Goal: Have a peer-led discussion of:

• **obstacles** to achieving diversity on the faculty
• **strategies** to maximize likelihood that diverse, well-qualified candidates will be identified and recruited
• individual **experiences** and initiatives toward diversity
Why is it difficult to recruit for diversity and excellence?

Everyone holds biases (explicit or implicit)

Numerous studies show that bias affects evaluation:

- **Resumes & CVs** (Steinpreis *et al.* 1999; Bertrand & Mullainathan 2004; Rooth 2010, Moss-Racusina *et al.* 2012)
- **Quality of research** (Wennerås & Wold 1997; Knobloch-Westerwick *et al.* 2013)
- **Letters of recommendation** (Trix & Psenka 2003)
- **Student course evaluations** (Hamermesh & Parker 2005)
- **Auditions** (Goldin & Rouse 2000)
- **Interviews** (Dovidio & Gaertner 2000; Segrest Purkiss *et al.* 2006; Huang *et al.* 2013)
Why is it difficult to recruit for diversity and excellence?

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

(Fine & Handelsman, 2006)
Implicit Bias – CVs

• Evaluation of lab manager applications by science faculty

• Randomly assigned male or female name to applicant

• Double-blind study \( (n = 127) \)

• The gender of the faculty evaluators did not affect responses!

Moss-Racusin et al. (2012)
Implicit Bias – CVs & Interviews

Candidates with nonnative accents:
- Less likely to be hired
- Perceived to have lesser political skills

Ethnic accent interacts with other markers of ethnicity (e.g., name) for less positive evaluations in employment interviews

Huang et al. (2013)

Segrest Purkiss et al. (2006)
Implicit Bias – Research Quality

- Graduate students in Communication rated research abstracts for relevance, rigor, whether publishable
- Gender of author name and gendered nature of research question varied
- Male authors doing “male” research scored higher
- Young researchers still show bias!

Knobloch-Westerwick et al. (2013)

Figure 1. Perceived scientific quality as a function of research topic and author gender.
Implicit Bias – Recommendation Letters

Analysis of letters for successful medical school faculty applicants

Letters for men:
- Longer
- More references to:
  - CV
  - Publications
  - Patients
  - Colleagues

Letters for women:
- Shorter
- More references to personal life
- More “doubt raisers” (hedges, faint praise, and irrelevancies)
  - “It’s amazing how much she’s accomplished.”
  - “It appears her health is stable.”
  - “She is close to my wife.”

Implicit Bias – Course Evaluations

• Student course evaluations from 463 courses at UT-Austin linked to instructor attributes

• Women, minority faculty, non-native English speakers receive lower ratings

• More physically attractive, well-dressed instructors score higher

Weighted least-squares estimates of the determinants of class ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite standardized beauty</td>
<td>0.275 (0.059)</td>
<td>0.384 (0.076)</td>
<td>0.128 (0.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.239 (0.085)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>-0.249 (0.112)</td>
<td>0.060 (0.101)</td>
<td>-0.260 (0.139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native English</td>
<td>-0.253 (0.134)</td>
<td>-0.427 (0.143)</td>
<td>-0.262 (0.151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track</td>
<td>-0.136 (0.094)</td>
<td>-0.056 (0.089)</td>
<td>-0.041 (0.133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower division</td>
<td>-0.046 (0.111)</td>
<td>0.005 (0.129)</td>
<td>-0.228 (0.164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-credit course</td>
<td>0.687 (0.166)</td>
<td>0.768 (0.119)</td>
<td>0.517 (0.232)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \] = .279, .359, .162

\[ N \text{ courses} \] = 463, 268, 195
\[ N \text{ faculty} \] = 94, 54, 40

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses here and in Table 4.

Hamermesh & Parker (2005)
Implicit Bias – Accents

- Listeners determine speakers’ social identity based on accent
- Implicit bias favors standard accents
- Affects evaluation of both native and non-native speakers

- Speaker status (competence, intelligence)
- Speaker trait (friendly, kind, aggressive, cold)
- Stereotypes about ethnic groups / regions / nationalities
- Content of the message
- Degree of nonstandardness / proficiency level

Lippi Green (1994); Rubin & Smith (1990); Pantos & Perkins (2012)
• Women academics who marry and have families publish as many articles per year as single women.

• “...net sex differences in productivity are small to nil once other personal characteristics, structural settings, and facilitating resources are taken into account.”

Cole & Zuckerman (1987)
Yu & Shauman (2003)
Strategies for Promoting Diversity

• Increase awareness of bias – *awareness of bias is shown to reduce its effects*
  
  Bauer & Baltes (2002); Christ *et al.* (2014); Jackson *et al.* (2014)

• Develop more explicit review criteria, avoid “gut reactions”

• Alter departmental policies and practices
Recruiting Strategies

- Seek out potential candidates (“prime the pump”)
- Compose diverse search committee
- Create broad job description
- Place targeted advertisements
- Engage in active recruiting
- Raise awareness of bias in evaluation
- Use fair interviewing practices
Invite diverse candidates to apply.

Consider candidates thriving at lower-ranked institutions. They may be there because of:

- Early career decisions
- Past discrimination by top tier institutions
- Candidate’s own internalization of biases
- Family & lifestyle considerations
Evaluation of Candidates

Awareness of evaluation bias:

• CVs
• Letters of Recommendation
• Student Evaluations

Spread awareness to others on the search committee.

Evaluation bias can be counteracted!
Focus on Multiple, Specific Criteria

- Examine *all* materials, including phone and in-person interviews.

- Systematically evaluate every candidate on the same set of criteria.

- Explicitly note both positive and negative attributes for each candidate.

- Avoid evaluation based on general impressions.

- All reviewers should leave a written record.

- Sample evaluation form (can be modified): [UM Candidate Evaluation Tool](#)
Interviewing Tips

Call/bring in more than one female/minority candidate
• Lone minorities stand out
• Do 6-10 phone interviews
• Hold 4 on-campus interviews if necessary

Treat diverse applicants as valued scholars and educators, not as valuable because they are female or minority scholars and educators.

Ensure all candidates meet a diverse set of people
• Include non-committee members, for personal & candid discussion

Interviewing Tips

Use a list of set questions

Speak clearly

Avoid culture-specific expressions (e.g., “the whole nine yards,” “knocked it out of the park”)

Even advanced speakers may still make grammatical errors (e.g., omission of articles)

Language for politeness differs across cultures
Avoid Questions that Might be Construed as Discriminatory or Offensive

Interviews should evaluate qualifications of the applicant that are relevant to a faculty position – *questions about matters that are not job relevant are not allowed.*

[Link to Ohio Civil Rights Commission’s Interview Questions Guide]

BGSU prohibits discrimination against employees and applicants for employment on the basis of race, sex, gender identity, genetic information, gender expression, sexual orientation, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, age, marital status, disability, pregnancy, military status, or status as a Special Disabled or Vietnam-era veteran.
Thanks!
Feel free to contact us with questions:

**College of A&S Diversity Committee**
- Lynn Pearson (ROCS)  pearson@bgsu.edu
- Carolyn Tompsett (Psychology)  cjtomps@bgsu.edu
- Peg Yacobucci (Geology)  mmyacob@bgsu.edu

**Office of Equity and Diversity**
- Barbara Waddell  bwaddel@bgsu.edu
- Vicky Kulicke  vickyk@bgsu.edu

**OED’s Online Search Committee Orientation Modules:**

Some portions of this presentation have been adapted from University of Michigan’s STRIDE (Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence) program
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