

A GUIDE TO FACULTY SEARCHES



SEARCHING FOR EXCELLENCE

Brigham Health
January, 2020

Contents

Introduction	2
Search Checklist	3
Background	4
Common Myths	5
Foundational Skills for Committee Members	6
Bias in Hiring	7
Initiating the Search	8
HMS Approval	8
Committee Composition	8
Committee Roles	9
Issues to Cover at First Meeting	9
Building the Candidate Pool	10
Position Description	10
Advertisement	10
Active Recruiting	11
Evaluating Candidates	12
Evaluation Criteria	12
Building Lists	12
Common Cognitive Errors	13
Interviews	14
Reviewing the Search	14
Campus Visits	15
Making an Offer	16
Failed Searches	16
Appendices	17
Citations	21



Dear Brigham Community,

At the Brigham, we embrace a culture of shared humanity and dignity, where our diverse community of patients, families and employees all feel welcome, cared for, and valued. This is one of our core values, and we are committed to upholding it. A diverse faculty enables us to better serve our diverse patient population, as well as creating a more dynamic, creative and high-performing intellectual community.

Our institution is a product of our systems. To enrich our diversity, it is important to rethink some of our systems, including how we recruit and hire our faculty and our leaders.

As we implement this new process, you are warmly invited to share your feedback by emailing BWHCDI@partners.org. Your perspective is valuable as we continue to evolve how we are creating a more diverse and inclusive faculty.

The goal of this guide is to put in place evidence-based practices that result in the recruitment of outstanding candidates who share our Brigham values, advance our mission, and enrich our Brigham community.



Elizabeth G. Nabel, M.D.
President
Brigham Health



Allen Smith, M.D.
President
Brigham and Women's Physicians Organization



SEARCH CHECKLIST

The following list outlines steps in the HMS/BH search process, and applies to all faculty searches at the Brigham.

Search Initiation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Select & Invite Search Committee: Every search committee will be at least 40 percent diverse.<input type="checkbox"/> Select Co-Chairs: Have two co-chairs for each search.<input type="checkbox"/> Notify HMS: <i>For professorial searches, department chair or hospital president sends search request letter & proposed committee to PCSA and HMS. HMS will send invitations to committee members. Schedule co-Chair orientation with HMS Office of Faculty Affairs.</i>
Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Plan Meetings: Plan search committee meetings. Invite faculty/staff to speak to the committee about the needs of the department.<input type="checkbox"/> Read Guide: Ask committee members to read this guide (“Searching for Excellence: A Guide to Faculty Searches”) prior to the first meeting.<input type="checkbox"/> Set Committee Expectations: Articulate clear, direct expectations that diversity and inclusion are foundational to BH and an important consideration for all searches.<input type="checkbox"/> Review National Data: Review national pool diversity data for the academic rank and discipline.<input type="checkbox"/> Weigh Bias: Review common myths (pg. 5) and Bias in Hiring (pg. 7), then define a process for weighing biases inherent in the search process.<input type="checkbox"/> Diversity Advocate: <i>For associate/full professor searches, select a search committee member to serve in the role of Diversity Advocate.</i>
Position Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Requirements: Write position description, including reaching consensus about the institutional needs for the position. These should be reflected as job requirements.<input type="checkbox"/> Diversity: Include diversity and inclusion in the position description (sample wording on pg. 10).<input type="checkbox"/> Debias Position Description: <i>For associate/full professor searches, run the position description through an online debiasing tool (see pg. 10).</i>
Active Recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Strategy: Create active recruitment plan, including nominators, nominees, publications, associations, online venues, conferences, and awards lists, including specific tasks and deadlines for committee members.<input type="checkbox"/> Advertisements: Include equal opportunity language in all ads (sample wording on pg. 10). Post ads, paying special attention to journals and associations with diverse membership. Post ads for at least 30 days before constructing the interview list.<input type="checkbox"/> Records: Keep records of all recruitment efforts, including Individuals & organizations solicited for names, letters sent, candidate lists, and why people were selected/removed from the candidate pool.
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Criteria: Create evaluation criteria based on the position description. Include the two mandatory evaluation criteria on pg. 12.<input type="checkbox"/> Reviewers: Assign committee members to review each candidate’s materials, using the above evaluation criteria.<input type="checkbox"/> Candidate Pool: Document consideration of at least two members of diverse groups. Whenever possible, interview at least two members of diverse groups.<input type="checkbox"/> Data Submission & Evaluation Form: <i>For associate/full professor searches (optional for other searches): submit evaluation criteria and candidate data to CDI (see pg. 12). CDI will send you the evaluation form populated with your criteria.</i>
Interviews & Offer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Interviews: Plan onsite or offsite interviews.<input type="checkbox"/> Questions: Plan standardized interview questions. Ask every candidate about diversity, equity and inclusion (see pg. 14 for sample language).<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection: <i>For associate/full professor searches, when candidates are presented to the person making the final hiring decision, reflect on diversity during the search process and share issues that arose, so this information can be weighed in making a decision.</i><input type="checkbox"/> Search Report & Appointment: Submit search report to HMS and begin HMS appointment process. Details at https://fa.hms.harvard.edu/FoMhandbook.

