



PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY

Office of the Dean of the Faculty

Best Practices for Faculty Search Officers and Search Committees



October 2022

Overview

Princeton University is committed to recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty. The diversity of our faculty is critical for training future generations of scholars in every field who will go forward “in the nation’s service and the service of humanity.” In recruiting faculty, it is important to consider diversity as central to the University’s teaching and research mission.

There is no task more important for a department than a search for a new faculty member. Although faculty searches are time consuming, departments gladly give this time as the outcomes define the future of the department and the field. Each faculty search affects the quality of the department as well as its diversity.

The purpose of this search guide is to outline the expected protocols in faculty searches. These processes constitute a collection of best practices and are intended to integrate searches more closely with the Office of the Dean of the Faculty. Outlining the best practices in faculty searches provides committees and search officers with the strategic methods to conduct efficient, effective, fair, and consistent searches that will yield an excellent pool of candidates.

Questions or Comments

Please contact Oliver Avens, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (avens@princeton.edu), with any questions, comments, or concerns related to tenure-track faculty searches. For questions or concerns about senior and open rank faculty searches, the faculty search authorization process, or resources for faculty diversity and development, please contact Toni Turano, Deputy Dean of the Faculty (tturano@princeton.edu). For general questions or concerns about how the Office of the Dean of the Faculty can support and diversify the University’s faculty community, please contact Prof. Frederick Wherry, Vice-Dean for Diversity and Inclusion (vdeandiversity@princeton.edu).

Acknowledgements

This guide draws from related materials distributed by Harvard University, Yale University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, the University of Chicago, Stanford, MIT, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and the NSF ADVANCE program. A detailed list of works consulted is available in Appendix G.

Table of Contents

I.	The Search Committee	3
II.	Target of Opportunity Program	4
III.	Effective and Efficient Pre-Search Process	5
IV.	Launching the Search	7
V.	Towards a Short List of Candidates	10
VI.	Planning Interviews and Campus Visits	12
VII.	Recommending a Candidate	13
VIII.	Completing the Search Process	13
IX.	Summary	14
X.	Appendices	
	▪ Appendix A: Sample Candidate Evaluation Form	15
	▪ Appendix B: Sample Academic Interview Questions	16
	▪ Appendix C: Guide to Acceptable Interview Questions	17
	▪ Appendix D: Personal Diversity Statements	20
	▪ Appendix E: Best Practices for Conducting Remote Job Searches	23
	▪ Appendix F: Advertising and Recruiting Resources	25
	▪ Appendix G: Bibliography on Bias and Stereotyping	30



I. The Search Committee

The hiring of faculty plays a central role in helping Princeton realize its aspirations and shapes its vision for generations to come. Searches are complex, time-consuming tasks. The procedures described in this document support our collective efforts to ensure that Princeton attracts the best candidates, and the best candidates are attracted to Princeton, regardless of those candidates' backgrounds and/or personal experiences. In addition, these procedures assist us in complying with federal and state collection and reporting requirements.

Princeton actively seeks “students, faculty, and staff of exceptional ability and promise who share in our commitment to excellence in teaching and scholarship, and who will bring a diversity of viewpoints and cultures. By incorporating a broad range of human experiences and a rich variety of human perspectives, we enlarge our capacity for learning, enrich the quality and texture of campus life, and better prepare for life and leadership in a pluralistic society.”

- Princeton's Statement on Diversity and Community

To submit a search authorization request for a tenure-track or tenured faculty position, a search committee must be designated and its membership listed in the Faculty Search Plan.

Committee Composition

- The search committee should include faculty from different backgrounds whenever possible, who will bring distinct perspectives to the committee's deliberations.
- A diverse search committee, with an array of backgrounds and experiences, is an important factor in identifying and attracting a large pool of talented candidates.
- Diverse committees are more likely to give full and fair consideration to candidates from underrepresented groups (Fine and Handelsman, 2012).
- Keep in mind that women and minority faculty often undertake a disproportionate amount of university service. It's important to monitor service loads and free faculty from less important tasks, so that they can fairly participate on search committees.

Search Officer Responsibilities and Duties

Each department is responsible for the appointment of a tenured faculty member as the department search officer. Ordinarily, the department chair does not serve as the search officer, although exceptions to this guideline can be made, as appropriate. The main responsibility of the search officer is to monitor the recruitment and selection processes for tenure-track and tenured faculty positions. (They may also be responsible for monitoring the recruitment and selection of professional researchers and specialists.) The primary charges of

the search officer are to encourage the search committee and the department to think broadly about the needs of the department, to propose approaches that will yield a candidate pool that is both broad and deep, and to aid in ensuring compliance with the University's equal opportunity, affirmative action, and human resource policies and procedures. Given their important role in the search process, the search officer should be a senior member of the department and should be able to serve for at least one full academic year and, preferably, for a number of years, so that there is familiarity with the factors that lead to successful recruitment and hiring.

The specific duties of the search officer include, among others:

- To ensure that the search process is likely to encourage talented women, underrepresented minorities, persons with disabilities, and veterans to apply to the position.
- To actively work with the search committee to encourage candidates from diverse backgrounds to apply.
- To review the resulting applicant pool and suggest additional approaches to increase its diversity whenever this seems warranted.
- To review individual applicant information and bring promising candidates to the attention of the search committee.
- To verify that each search follows University guidelines and includes good faith efforts to support diversity that enhances the teaching and research mission of the University.

II. Target of Opportunity Program

Resources are available to support the efforts of academic departments to broaden the intellectual agenda of the University and to support the University's efforts to bring diverse and innovative approaches to teaching and research. These additional resources are administered through the Office of the Dean of the Faculty. The program has supported faculty candidates who bring a diversity of intellectual viewpoints to campus and who themselves are often underrepresented in their fields.

The Target of Opportunity Program has resources to help departments that have identified strong, eligible candidates but do not have the resources to extend offers to them. This may be because the department simply lacks the FTE resources or because any additional FTEs the department has are committed to hiring in different areas. Normally, requests for .50 FTEs are considered, though departments may request additional FTE resources under special circumstances. Deputy Dean of the Faculty Toni Turano (tturano@princeton.edu) can answer questions about the ToO process, assist departments in identifying whether they may have an

eligible candidate to propose for ToO funding, and advise on FTE resources.

III. Effective and Efficient Pre-Search Processes

Discuss the search strategy

The search committee should take time to discuss the search strategy in order to find the top candidate for a position and recruit the most diverse applicant pool. The Office of the Dean of the Faculty, including the Vice-Dean for Diversity and Inclusion (vdeandiversity@princeton.edu), will engage with search committees on strategy development. Best practices include:

Develop a broad position description that meets the needs of the department. Use broad search definitions to produce more diverse applicant pools (Smith, 2004).

