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Two Models of Faculty Search Committee Education: UIC and UW-Madison

- Design and implementation of workshops
  - WISELI – UW-Madison
  - WISEST – UIC
- Content presented in workshops
  - WISEST – UIC
  - WISELI – UW-Madison
- Evaluation
  - WISELI – UW-Madison
  - WISEST – UIC
- Q & A
Design and implementation of workshops:
WISELI – UW-Madison

- Why develop a workshop for Search Committees?
Design and implementation of workshops:
WISELI – UW-Madison

- Designing the workshop
  - Initial concept
  - Guiding principles
  - Input from a design team
  - Pilot sessions
  - Evaluation
Design and implementation of workshops: WISELI – UW-Madison

- Target audience
  - Discipline/department
  - Faculty, staff, and/or administrators
  - Chair vs. whole committee

- Gaining participation
  - Support of high level administrators
  - Accountability
Design and implementation of workshops: WISELI – UW-Madison

- Implementation/administration of workshops
  - Organization
    - scheduling, room reservation, registration, room setup, refreshments, etc.
  - Invitation and publicity
  - Presentation
  - Facilitation
  - Development and distribution of materials
  - Evaluation
UIC IMPLEMENTATION

• Background: Claudia Morrissey, MD, fresh to UIC (i.e. outsider’s views), founded principles of WISEST

• Facilitator model – STEM research faculty, at least one per dept, activities are faculty-driven and faculty-invested, ‘grass roots’

• SUCCEED Committee

  Supporting UIC’s Commitment to a Community of Excellence, Equity & Diversity

• Differences from WISELI...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How designed? Who helped decide what content to include?</th>
<th>Early 2002, <strong>Facilitator concept</strong> by Claudia Morrissey, WISEST founder. <strong>SUCCEED workshop</strong> based on leadership seminars (Virginia Valian, Molly Carnes, Sue Rosser, etc.) and Michigan’s STRIDE. <strong>Ever-evolving via post-facto discussions</strong> with other facilitators after every workshop. Provide national and UIC reality (department-tailored)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Our target audience | Specific: **Entire faculty search committee at first meeting**  
General: **Entire college faculty or executive officers of colleges (Liberal Arts, Medicine, Engineering)** |
| How audience recruited? | Dean announces authorized searches to SUCCEED and the chair of search committee is advised by Dept. Head to schedule a SUCCEED workshop. |
| Who implements? | **Faculty.** Founder Morrissey and STEM faculty who comprise the SUCCEED team and attended past **workshops** prepare the **materials**. SUCCEED makes arrangements with search committee chair, customize/update presentation, develop and distribute materials (SUCCEED Brochure and **Search Toolkit**). |
| Accompanying changes in overall processes | **We are insiders! Dept. facilitator often a member of search or is a consultant: pro-active searching.** Women faculty involved in campus interviews of female candidates. **Search Toolkit** includes many aspects of fair evaluation, as well as climate issues, e.g. life-friendly policies. |
SKELETON of SUCCEED PRESENTATION:

• Who we are
• What’s the issue?
• Common beliefs
• What research shows
• Concepts search committees must understand: Lack of critical mass, gender schemas, evaluation bias (schemas in action), accumulation of disadvantage
• What can search committees do? Strategies for recruiting a diverse faculty: Lessons from SUCCEED and Search Toolkit
• Case studies: Pro-active recruiting vs. standard practice
Message: We are faculty just like you, obtain & manage research grants, run research groups; we want to hire the best candidate, just like you do.

Who We Are

- Constantine Manosidis, Chair
- Mechanical and
- Sharad Laxpa
  Electrical & Comp
- Cynthia James
  Chemistry, Chem
- Martin Newcomb
  Chemistry
- Ludwig Nitsch
  Chemical Engi
- 8 additional fa

SUCCEED’s Mission

Supporting UIC’s Commitment to a Community of Excellence, Equity & Diversity

To support UIC’s commitment to creating a community of excellence, by assisting search committees identify, recruit & hire talented and diverse faculty and heads
**Message:** Its not the pipeline!

