACTIVELY RECRUIT AN EXCELLENT AND DIVERSE POOL OF CANDIDATES
GROUP DISCUSSION

What strategies have you successfully used to recruit an excellent and diverse pool of candidates?
Actively recruit an excellent and diverse pool of candidates

- **Short-term strategies:**
  - Interesting job ad/job description
  - Placement of job ads—publications, listservs
  - Networking!

- **Long-term strategies:** Networking!
  - Professional societies
  - Contacts at institutions that graduate excellent and diverse students
  - Visitors and guest lecturers in departments on campus
RAISE AWARENESS OF UNCONSCIOUS ASSUMPTIONS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS
Raise awareness of unconscious bias

- What is unconscious bias?
- How might unconscious biases influence evaluation of candidates?
- How can a search committee minimize the influence of bias?
Bias as a *habit of mind*

Ordinary mental operations that serve us quite well in most circumstances are subject to error and can fail our intentions.
STROOP EFFECT
COLOR NAMING TEST

Stroop, Journal of Experimental Psychology 1935
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RED</strong></td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>YELLOW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>BROWN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RED</strong></td>
<td><strong>YELLOW</strong></td>
<td><strong>BLUE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROWN</strong></td>
<td><strong>BROWN</strong></td>
<td><strong>BLUE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jerry Kang, “Immaculate Perception”, TEDx San Diego 2013
Unconscious bias

- A substantial body of evidence demonstrates that most people hold unconscious assumptions or biases about groups of people.

- Depending on the discipline, unconscious biases can also be referred to as:
  - Schemas
  - Stereotypes
  - Mental models
  - Cognitive shortcuts
  - Statistical discrimination
  - Implicit associations
  - System 1 thinking
  - Spontaneous trait inference

The tendency of our minds to judge individuals by the characteristics (real or imagined) of the groups to which they belong.
Stereotypes about men?

Stereotypes about women?

Stereotypes about professors?
Gender stereotypes

- Men are *agentic*: decisive, strong, competitive, ambitious, independent, willing to take risks
- Women are *communal*: nurturing, nice, gentle, supportive, sympathetic, dependent
- These stereotypes lead to *expectancy bias* and assumptions of *occupational role congruity*
- *Prescriptive norms*: how women and men *should* and *should not* be
- *Social penalties* for violating prescriptive gender norms

### Common racial/ethnic stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African American¹</th>
<th>Chinese²</th>
<th>Latinos³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Have many children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in intelligence</td>
<td>Loyal to family ties</td>
<td>Illegal immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>Scientifically minded</td>
<td>Dark-skinned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Business oriented</td>
<td>Uneduated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loud</td>
<td>Strong values</td>
<td>Family-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Clever</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Day laborers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorant</td>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>Gangsters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unconscious bias in the search process

- Applications/curriculum vitae/résumés
- Reference letters
- Interviews/evaluation of leadership
Evaluation of CVs and résumés

- 238 academic psychologists (118 male, 120 female) evaluated an actual CV randomly assigned a male name (Brian Miller) or female name (Karen Miller)
  - Junior level—little evidence of productivity
  - Senior level—CV of professor who applied and received early tenure

- Respondents asked to rate research, teaching, service, recommend hire/tenure, and return all materials

Evaluation of CVs and résumés

- **Entry-level:**
  - More likely to hire “Brian Miller”
  - “Brian Miller” had higher ratings for research, teaching, and service
  - NO DIFFERENCE in ratings of male vs. female respondents

- **Senior-level:**
  - Equally likely to recommend tenure for “Karen” vs. “Brian”
  - FOUR TIMES as likely to put cautionary comments on “Karen’s” materials compared to “Brian’s”

Evaluation of CVs and résumés

- “Bank” of résumés with differing skills, characteristics, higher and lower “quality”
- Résumés randomly assigned a “white-sounding” or “African-American-sounding” name
- Résumés sent to actual job openings advertised in Chicago and Boston newspapers
- Measured callbacks

Evaluation of CVs and résumés

- Applicants with “white-sounding” names were 50% more likely to be called back for an interview.

- Applicants with “white-sounding” names and a higher-quality résumé were 27% more likely to be called back, compared to white names/lower quality résumé.

- Applicants with “African American-sounding” names and a higher-quality résumé only 8% more likely to get a callback (not statistically significant).