- For example, consider expressing subfield as a preference, not a requirement (e.g., “applicants from all areas are encouraged to apply, with special consideration given to applicants from [subfield]”). Consider whether a broader subfield would suit the department’s needs just as well.
- Women and underrepresented minorities may be less likely than others to apply if they meet *some* but *not all* of the listed qualifications (Kay and Shipman, 2014). Aim to limit the listed qualifications to those that are truly necessary.
- Keep in mind that the Target of Opportunity Program may be able to help make an additional appointment outside the intended subfield.

Signal a special interest in candidates who contribute to the department’s diversity. Diversity should be understood broadly and also include consideration of candidates with non-traditional career paths, including different types of training, different types of employment, and non-standard undergraduate degrees. Use language that highlights the University’s mission to foster a heterogeneous and inclusive campus community. Some examples of wording that can be included in job descriptions:

- “Princeton is especially interested in candidates who, through their research, teaching, and service, will contribute to the diversity and excellence of the academic community. The department strongly encourages applications from individuals who identify as members of groups that are underrepresented in [FIELD].”
- “We seek faculty members who will create a climate that embraces excellence and diversity, with a strong commitment to teaching and mentoring that will enhance the work of the department and attract and retain a diverse student body.”
- “The department values diversity among its faculty, is committed to building a culturally diverse intellectual community, and strongly encourages applications from women and

members of underrepresented groups.”

- “Princeton recognizes the unique needs of dual-career couples. The Office of the Dean of the Faculty offers support and assistance to the spouses and partners of senior faculty as they consider their career transition to the Princeton area.”

Princeton University does not require personal diversity statements from applicants, although individual departments may choose to offer candidates an opportunity to describe their potential contributions to diversity and inclusion in the campus community.

Recent job descriptions at Princeton, for example, have included the following:

- “The department is committed to fostering a diverse and inclusive academic community. Applicants are welcome to include a brief description of how they would contribute to this goal in their cover letter.”
- “The department is committed to fostering an academic environment that acknowledges and encourages diversity and differences. The successful candidate will show the potential to pursue academic excellence in diverse, multicultural, and inclusive settings.”

See Appendix D for some guidelines and considerations about the use of personal diversity statements in academic searches.

Identify Sources of Excellence in the national pool of qualified candidates:

- For junior searches, identify institutions that have a demonstrated record of producing highly sought-after doctorates and post-doctoral fellows from under-represented groups in relevant fields or subfields.
- Review steps that can be taken to ensure that the search process does not limit the review of candidates from diverse backgrounds.

Review past departmental searches in order to learn from previous successes and failures. In this respect, it is helpful to have a search officer who has served in the role for more than a year. Consider the following questions:

- What proportion of past applicant pools and short list candidates were women and underrepresented minorities?
- Have women and underrepresented minorities been offered positions recently?
- How were women and underrepresented minority faculty who were recently hired persuaded to accept their position?
- Did one of our peer-competitors offer a position to a woman or underrepresented minority that the search committee failed to short-list or to rank highly in its

review?

- How will this data influence the way that the present search is conducted?

Develop a search plan

The department must submit a Faculty Search Plan as part of the search authorization request. This plan must include the following information:

- ✓ List of all committee members
- ✓ Rank proposed for the position, as specified in the authorization
- ✓ Position description, including specification of the desired scholarship, experience, and disciplinary background, and identification of required and preferred qualifications that are essential to the position
- ✓ Proposed ad
- ✓ Process proposed for developing the applicant pool, including whatever advertising and outreach will be done. List specific venues where the ad will be posted and who will be contacted to help develop the pool of candidates.

A separate search plan must be submitted for each faculty position. If multiple searches are being conducted simultaneously by a department search committee, it is acceptable to submit an identical search plan for each position. This document (the Faculty Search Plan) should be submitted as part of the Faculty Search Authorization request. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (for junior faculty searches) or the Deputy Dean of the Faculty (for senior and open rank faculty searches) must approve the search plan and the proposed ad before the search committee can proceed.

IV. Launching the Search

Once a search is authorized, and following approval from the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or the Deputy Dean of the proposed ad, the search process can continue. Next steps and best practices include:

Advertise the position widely

The process of advertising for a faculty position provides the department and the University with a public relations opportunity. Thoughtful consideration should be given to how the content of an advertisement raises awareness about Princeton in certain communities. Broadly advertising positions both ensures that notice of available positions reaches the largest number of candidates and signals that Princeton is truly interested in attracting a diverse faculty.

- Post the position early to allow for a broader application window and to encourage a larger, more inclusive pool of applicants.

- Avoid framing the search as a “replacement” for a retired or departing colleague.
- See Appendix F for a list of recruiting resources and potential places to advertise.

Develop a broad and deep applicant pool

- Ask colleagues at peer institutions for recommendations of highly-qualified women and members of underrepresented groups. Focus on expanding the applicant pool as much as possible.
- Consult individuals outside the search committee, including graduate students and post-doctoral fellows not involved in the search, who have diverse backgrounds or experiences. Such contacts may help you reach highly-qualified underrepresented minority and women candidates, whom you may need to invite to apply.
- Make lists of professional meetings and professional societies that focus on groups typically underrepresented in your discipline, and enlist members of these societies to help you recruit candidates.
- Avoid assumptions that may limit your efforts to recruit actively and broadly, such as: “We shouldn’t have to convince a person to apply to Princeton.” Simply posting ads will not be sufficient to produce the applicant pool you want (Fine and Handlesman, 2012).
- Contact potential candidates directly to encourage them to apply; this is easier if you build relationships with potential candidates before there is an actual vacancy. Studies show that personal outreach is the most effective way to achieve a deep and diverse applicant pool. Focus direct communications on qualifications and academic fit, since all applicants want to be evaluated based on scholarly credentials, not demographic characteristics.
- Be mindful that, until recently, many highly ranked universities were not actively producing women and minority Ph.D.’s. It is thus important to deliberately consider candidates from a broad spectrum of institutions that demonstrate excellence in some of its subfields.
- Contact relevant professional organizations for assistance identifying members of underrepresented groups who have received Ph.D.’s in the field.
- Brainstorm other active recruiting strategies and discuss diversity issues with the committee and the department.
- Avoid hard and fast application deadlines to increase flexibility and allow for opportunities to develop a robust and diverse pool. One way to do this is to say: “For fullest consideration, apply by ...”
- Keep records of outreach efforts (calls, postings, conferences attended, etc.) for reporting purposes.

Review the candidates

As applications are submitted, demographic information (gender, race, veteran status, disability status, citizenship status) about the pool is collected confidentially and stored in a separate file on the AHIRE site, per federal and state guidelines. The U.S. Department of

Labor and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission enforce the applicable laws and regulations that require the University to document the race/ethnicity, gender, veteran status, and disability status as a part of the composition of the applicant pool, as well as that of the short list and the candidate who is offered the position.

The search officer is the only individual who can see the confidential individual, self-identified demographic data, including data about gender, race, and ethnicity, stored on the application site. The AHIRE site also includes summaries of the applicant demographic data, which the search officer can use to see how they compare to the national availability pool.