**What’s the Issue?**

- Over the last thirty years, the proportion of women PhDs in the pipeline has been increasing steadily (e.g., chemistry 1/3)
- There has not been a commensurate increase in the percentage of women in tenured/tenure track and leadership positions in US academic and engineering departments

*The underlying issues are important committees in general to understand.*
**Message:** Data for each discipline and the UIC reality

**What is the situation for women in Economics?**

that is, besides the fact that Prof. Elinor Ostrom shared the 2009 Prize in Economic Sciences in memory of Alfred Nobel

**Women in Economics Faculty**

All Ph.D.-Granting Depts

- New Ph.Ds: 50%
- Asst Prof: 28.3%
- Assoc Prof: 25%
- Full Prof: 10%

Based on CSWEP survey data. Faculty includes non-tenure track

**Underrepresented Faculty in Economics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UIC T/TT Faculty*</th>
<th>Top 50 Econ depts Nelson report</th>
<th>Pipeline PhDs NSF data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Evelyn L. Lehrer, Prof. Deirdre N. McCloskey, Distinguished Prof. MoYin Tam, Prof

**Good news:** Economics pipeline not very leaky

- The female share of 1st year students in economics Ph.D. programs went from **30.9%** in 1996-7 to **31.45%** in 2005-6, very close to the share of women undergrad economics majors.
- The female share of new Ph.D.’s increased from **24.55%** to **31.9%** in the same time periods.
**Message:** People are biased

**Common Beliefs**

- “We simply hire the best available faculty based on objective assessment of their accomplishments; the gender of the candidate doesn’t matter.”
- “If women behaved like men, they would succeed at the same rate.”
- “Discrimination is only practiced by a small set of ignorant people.”

**Common Perceptions**

- The lack of women in leadership positions will fix itself over time.
- Since many of the problems encountered by female faculty are minor, recent emphasis on remedies to improve the climate is an over-reaction.
Message: Research shows that people are biased

What the research shows...

- Unconscious gender-based assumptions and stereotypes are deeply embedded in the patterns of thinking of both men and women.
- Women (and work performed by women) consistently receive lower evaluations than men (and work performed by both men and women) even when controlled for other factors.
- These cumulative disadvantages impede women’s progress toward full participation in academia.

Concepts that Search Committees Must Understand:

- Lack of Critical Mass =>
- Gender Schemas =>
- Evaluation Bias =>
- Accumulation of Disadvantage
Message: Search committees must understand certain concepts

What are Gender Schemas?

Non-conscious hypotheses about sex differences that guide judgments and behaviors

1. Those that define “average” members of a sex
   - Societal standards for masculinity and femininity
   - Traditionally masculine and feminine behaviors

2. Those that define the aggregate, influence individual’s capability and their work:
   - People are not the same schemas
   - Evaluation criteria vary based on culture and era

Lack of Critical Mass

- When women make up ≥30% of an applicant pool, individual women are judged more positively by evaluators

- When women make up ≥30% of a work group, their work is judged more positively by evaluators

- When there are fewer women (or minorities), stereotypes (schemas) have more influence in evaluation
**Message:** Research is compelling

---

### Schemas in Action: Competency Bias

- "Blind" auditions can explain 30 to 55% of the increase in women winning orchestral jobs
  

- University psychology professors prefer 2:1 to hire "Brian" over "Karen" even though the application packages are identical
  
  Steinpreis, Anders & Ritzke (1999). *Sex Roles*, 41, 509

- Letters of recommendation for women hired at a large academic medical center differ systematically from those for men hired. They were shorter and used gender terms & stereotypic adjectives. They had more grindstone adjectives and fewer standout adjectives
  
**Message:** Research is compelling, published in premier journals

**Schemas in Action:**
**Competency Bias**

**Swedish Postdoc study:**

- 114 applications for prestigious grants to the Swedish MRC (52 women; 62 men)
- 4 of 20 (20%) went to women
- Standardized metric developed for record, research plan, etc.

![Graph showing competence score vs total impact points for men and women](image)
Message: If bias is inescapable, it’s about the procedure!

What Can Search Committees Do? During the Search:

- Word the position description so that it conveys the College’s commitment to excellence, equity, and diversity
- Engage in active outreach to diverse individuals

Strategies for recruiting a diverse faculty

- Engage in pro-active recruiting (Use SUCCEED Rules of Engagement in WISEST Search Toolkit!)
Department chairs, search committee members, and other senior faculty in the department should personally reach out to prospective women and minority candidates and invite them to apply.
Message: If bias is inescapable, it’s about the procedure!

Faculty Search Toolkit

- Suggestions for the process
  - What leaders should do to advance diversity
  - search committee tips
  - outline of search process
  - search approval sheet
- Two templates to use
  - candidate profile template
  - candidate interview scoring sheet
- Pro-active recruiting
  - recruitment plan to enrich applicant pool with women & underrepresented minorities
  - writing successful recruiting e-mails
  - case study: pro-active ChemE search
- Other
  - Annotated bibliography on evaluation bias
  - diversity text for search ads
  - Life-friendly UIC policies
Message: It’s about the procedure! Emphasis on pro-active recruiting

A plan

Desired attributes are well-known. Look for females high in those attributes. Encourage them to apply.