Evaluation of CVs and résumés

“I sent my resume for something and when I showed up someone said to me, ‘Your resume didn’t look black.’ Can you imagine someone saying that?”

- URM female, senior faculty member

Pololi et al. (2010), JGIM 25(12): 1363-69.
Evaluation of recommendation letters

- 312 letters of recommendation for medical faculty successfully hired at a large U.S. medical school
- Letters written for women vs. men:
  - Shorter
  - Offered “minimal assurance”
  - More gendered terms
  - More doubt-raisers
  - Fewer “standout adjectives”
  - More “grindstone adjectives”
  - More references to personal lives

Evaluation of recommendation letters


Semantic realms following the possessive (e.g., “her training”)

- Training
- Teaching
- Application
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Male
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- Career
Evaluation of recommendation letters

Semantic realms following the possessive (e.g., “her training”)

Evaluation of job interviews

- Taped male and female candidates interviewing for a leadership position in a male dominated field (computer lab manager)

- Candidates were actors trained to perform an agentic or communal script of 12 interview questions

- 428 evaluators (50% women) viewed the taped interviews and rated the “candidates” on competence, likeability, and hireability

Evaluation of job interviews

- **Competence**: Agentic interviewees rated more competent than communal

- **Likeability**: Agentic men rated more likeable than agentic women; communal men less likeable than communal women

Hireability:

- Agentic interviewees more hireable than communal
- No gender difference for communal interviewees
- GENDER DIFFERENCE for agentic interviewees: Agentic men more hireable than agentic women
  - WHY? SHIFTING CRITERIA
  - For agentic men, communal men, communal women—competence weighted most heavily in hiring decision
  - For agentic women, likeability/social skills (perceived weakness) weighted most heavily

Case Study
ENSURE A FAIR AND THOROUGH REVIEW OF CANDIDATES
Minimizing unconscious bias in a hiring setting

WHAT NOT TO DO!

- Suppress bias and assumptions
  - “Stereotype rebound”

- Rely solely on one’s sense of “objectivity”
  - Numeric ranking systems
Minimizing unconscious bias:
BEFORE conducting evaluations

- Replace your self-image as an objective person with recognition and acceptance that you are subject to the influence of bias and assumptions

- Diversify your search committee
  - Social tuning/increased motivation to respond without bias
  - Counterstereotype imaging

- Critical mass—increase proportion of women and minorities in the applicant pool
  Heilman (1980) Organizational Behavior and Human Performance
  Van Ommeren et al. (2005) Psychological Reports

- Develop and prioritize criteria prior to evaluating applicants
Minimizing unconscious bias: WHILE conducting evaluations

- Spend sufficient time and attention on evaluating each application

- Focus on each applicant as an individual and evaluate their entire application package – information minimizes bias
  Tosi and Einbender (1985) *Academy of Management Journal*.

- Use inclusion rather than exclusion decision-making processes

- Stop periodically to evaluate your criteria and their application

- Accountability: Be able to defend every decision!
DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT AN EFFECTIVE INTERVIEW PROCESS
Describe an interview experience you had that was memorable (good or bad). What lessons can be learned for ARCC/ATC?
Two key aims of the on-campus interview:

- Allow the hiring department to determine whether the candidate possesses the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other attributes to be successful at your college

  AND.....

- Allow the candidate to determine whether your college offers the opportunities, facilities, colleagues and other attributes necessary for his/her successful employment

Keep both of these aims in mind!!!
On-campus interviews

- **PLAN** for an effective interview process
  - Make sure all interviewers are aware of inappropriate questions
  - Develop interview questions that will evaluate candidates' entire record; consider asking different interviewers to discuss different aspects of the position rather than all interviewers asking the same set of questions
  - Personalize the visit/universal design
  - Provide candidates with a knowledgeable source of information about the collect/community from someone NOT INVOLVED in the search
  - Develop and share an information packet
On-campus interviews

■ DURING the visit
  □ Ensure that candidates are treated fairly and with respect
  □ Inappropriate questions are inappropriate in both formal and informal settings!

■ AFTER the visit
  □ Review materials on unconscious bias to ensure assumptions have not influenced your final evaluation of the candidates
CLOSE THE DEAL:
SUCCESSFULLY HIRE YOUR SELECTED CANDIDATE
Close the deal

- Timeliness
- Maintain communication
- Dual career issues/timeliness (?
- Negotiation of start-up packages (?
- Return visit (?)

Ensure the Success of Your Chosen Candidate!!!
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