Individual confidential data may not be shared with the search committee, but the search officer and the committee should review the summary of the applicant demographic data before taking next steps in the search process.

If the department search officer and the search committee are not satisfied with the makeup of the pool of candidates, particularly as it relates to women and underrepresented minority groups, they should discuss whether there are additional steps that can be taken to broaden the pool. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or Deputy Dean may be consulted about making the search more wide-ranging and thorough. It is always best to do this before developing a “short list.”

Search officers can access demographic information on applicants by:

- Logging into AHIRE with your netID (<https://www.princeton.edu/acad-positions/priv/admin>);
- Finding the position listing for your department’s search; and
- Clicking “View Applications” and then the applicant’s name. “EEO Information” shows applicant’s self-reported data.
- Alternatively, search officers can run various reports by clicking the Reports Tab in the listing.
 - “EEO Full Report” shows individual demographic information for all applicants and can be filtered by category.
 - “EEO Summary Report” shows number counts by category.
 - “Search Report” shows number counts by category and gender/URM percentages once applicants have been dispositioned.

Moody’s 13 Cognitive Errors

Search committees should be aware of implicit biases that affect how they view candidates and how they may be making their decisions about faculty hiring. In her book, *Faculty Diversity*, author JoAnn Moody reminds us of 13 common “Cognitive Errors,” which she describes as shortcuts and biases that corrupt rational thinking, estimates of probabilities, and sound decision-making. (Adopted from

the University of Chicago)

1. First Impressions: Unfairly drawing conclusions about a candidate in a matter of seconds, based on some aspect not truly related to a candidate's ability to successfully assume the job responsibilities.
2. Elitism: Minimizing the candidacy of an applicant due to aspects you deem as inferior in some regard (e.g., academic pedigree, current institution, social class, ethnic background).
3. Raising the Bar: Elevating requirements for the job during the evaluation process to eliminate a candidate from being considered further.
4. Premature Ranking/Digging In: The rush to rank candidates leads evaluators to state their positions early in the process, close their minds to new evidence, and defend their stated position
5. The Longing to Clone: Seeking candidates who resemble yourself or colleagues you perceive favorably. This often leads to undervaluing or not considering those who are qualified but not similar enough to you or the current faculty in the department.
6. Good Fit/Bad Fit: Fit is a subjective term and should be determined very carefully with the presence of abundant evidence and details, rather than opinions and personal leanings.
7. Provincialism: Undervaluing aspects that are outside of your own areas of interest, circles, or affiliations.
8. Extraneous Myths and Assumptions: Personal opinions and assertions about a candidate's potential for success in the position, sincere interest in joining the department/institution, possible geographical location preferences, etc.
9. Wishful Thinking; Rhetoric not Evidence: Holding to a notion in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary and allowing this notion to cloud one's cognitive processes.
10. Self-Fulfilling Prophecy: Structuring interactions so we can receive information congruent with our assumptions and avoid information incongruent with our assumptions.
11. Seizing a Pretext: Setting up superficial/false reasons to ultimately eliminate a candidate.
12. Assuming Character over Content: Overlooking the possibility that the circumstances of a given situation might well explain certain behaviors and instead attributing the behaviors to the individual's personal characteristics.
13. Momentum of the Group: The tendency to fall into group-think and simply go along with the group consensus.

V. Towards a Short List of Candidates

Prior to reviewing the candidates, members of the search committee are encouraged to review the relevant resources on implicit bias in searches (see Appendix G). Recognizing that everyone has these biases is an important step in attempting to eliminate them from search processes. For example, symphony orchestras started requiring blind auditions in the 1970s. Research shows that using screens during auditions increased by 50 percent the probability that a woman would advance from preliminary rounds and also increased the likelihood that a woman would

be selected in the final round (Goldin and Rouse, 2000). The following are steps that the committee can take as it develops the medium/short list:

- Discuss what criteria will be used to evaluate applications and choose candidates for the long and short lists. Create a Candidate Evaluation Form to guide the evaluation process. (See Appendix A for a sample form that may be adapted.)
- Apply the criteria in the Candidate Evaluation Form consistently to all applicants and materials (Uhlmann and Cohen, 2005). Research indicates that rater accountability increases the accuracy and objectivity of ratings when using a form (Mero & Motowidlo, 1995).
- Use multiple criteria and consider ways to include criteria that are pertinent to the goals of enhancing University and departmental diversity. In addition to scholarly impact and research productivity, consider the ability to attract, work with, and teach diverse students (Georgi, 2000).
- Establish clear and consistent guidelines regarding searching for candidates on the internet (i.e., “Googling”). Such searches can inadvertently reveal sensitive personal details or give an unfair advantage to candidates with well-curated internet presences.
- Generate a “long” list from which to develop your short list. Consult with the search officer about whether any qualified women or underrepresented minority candidates were inadvertently overlooked before moving on to a short list. Studies show that women and minority candidates are judged more fairly when they make up at least 30% of the applicant pool (Sacket et al., 1991; van Ommeren et al., 2005).
- Members of the committee should remind themselves to be conscious of the possible assumptions and biases that shape how we (and recommenders) judge other people. Psychological research shows that individuals generally have the potential for unconscious evaluation bias. Therefore, it’s important to review the assumptions and biases that can occur at every step of the process. See, for example, the cognitive errors described by JoAnn Moody above.
- In evaluating letters of reference, be especially mindful that women and minority candidates receive more negative evaluations, on average, than their male majority peers (Trix & Psenka, 2003).

The list of people to be considered in depth (i.e., the short list) must be submitted to and approved by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (for junior faculty searches) and by the Deputy Dean of the Faculty (for senior and open rank faculty searches) before invitations for campus visits can be extended or before offers can be made. Packets should include:

- ✓ List of finalists, including all candidates still under consideration;
- ✓ Copies of the C.V. of each candidate under consideration; and
- ✓ Letters of recommendation for these candidates, if not available in AHIRE.

Before the short list is sent to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or the Deputy Dean, the search officer must review it for gender and racial/ethnic representation. If there are very few women and/or underrepresented minority candidates on this list, the search officer should be prepared to discuss with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or the Deputy Dean whether there are additional women and/or underrepresented minority candidates in the applicant pool who were under consideration but not included on the forwarded list.

VI. Planning Interviews and Campus Visits

In some disciplines, a larger number of candidates are interviewed at a professional meeting, followed by campus visits for a subset of those who have been interviewed. In other disciplines, the entire short list is invited for a campus interview. The usual campus visit includes a talk by the candidate, one-on-one meetings with relevant members of the department (sometimes with other departments as well), one or more social events, and possibly a teaching demonstration.

The following are examples of best practices for the interview and/or campus visit process.