The Pro-active Way

1. Get names of leads:
   a. Top 40 Depts list, personal calls to colleagues, e-mails with WISEST appeal to female faculty, look in web pages for female postdocs/senior grad students
   b. Faculty candidate postings: CACHE, AIChE “Meet the Faculty Candidates Poster Session”, COACH workshop list

2. Google the leads for CVs, publications, awards, presentations.

3. Turn leads into applicants
   a. Personalized e-mails, phone calls to leads
   b. Interviews at AIChE conference
Message: Pro-active recruiting strategies have worked at UIC

Case Study

PRO-ACTIVE RECRUITING vs. Standard Practice

Department Y: 2 searches for 2 positions

Search 1: Standard Practice

Search 2: Pro-active Recruiting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applied to OAE</th>
<th>Invite</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 woman hired
Content presented in workshops: Additions/Differences from WISELI – UW Madison

Essential elements:

- Run an effective and efficient committee
- Actively recruit an excellent and diverse pool of candidates
- Become aware of unconscious bias and assumptions
- Ensure a fair and thorough review
- Develop and implement an effective interview process
- Closing the deal
Content presented in workshops: Additions/Differences from WISELI – UW Madison
Content presented in workshops:
Additions/Differences from WISELI – UW Madison

### Evidence-based Approach: Interventions to Mitigate Bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Example of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 25% women in the pool being evaluated</td>
<td>Heilman ME. Organ Behav Hum Perf 1980; 26: 386-395, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction to try to avoid prejudice in evaluation</td>
<td>Blair IV, Banaji MR. J Pers Soc Psychol 70:1142-1163, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the value of credentials before any applicant is seen to avoid “redefining” merit</td>
<td>Uhlmann and Cohen, Amer Psychol Assoc 16:474-480, 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Interview process

- Aims
- Advice
- Additional concerns: phone interviews, professional conferences
Content presented in workshops: Additions/Differences from WISELI – UW Madison

Closing the deal

- Timeliness
- Communication
- Issues of Dual Career and Timeliness
- Negotiating Start-up Packages
- Return visit from selected candidate??
Evaluation
WISELI – UW-Madison

- Why evaluate?
- What to evaluate?
  - Formative: How well do participants like the training? What can be improved?
  - Summative: Is the hiring process changing in a positive way? What are the markers?
    - Increased diversity of pools, shortlists, offers, new hires
    - Changes in recruiting
    - Improved experiences of new hires
    - Other effects? (E.g., climate?)
New Hires’ Satisfaction* With the Hiring Process
Biological & Physical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participating Departments</th>
<th>Non-Participating Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Agree Strongly to the item "I was satisfied with the hiring process overall."
The climate for faculty of color in my department is good.

* Significant t-test between minority and majority faculty at $p<.05$.

^ Significant t-test between dept. chairs and all other faculty at $p<.05$. 
The climate for faculty of color in my department is good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Agree Strongly or Somewhat</th>
<th>Participated in Hiring Workshop</th>
<th>No Hiring Workshop Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION: Changes in pools, interview lists, new hires

Standard Practice
5 searches 5 positions compiled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied to OAE</th>
<th>Invite</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 men hired

Pro-active Recruiting

2 women hired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied to OAE</th>
<th>Invite</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%
Changes in pools, interview lists, new hires
Summary of 2 departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>per position</th>
<th>HIRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POOL</td>
<td>INTERVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Y</td>
<td>standard 2W / 55</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pro-active 26W / 112</td>
<td>5W</td>
<td>1W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept X</td>
<td>standard 7.2W / 51.4</td>
<td>1.6W</td>
<td>4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pro-active 27.5W / 123</td>
<td>6.5W</td>
<td>2W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Increased TOTAL pool with pro-active recruiting
2. Increased probability of hiring a woman
## STEM search outcomes 2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># T/TT women Spr 06</th>
<th>new hires men</th>
<th>new hires women</th>
<th># T/TT women Spr 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BioE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1 NT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChemE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ Mat E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Sci</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elec Comp E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech Ind E</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 (2 RET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (1 RET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Env Sci</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8 (1 RET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.25W</strong></td>
<td><strong>30M</strong></td>
<td><strong>20W</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.25W</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Models of Faculty Search Committee Education: UIC and UW-Madison

Questions, Answers, and Discussion