- Determine what core set of questions or themes will be taken up with every candidate (e.g., potential research program, possible teaching initiatives, mentoring of a diverse student body). See Appendix B for a sample of evaluative interview questions.
- Remind interviewers that there are illegal and improper topics and questions that should be avoided. See Appendix C for a representative list of unacceptable questions.
- Create opportunities for the candidates to interact with faculty in more than one venue in order to get a sense of the candidates in a variety of circumstances. If appropriate, offer invitations to meet with cohort faculty in related disciplines, departments, and fields.
- Convey to all candidates the University's interest in exposing students to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints. Make clear the aspects of the department's (and University's) organizational structure and culture that make it possible for women and underrepresented minority faculty to thrive.
- Distribute information about family-friendly policies to all candidates regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, and parental or familial status. Make sure that everyone on the search committee is aware that senior staff in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty are available to address dual career issues and the various non-salary benefits available to faculty (e.g., childcare programs).
- Refer questions about specific circumstances related to a relationship or family status to the appropriate Associate Dean for Academic Affairs: Oliver Avens (avens@princeton.edu) for childcare assistance and issues, and Karen Haskin (khaskin@princeton.edu) for dual career issues.

- Assume that every candidate is willing to relocate, will be able to “fit” into the department or community, and can perform the essential duties of the position, without regard to the candidate’s race, gender, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, or veteran’s status.
- Using the Candidate Evaluation Forms, summarize the feedback from the core questions and themes that were taken up with each candidate, so that the search committee can more easily compare candidates according to the evaluation criteria.
- If you are conducting aspects of the hiring process remotely, including interviews on Zoom and virtual “campus visits,” consult Appendix E: Best Practices for Conducting Remote Job Searches.

VII. Recommending a Candidate

The final task of the search committee is to recommend a candidate to the department for appointment. Some matters that the search committee and search officer might want to bring to the attention of the department faculty and the department chair include:

- Identify the items and circumstances that might be most needed or wanted to ensure the candidate’s success at Princeton.
- Confirm that the resources a candidate is offered are determined by the candidate’s needs and not by their negotiation skills. Early career women and underrepresented minority candidates often have less mentoring about how to negotiate offers and, therefore, may be at a disadvantage in this process (Babcock and Laschever, 2007; Fine and Handelsman, 2012). To empower candidates to advocate for themselves on even terms, for instance, consider providing them with a list of items that are open for negotiation.
- Throughout the negotiation process, continue communicating with the selected candidate in a timely manner in order to demonstrate interest and deter the candidate from accepting another offer.
- Consider creative options for making non-traditional offers (e.g., offering a one-year post-doc before the beginning of an assistant professor appointment) if an individual has not had the opportunity to meet a preferred requirement but seems nonetheless an attractive candidate for an appointment (Smith et al., 2004). Possibilities for non-traditional offers can be discussed with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

VIII. Completing the Search Process

For an appointment to be processed, several steps are needed. The department chair is responsible for most of the necessary paperwork and forms, including the Search Committee Report. The search officer oversees the submission of the Search Report Form.

The Search Report Form has recently been simplified and now does not duplicate information that can be found in the AHIRE listing. Any additional efforts to ensure the development of a diverse pool of candidates, however, should be noted. If all applicants have been dispositioned properly, a PDF copy of the Search Report from AHIRE can be submitted with the Search Report Form. After review, the search officer and chair should sign the Search Report Form, affirming that “The search and selection process complied with all University policies for faculty and staff appointments, including affirmative action and equal opportunity policies.”

After the hiring process has concluded and the offer letter has been accepted, members of the search committee should remain in contact with the new faculty member in order to make them feel wanted and welcomed.

IX. Summary

This guide is intended to help departments create faculty search processes that will increase the diversity of the applicants under consideration at every step in the process. Through this process, our goal is to bring the most talented and accomplished faculty members to Princeton. The steps described should be part of every search. At every step, the Office of the Dean of the Faculty and, in particular, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Deputy Dean of the Faculty, are available for consultation and advice.

Search officers may also want to consider using a future department faculty meeting to review with members of the search committee and the entire department the success (or opportunities for improvement) of the search processes and outcomes for the year. Identifying the following could be useful for future reference:

- Were there particular practices that had a significant impact on increasing the number of women and underrepresented minority applicants (e.g., job description, advertising, other outreach efforts)?
- Were there criteria that seemed not to be met by women or underrepresented minority candidates? Are these criteria essential in their current form? Could they be revised so that talented candidates are not overlooked?
- Were offers made but not accepted by candidates from underrepresented groups? What reasons did they give for turning down the offer? Are there things the department and University could do to make themselves more attractive?
- Were there lessons learned that could inform an ongoing outreach effort?

Are there insights that should be shared with the Office of the Dean of the Faculty about the challenges, opportunities, limitations, or best practices for use in broader discussions and decision-making?

Appendix A: Sample Candidate Evaluation Form
(adapted from Harvard University and the University of Michigan)

The following offers a method for department faculty to provide evaluations of job candidates. It is meant to be a template for departments that they can modify as necessary for their own uses. The proposed questions are designed for junior faculty candidates; however, alternate language is suggested in parenthesis for senior faculty candidates.

Candidate's Name:

Please indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's C.V.
<input type="checkbox"/> Met with candidate
<input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's scholarship
<input type="checkbox"/> Attended meal with candidate | <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's letters of recommendation
<input type="checkbox"/> Attended candidate's job talk
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please explain) |
|---|--|

Please comment on the candidate's scholarship (noting the basis of your assessment):

Please comment on the candidate's teaching ability (noting the basis of your assessment):

Please rate the candidate on each of the following:	excellent	good	neutral	fair	poor	unable to judge
Potential for (Evidence of) scholarly impact						
Potential for (Evidence of) research productivity						
Potential for (Evidence of) research funding						
Potential for (Evidence of) collaboration						
Relationship to the department's priorities						
Ability to make positive contribution to department's climate						
Potential (Demonstrated ability) to attract and supervise graduate students						
Potential (Demonstrated ability) to teach and supervise undergraduates						
Potential (Demonstrated ability) to attract, work with and teach diverse students						
Potential (Demonstrated ability) to be a conscientious university community member						

Appendix B: Sample Academic Interview Questions

About their research

- What research influences have you been exposed to? Who has influenced you the most?
- What do you consider to be your best paper/work and why? What did it change about the way people approach the field?

General research questions

- What are your professional goals in the next five and ten years, and how does this job fit with them?
- What would you do on the first day of the job?
- What are the big issues in your research area?
- How would you bridge the gap from your research to research users?
- The university is keen to serve the wider community and economy. Does your planned research have any potential in these areas?

About them and their capabilities

- How do you balance your time? If several challenges came up at the same time (grant deadline, pastoral care for a student, teaching commitments), how would you prioritize them?
- If you were starting your project again today, what would you do differently?
- Describe a research problem you have faced. What did you learn?
- What has been the most productive period in your research career and why?

About your ability to gain funding

- Where will you apply for grants? If your funding applications are unsuccessful, what alternatives do you have in mind? (looking for knowledge of the funding infrastructure)
- How would you convince a funding body that they should fund your research rather than one of the other hundreds of proposals they receive?

About their proposed research

- What will you focus on and what gives you a competitive edge in this area?
- What is the overall importance of this project? How do you see this work impacting the field?
- What will you do if your hypothesis is proved wrong? Can you see any of your research proposals failing?
- If we gave you unlimited resources, what would you do with them?
- What resources will you need?

About their role as supervisor/ teacher

- Describe your teaching experience. How do you feel about teaching? What is your teaching philosophy?
- What advice would you give to a new researcher about supervising undergraduate or masters students?
- How would you go about motivating a researcher who is going through a low point?
- How would you deal with any conflict/disagreement within the research group? Do you have an example of when you have had to deal with a disagreement?

About 'fit' with the department

- What will you bring to the institution?
- We are keen to develop collaborations between departments. What opportunities for multi-disciplinary work does your research offer?
- What committee work have you done and what challenges has it presented?
- In what ways other than research and teaching could you contribute to this department?

Appendix C: Guide to Acceptable Interview Questions

It is essential for all members of a search committee to be aware of these guidelines and follow them in both spirit and letter. Avoid any direct or indirect questions that touch on material that may not be asked. This information about an applicant should never be discussed with regard to his or her candidacy for a position.

Sources: University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, MIT

Subject	What May Be Asked	What May NOT Be Asked
Name	Whether the applicant has worked for the University under another name. Whether any other information, such as a nickname or initials, is needed to check the candidate's work and educational record.	Maiden name of a married woman. Inquiries about the name that would seek to elicit information about the candidate's ancestry or descent.
Age	Discussion should be kept to questions about the applicant's career stage.	Inquiry into the date of birth or age of an applicant.
Gender	No questions.	Inquiry into an applicant's maiden name or any question that pertains to only one sex.
Sexual Orientation	No questions.	Inquiry into applicant's sexuality.
Religion	No questions.	Inquiry into an applicant's religious denomination, affiliation, church, parish, pastor, or religious holidays observed. Avoid any questions regarding organizations and/or affiliations that would identify religion.
Birthplace	No questions.	Birthplace of applicant. Birthplace of applicant's parents, spouse, or other close relatives.
Relatives	Names of applicant's relatives already employed by Princeton.	Names, addresses, ages, number, or other information concerning applicant's children or other relatives not employed by Princeton.

Subject	What May Be Asked	What May NOT Be Asked
National Origin	An employer may require an employee to produce documentation that evidences his or her identity and employment eligibility under federal immigration laws.	Inquiry into the applicant's lineage, ancestry, national origin, descent, parentage, or nationality; nationality of parents or spouse; applicant's native language.
Citizenship	"Are you legally authorized to work in the United States?"	Any inquiries about citizenship or whether the applicant intends to become a U.S. citizen.
Language	What languages do you read fluently? Write fluently? Speak fluently?	Inquiries into how applicant acquired the ability to read, write, or speak a foreign language.
Disability	You can ask an applicant about his or her ability to perform job-related functions, as long as the questions are not phrased in terms which would elicit whether the applicant has a disability.	<p>Inquiry into whether the applicant has a physical or mental disability/handicap or about the nature or severity of the disability/handicap.</p> <p>Inquiry into whether an applicant has ever been addicted to illegal drugs or treated for drug abuse/alcoholism</p> <p>Inquiry into whether an applicant has AIDS.</p> <p>Inquiry into whether an applicant has ever received workers' compensation.</p> <p>Inquiry into whether an applicant has ever been hospitalized/treated for medical or mental health conditions.</p> <p>Inquiry into whether an applicant has ever been absent from work due to illness.</p> <p>An employer may not inquire as to the nature, severity, treatment, or prognosis of an obvious handicap or disability or of a hidden disability or handicap voluntarily disclosed by the applicant.</p>
Marital Status	No questions.	Are you married? Where does your spouse work? What are the ages of your children, if any? What was your maiden name?

Subject	What May Be Asked	What May NOT Be Asked
Address	Applicant's place of residence.	Do you rent or own your home? How long at each particular address?
Notice of Case of Emergency	Name and address of person to be noticed in case of an accident or emergency.	n/a
Height, Weight, Strength	Questions regarding height, weight, or strength may be asked only if the employer can prove these requirements are necessary to do the job.	n/a
Photograph	No questions.	An employer cannot ask for a photograph to accompany an application.
Military	Applicant's work experience, including names, addresses of previous employers, dates of employment, reasons for leaving.	Inquiry into an applicant's general military experience or type of discharge.
Criminal Record	Inquiry into actual convictions (not arrests) that relate reasonably to fitness to perform a particular job.	Inquiry relating to arrests. Any inquiry or check into a person's arrest, court, or conviction record if not substantially related to functions and responsibilities of the prospective employment.
Education	Inquiry into the academic, vocational, or professional education of an applicant for employment.	Questions about education designed to determine how old the applicant is.
Experience	Inquiry into work experience. Inquiry into countries the applicant has visited. Inquiry into references.	Inquiry into the organizations of which the applicant for employment is a member, the nature, name, or character of which would likely disclose the applicant's protected class status.
Organizations	Are you a member of any professional societies or organizations?	Inquiry into applicant's membership in nonprofessional organizations (e.g., clubs, lodges)

Appendix D: Personal Diversity Statements in the Academic Recruitment Context

Office of the Provost: Institutional Equity & Diversity
Princeton University
February 2019

Purpose and Prevalence

In the last decade, some universities have begun to request a required or optional personal diversity statement as part of the academic job application. This White Paper is intended serve as a guide to considerations and best practices surrounding requesting and evaluating diversity statements.

Personal diversity statements are intended to allow an applicant to demonstrate commitments and capacities that could contribute to the institution's efforts around diversity, inclusion, and equity through research, teaching, service, mentoring, and/or advising.¹ Requiring a personal diversity statement can signal the institution or department's support of diversity and inclusion goals in terms of campus climate, hiring, and scholarship. It can also signal that creating a welcome academic environment is a shared responsibility and each potential member of the campus community is expected to contribute in some way.²

Princeton University does not require personal diversity statements, although individual departments are welcome to consider including one as part of a comprehensive and transparent evaluation of candidate qualifications. Preliminary research shows that diversity statements are most useful when the purpose for the statement and method of evaluation have been discussed and agreed upon by all members of the search committee.³

Critics of diversity statements express concern that evaluation of the statement will serve as a political litmus test, potentially restricting academic freedom.⁴ Critics also note that the preferred executions of diversity and inclusion goals are still under debate, e.g., color-blind vs. multicultural methods, general vs. race/gender-specific methods, etc. Though the peer-reviewed research on the content of most diversity statements is limited, one working paper suggests that personal diversity statements do tend to reflect many ways of defining and supporting diversity.⁵

Supporters of diversity statements consider them a logical extension of the policies and procedures that have increased diversity and inclusion in the workplace and academia thus far.³ For supporters, diversity statements are intended to ensure that scholars with minority identities receive credit for invisible labor such as mentoring and service, and that all scholars engage with diversity and inclusion goals and consider ways to contribute.⁶

Personal diversity statements are still relatively rare. In a 2014 survey of assistant professor job ads, only about 17% of the 110 ads requested a diversity statement, but the numbers are likely growing. Thus far, only a few institutions (including Cornell and UCLA) have made such a statement a requirement for all faculty applications (including tenure and promotion portfolios).⁶

Considerations

Before deciding whether to require a personal diversity statement as part of a search committee's application, the department and/or search committee should discuss potential advantages and disadvantages, and make a commitment to evaluating it in a standard way. Diversity statement processes can produce unintended consequences and even deter applicants if poorly designed.

- The search committee should be aware that the degree of involvement and awareness of diversity and inclusion will vary greatly across position levels and fields.⁶

- Applicants who have developed their careers in non-U.S. countries may have difficulty understanding the context of diversity statements, and the content of their statements may differ from those of U.S.-based applicants.
- Committees should be prepared to be receptive of different ways of supporting inclusivity, and/or interaction with a variety of identities.
- Diversity statements may raise expectations on the part of applicants about the level of departmental support. Departments should consider their ability to support the contributions suggested in applicant statements.
- Diversity statements can result in applicant concern about what aspects of their personal identity to disclose, as well as opportunities for evaluators to misunderstand or misuse what is disclosed.⁶ Statements should not be used in order to identify the personal characteristics of the applicants themselves, but should focus on relevant professional experiences.

Best Practices

Sample Prompts

Departments may choose to require or suggest that applicants address diversity, equity, and inclusion values within existing application materials or in a separate statement. The following are prompts currently in use in higher education.

"This department is committed to fostering a diverse and inclusive academic community. We encourage applications from individuals whose backgrounds or interests align with this commitment. Candidates are welcome to include a brief, separate statement in this regard in their application."

"A description of how the applicant would contribute to the development of a diverse and inclusive [learning/working] community through their [teaching, research, and/or service] should be included in the personal statement."

"This department strives to create and strengthen an inclusive, respectful, and intellectually challenging environment that embraces difference in the pursuit of knowledge. The diversity statement should describe how your background and experiences demonstrate your commitment and ability to engage with issues of diversity and inclusion, and should also discuss how those values might be reflected should you join our community."

See [Cornell University's explanatory material](#) regarding the goals of their required statement and the type of content that could be included.

Potential Evaluation Criteria

If departments choose to use diversity statements, it is important to have a clear rubric for how the information will be evaluated, including in relation to other aspects of the application. Rubrics may include such elements as:

- Knowledge of and interest in dimensions of diversity that result from different identities, such as ethnic, socioeconomic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and cultural differences - particularly in relation to Princeton University or higher education in general
- Prior research contributions to the advancement of knowledge of topics related to diversity and equity in any field
- Effectiveness in creating an academic environment (in the classroom or through mentoring) that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various under-represented groups

- Involvement or leadership in organizations/programs/activities dedicated to furthering diversity and equal opportunity within or external to a university
- If applicant has not previously engaged in any relevant activities, statement should demonstrate knowledge of the value of equity, diversity, and inclusion, and outline clear and detailed plans for committing to those principles in this position

See UC Berkeley's [Rubric to Assess Candidate Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion](#) for further guidance.

For more information:

1. Turner, C. S. V. (2002). *Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities
2. Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1, 139–168.
3. Canning, C. & Reddick, R. (2019). In Defense of Diversity Statements. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 11.
4. Flier, J. (2019). Against Diversity Statements. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 3.
5. Flaherty, C. (2018). Breaking Down Diversity Statements. *Inside Higher Ed*, November 19.
6. Schmaling, K. B., Trevino, A. Y., Lind, J. R., Blume, A. W., & Baker, D. L. (2015). Diversity statements: How faculty applicants address diversity. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8(4), 213-224.
7. Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. *Psychological Science*, 11(4), 315-319.
8. Kelsey, K. (2014). How to make sense of the diversity statement. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January, 31, A37.
9. Wilton, L. S., Good, J.J., Moss-Racusin, C.A., Sanchez, D.T. (2015). Communicating more than diversity: The effect of institutional diversity statements on expectations and performance as a function of race and gender. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 21(3), 315-325.

Appendix E: Best Practices for Conducting Remote Job Searches

The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the existing trend across academia towards conducting major aspects of faculty job searches virtually. The improving epidemiological situation has made it possible to consider a return to in-person interviewing, but it is likely that much of the search process this year will once again be conducted remotely.

Universities and departments that have already begun to incorporate virtual processes have reported a number of important benefits. Interviewing candidates remotely, for instance, helps remove informalities and small talk that can inadvertently give an unfair advantage to candidates who share an affinity with members of the search committee. The “winning-and-dining” aspect of traditional campus visits, for instance, can lead committee members to make decisions based on social niceties rather than objective credentials. Conducting interviews and holding campus visits remotely, by contrast, can democratize a search and help committee members focus on candidates’ talents and experience. Remote interviews also have the effect of saving time and money for all parties. This is an especially important consideration for graduate students and underemployed Ph.D.’s, for whom traveling to a conference can be prohibitively expensive. Eliminating such travel also lessens a search’s environmental impact and can allow committees to interview more candidates.

Alongside such benefits, however, come new potential pitfalls and opportunities for bias. In order to be fair, consistent, and equitable to all candidates, please consider the following best practices:

- In order to provide a level playing field to all candidates, it is important to maintain consistency in the choice of venue for each stage of interviews. This may not be possible for campus visits, if some finalists are unable to travel to the US, but every effort should be made to judge all candidates according to the same criteria.
- Consider conducting interviews according to local time for the candidate, to ensure that all candidates are “performing” under similar circumstances. For instance, avoid scheduling interviews at times that would force candidates to participate late at night, when they may be less alert.
- Recognize that candidates may have teaching or other obligations that conflict with a virtual “campus” interview. Plan accordingly to avoid such conflicts, even if that means such a “visit” lasts more than one day.
- It is tempting to consider recording virtual interviews so that members of the committee can review them later. Although not strictly forbidden if the candidates have given express written permission, this practice is highly discouraged out of respect for privacy of the candidates and because it could be a liability. Since we do not record in-person interviews, we should not record virtual interviews.
- As you would for an in-person interview, consider in advance the complications for candidates with disabilities and make clear in the invitation that the university provides accommodations upon request (e.g., sign language interpreters, closed captioning).
- Before each remote interview or session, the committee should identify someone who will take the lead as “host.” This individual should ensure the meeting starts and ends on time, handle all introductions, facilitate discussion, and troubleshoot any technical problems.
- If conducting a “campus visit” remotely, be sure to build in 5–10 minute breaks between each session so that participants can stretch their legs, use the restroom, etc. Also aim to include a 10–15 minute break at mid-morning and mid-afternoon, as well as a lunch break of at least 30 minutes. If an extended lunch break is not

possible due to the agenda, be sure to build in several more substantial breaks, to reduce Zoom fatigue. Consider building in preparatory time if the candidate will be doing a teaching demo or research talk, much as you would for an in-person visit.

- Remember that the rules regarding inadmissible questions are the same for remote interviews as they are for in-person interviews. For instance, if you see a family photo in the background of a candidate's home office, it is still not appropriate to inquire about a spouse, child, pet, etc. To reduce such temptations and account for unconscious bias, consider conducting first-round interviews over the phone, or asking candidates to keep their camera off.
- Although remote interviewing can help focus the committee's attention on candidates' talents and experience, it can also introduce new types of implicit bias. Remember that you should evaluate a candidate according to your own pre-determined criteria. A candidate's background scenery or the quality of their internet connection, for instance, should not be factored into a committee's evaluation process.
- Traditionally, a discipline's annual conference has served to synchronize hiring schedules. The move to virtual interviewing, however, has disrupted this timeline, with the result that candidates receive offers at different times and may be forced to make decisions before having all options on the table. A committee should be careful to adjust their hiring schedule to accommodate candidates, allowing them ample opportunity to weigh options before requiring a firm decision.

For more information, see the following:

[Michigan State University – Faculty Search Guide \(esp. Appendix 14, pp. 56–60\)](#)

[University of British Columbia – Equity Considerations in Virtual Interviews](#)

[University of Nebraska Omaha – Video Interview Tips](#)

[Case Western Reserve University – Best Practices for Virtual Interviewing](#)

[University of Oregon – Remote Interviewing Guidance](#)

[Chronicle of Higher Education, 10/8/20 – The Job Season Without In-Person interviews](#)

[Chronicle of Higher Education, 5/4/20 – Keep Calm and Hire On \(If You Get the Chance\)](#)

[APA Blog – How do you bring candidates “to campus” during the COVID-19 pandemic? Part 1](#)

[APA Blog – How do you bring candidates “to campus” during the COVID-19 pandemic? Part 2](#)

Appendix F: Advertising and Recruiting Resources*

General:

Academic Keys

<http://www.academickeys.com/>

American Association for Access, Equity and Diversity

<https://www.aaed.org/aaed/default.asp>

American Education Research Association (AERA)

<http://www.aera.net/>

American Physical Society

<http://www.aps.org/programs/roster/index.cfm>

Diverse: Issues in Higher Education

<http://diverseeducation.com/>

Diversity.com

<http://www.diversity.com/>

Equal Opportunity Employment Journal

<http://eoejournal.com/>

Higher Ed Jobs.com

<http://www.higheredjobs.com/default.cfm>

Higher Education Recruitment Consortium

<http://www.hercjobs.org>

Humanities and Social Sciences H-Net Job Guide

<https://www.h-net.org/jobs/home.php>

IMDiversity.com

<http://www.IMDiversity.com>

INSIGHT Into Diversity

<http://www.insightintodiversity.com>

LGBTinHigherEd.com

<http://lgbtinhighered.com>

Minority PostDoc

<http://www.MinorityPostdoc.org/view/jobs.html>

National Organization of Gay and Lesbian Scientists and Technical Professionals Inc.

<http://www.noglstp.org>

National Science Foundation Survey of Earned Doctorates

www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvydoctorates/

The Professorial Advancement Initiative

<https://www.btaa.org/leadership/pai/pai-home>

The Registry: National Registry of Diverse and Strategic Faculty
<http://www.theregistry.ttu.edu>

Disciplines:

American Anthropological Association (AAA)
<http://www.aaanet.org/>

American Chemical Society
<http://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/careers.html>

American Comparative Literature Association
<http://www.acla.org/>

American Economics Association (AEA)
<http://www.aeaweb.org/committees/csweb/>

American Historical Association (AHA)
<http://www.historians.org/>

AHA (African American History)
<http://www.asalh.org/>

AHA (Latin American History)
<http://clah.h-net.org/>

AHA (Women)
<http://www.theccwh.org/>

American Institute of Biological Sciences
<https://www.aibs.org/careers/>

American Physical Society
<http://www.aps.org>

American Political Science Association
<http://www.apsanet.org>

American Psychological Association (APA)
<http://www.apa.org/index.aspx>

APA (Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs)
<http://www.apa.org/pi/oema>

APA (Office of Women's Programs)
<http://www.apa.org/pi/women/index.aspx>

APA (Society for Psychological Study of Culture, Ethnicity, and Race)
<http://www.division45.org/>

American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
<http://www.asbmb.org/>

American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB)
<http://www.ascb.org/>

American Sociological Association (ASA)

<http://www.asanet.org/>

Computer Research Association

<http://www.cra.org/>

Mathematics Association of America

http://www.maa.org/summa/archive/summa_wl.htm

Modern Languages Association (MLA)

<http://www.mla.org/>

MLA: Committee on Literatures of People of Color

<https://clpc.mla.hcommons.org/>

MLA: Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession

<https://www.mla.org/About-Us/Governance/Committees/Committee-Listings/Professional-Issues/Committee-on-the-Status-of-Women-in-the-Profession>

Ethnicity/Racial Affinity Groups:

American Indian Graduate Center

<http://www.aigcs.org>

American Indian Higher Education

<http://www.tribalcollegejournal.org/>

American Indian Science and Engineering Society

<http://www.aises.org/>

The Black Collegian Online

<http://blackcollegian.com>

Commission on the Advancement of Women and Minorities in Science, Engineering, and Technology (CAWMSET)

<http://www.nsf.gov/od/cawmset/>

HBCU Connect.com Career Center

<https://hbcuconnect.com/jobs>

Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities

<https://www.hacu.net/>

The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education

www.hispanicoutlook.com

The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education

www.jbhe.com

National Consortium for Graduate Degrees for Minorities in Science and Engineering

<http://www.gemfellowship.org/>

National Organization for the Advancement of Black Chemists and Chemical Engineers

<http://www.nobcche.org/>

National Society for Black Engineers
<http://www.nsbe.org/>

National Society for Black Physicists
<http://www.nsbp.org/>

Nemnet
<http://www.nemnet.com>

Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science
<http://sacnas.org/>

Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers
<http://www.shpe.org/>

Society of Mexican American Engineers and Scientists (MAES)
<http://www.maes-natl.org/>

Affinity Groups for Women:

Association for Women in Science
<http://www.awis.org/>

Commission on the Advancement of Women and Minorities in Science, Engineering, and Technology (CAWMSET)
<http://www.nsf.gov/od/cawmset/>

National Academies: Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, and Medicine
<http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/cwsem/>

National Institutes of Health Office of Research on Women's Health (ORWH)
<http://orwh.od.nih.gov/>

Society for Women Engineers
<http://societyofwomenengineers.swe.org>

WEPAN (Women in Engineering ProActive Network)
<https://www.wepan.org/>

Women in Higher Education
<http://www.wihe.com>

Fellowships and Awards:

Native Forward Scholars Fund
<https://www.nativeforward.org/>

Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP)
<http://www.pathwaystoscience.org/agep.aspx>

American Association of University Women (AAUW) Directory of Fellowship Recipients
<https://www.aauw.org/resources/programs/fellowships-grants/directory-of-recipients-sponsors/>

American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS)
<https://www.acls.org/recent-awardees/>

DARE- Diversifying Academia, Recruiting Excellence

<https://vpge.stanford.edu/fellowships-funding/dare/details>

The Ford Foundation Fellowship Program

<https://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/Fellowships/index.htm>

https://nrc58.nas.edu/FordFellows20/Directory_Ford30/ModulePage.aspx?Nav=Home

Hanna H. Gray Fellows Program:

<https://www.hhmi.org/programs/hanna-h-gray-fellows-program>

Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT)

<http://www.igert.org/>

L'Oreal For Women in Science Fellowship Program

<https://www.forwomeninscience.com/>

Luce Scholars Program

<https://www.hluce.org/programs/luce-scholars/>

Mellon Mays Graduate Initiatives Program (SSRC)

<https://www.ssrc.org/programs/view/mellon-mays-graduate-initiatives-program/>

Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship Program

<http://www.mmuf.org/>

The Meyerhoff Fellows Program at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC)

<http://www.umbc.edu/meyerhoff/Graduate/>

Paul & Daisy Soros Fellowships for New Americans

<https://www.pdsoros.org/>

The Presidential Awards for Excellence in Science, Mathematics, and Engineering Mentoring (PAESMEM)

http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=5473

Schlumberger Foundation Faculty for the Future Fellowship

<https://www.facultyforthefuture.net/>

Sloan Scholars Mentoring Network (SSRC):

<https://sloan-scholars.ssrc.org/>

University of California President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program

<https://ppfp.ucop.edu/info/>

**Sources:* Columbia University Guide to Best Practices in Faculty Search and Hiring; University of Chicago Promising Practices for Recruiting & Retaining Diverse Faculty; Dartmouth College Faculty Recruitment and Selection; University of Michigan Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring; UC Berkeley Office for Faculty Equity & Welfare.

Appendix G: Bibliography on Bias and Stereotyping in Search Processes

- Babcock, L. & Laschever, S. (2007). Women Don't Ask: The High Cost of Avoiding Negotiation—and Positive Strategies for Change. Bantam.
- Bertrand, M., Chugh, D., & Mullainathan, S. (2005). Implicit discrimination. American Economic Association Papers and Proceedings, 95(2), 94-98.
- Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. The American Economic Review, 94(4), 991-1013.
- Best practices for Conducting Faculty Search. (2016). Harvard University Office of the Senior Vice Provost.
- Best Practices for Search Committees. Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity Initiatives, University of Pennsylvania.
- Best Practices: Faculty and Leadership Searches. (2015). Yale University Office of the Provost.
- Biernat, M., Manis, M., & Nelson, T.E. (1991). Stereotypes and standards of judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60(4), 485.
- Dovidio, J. & Gaertner, S.L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. Psychological Science, 11(4), 315-319.
- Effective Pool Development Strategies. Cornell University.
- Ellis, E., Hankel, B., Cantada, B., St. Sauveur, M., & Cusick, K. (2016 [Revised]). Faculty Recruitment and Selection: A Guide for the Dartmouth College Arts and Sciences Faculty. Office of Institutional Diversity & Equity, Dartmouth College.
- Evaluating the Candidate Pool. Cornell University.
- Fine, E., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Searching for Excellence and Diversity. WISELI University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Fiske, S.T. (2002). What we know now about bias and intergroup conflict, the problem of the century. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11(4), 123-128.
- Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J.C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82(6), 878-902.
- Georgi, H. (2000). Is there an unconscious discrimination against women in science? The American Physical Society News Online.
- Goulden, M. et al. (2019). Searching for a Diverse Faculty: What Really Works. Peer Review, 21(4).
- Goldin, C. & Rouse, C. (2000). Orchestrating Impartiality: The Impact of 'Blind' Auditions on Female Musicians. American Economic Review, 90(4), 715-741.

Guide to Best Practices in Faculty Search and Hiring. Columbia University Office of the Provost.

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

Levine, S.S, Apfelbaum, E.P., Bernard, M., Bartelt, V.J., Zajacm E., & Stark, D. (2014). Ethnic Diversity Deflates Price Bubbles. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

Managing Campus Visits. Cornell University.

Mero, N.P. & Motowidlo, S.J. (1995). Effects of Rater Accountability on the Accuracy and the Favorability of Performance Ratings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 517-524.

Moody, J. (2011) Faculty Diversity: Removing the Barriers. 2nd ed. Routledge: New York, NY.

Nosek, B., Banaji, M., & Greenwald, A. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site. Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 6(1), 101-115.

O'Rourke, S. (2013). Successful strategies for Faculty Diversity: Valuing Faculty Work that Promotes Equity (Transcript and PowerPoint). National Center for Faculty Development & Diversity. Olson, G.A. (2007). Don't Just Search, Recruit. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Planning the Search. Cornell University.

Promising Practices for Recruiting & Retaining Diverse Faculty. University of Chicago Office of the Deputy Provost for Research and Minority Issues.

Recruitment Committee of the Johns Hopkins University Commission on Equity, Civility, and Respect. (2009). Strategies for Successfully Recruiting a Diverse Faculty (Best Practices). Johns Hopkins University.

Sackett, P.R., DuBois, C.L.Z., & Noe, A.W. (1991). Tokenism in performance evaluation: The effects of work group representation on male-female and white-black differences in performance ratings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(2), 263-267.

Smith, D.G., Turner, C.S., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Hiring Diverse Faculty. The Journal of Higher Education, 75(2), 133-160

Springer, A., & Westerhaus, C. (2006). How to Diversity the Faculty. American Association of University Professors.

Steinpreis, R.E., Anders, K.A., & Ritzke, D. (1999). The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job candidates and tenure candidates: A national empirical study. Sex Roles, 41(718), 509-528.

Strategies for Generating Diverse Candidate Pools. (2015). Yale University Office of the Provost.

Trix, F. & Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. Discourse and Society, 14, 191-220.

Uhlmann, E.L., & Cohen, G.L. (2005). Constructed criteria redefining merit to justify discrimination. Psychological Science, 16(6), 474-480.

Valian, V. (1998). Why so slow? MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.

van Ommeren, J., de Vries, R.E., Russo, G., & van Ommeren, M. (2005). Context in selection of men and women in hiring decisions: Gender composition of the applicant pool. Psychological Reports, 96, 349-360.

Wenneras, C. & Wold, A. (1997). Nepotism and sexism in peer review. Nature, 387, 341-342.

See also the video recording of “Implicit Bias Workshop: An Introduction to Interrupting Bias in the Academic Search Process,” available at: <https://academicinclusion.princeton.edu/professional-development/workshops>