Notes: 1) Please keep records at all steps, as these will be needed to compile the final search report for HMS.
2) Please email BWHCDI@partners.org if you encountered barriers to fulfilling any parts of this process. This feedback is valuable to us as this new process is implemented.

BACKGROUND

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this document, the concepts of equal opportunity and diversity are understood as the right of all candidates to be treated with equal fairness and to have the opportunity to excel without bias. The term “diverse candidates” encompasses race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, national origin, age, disability, and protected veteran status.

The term URM (Underrepresented in Medicine) is defined by the American Association of Medical Colleges as racial and ethnic populations that are underrepresented in the medical profession relative to their numbers in the general population. As of 2020 at HMS, this includes black, Hispanic, and Native American/Alaska Native populations. Although women and Asian populations are not URM, they are underrepresented in leadership positions at the Brigham, HMS and nationally.

POSITIONS REQUIRING A SEARCH

Searches are an essential step to having the strongest people and creating a vibrant future for the Brigham. The process outlined in this document applies to all faculty searches. It is the Brigham’s institutional expectation that an open search will take place for faculty leadership positions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This guide builds upon the outstanding work of other institutions, notably the University of Michigan and the University of Wisconsin, as well as Columbia, Harvard, MIT, Stanford, UCLA, UCSF, and Yale.

Special thanks to the Brigham Task Force on Search Committees co-chairs Terrie Inder, MD and Nawal Nour, MD, and members Dale Adler, MD, Robert Barbieri, MD, Cheri Blauwet, MD, Zara Cooper, MD, Sunny Eappen, MD, Nickolette Gaglia, Daphne Haas-Kogan, MD, Galen Henderson, MD, Hadine Joffe, MD, Fidencio Saldana, MD, Ali Salim, MD, and Michael VanRooyen, MD.



COMMON MYTHS

Some people believe the following to be true. It is important that we dispel these myths.

Diversity considerations distract from finding an exceptional candidate.

A focus on diversity enhances the likelihood of finding an exceptional candidate. Diversifying the candidate pool through targeted outreach to underrepresented groups ensures that all promising applicants are considered.¹ Guarding against bias leads to the selection of the top individual.

Diverse candidates are few and difficult to recruit and retain.

Though the number of diverse faculty may be low in many fields, their representation is not reflective of their numbers in the pool of available candidates. The most common reasons that faculty relocate are dual career considerations, questions of fit, and points of contention with their previous place of employment, rather than the promise of a richer offer from another institution.^{2,3}

Search practices don't need to change. We'll naturally have more diverse leaders as more move through the pipeline.

This is false. Diverse faculty are not advancing at the same rate that they are receiving advanced degrees and entering academic medicine.⁴

Departmental leadership positions are good retention tools. By doing searches, we could lose talented faculty we've spent years cultivating.

The goal of a search is to identify the best possible candidate for a position--internal or external. A search opens up a much larger pool of prospects to choose from. Potential faculty who leave are counterbalanced by new incoming faculty who are a better match for departmental needs.

Even if departments have diverse faculty members, it's rare for them to experience the benefits of diversity.

It is true that a more diverse faculty body doesn't automatically bring results. A workplace also needs inclusion -- a culture where everyone brings their unique perspectives, ideas and viewpoints to the work at hand. Recruiting diverse faculty members is the first step to achieving the benefits of diversity.

Active outreach to diverse faculty is not necessary because our department has an outstanding reputation.

It's not enough to place an ad in a few places. Some of the best candidates may not see it, or may not see themselves in the advertised position without some encouragement. A study of MIT faculty found that 63% of their URM faculty entered a search because they were contacted by a member of the department and encouraged to apply, compared to just 21% of non-URM faculty.⁵

FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Being an expert in a particular field of medicine and conducting an effective and fair search often require distinct skill sets. With few exceptions, faculty are not inherently aware or trained to avoid two important hazards that can compromise the effectiveness of a search. They are group dynamics and implicit bias.

GROUP DYNAMICS

Imbalances of power among committee members can silence some members while allowing for others to control too much of the search process. It is helpful to draw colleagues into the discussion since it is the *committee*, not a single individual (or even pair of individuals), which is making all decisions.

The search process is a group endeavor. Effective communication is founded on a sense of trust and confidence among the participants. Suspend judgment, test assumptions and inferences, state views and ask genuine questions, ask others to reconcile their opinions and beliefs in considering evidence to the contrary, and come to a mutual agreement that it's okay to remind one another if anyone's words or actions are straying from creating a safe space.

At the end of each meeting, reflect on the proceedings and provide feedback on what you did well as a committee, and what moments of concern you had. This feedback is the basis for improvement.

IMPLICIT BIAS

Acknowledging that we are all subject to bias is a critical step to mitigating its impact.

Please read carefully through the list of ways bias can influence hiring on the next page. Additional resources and trainings are available at aamc.org/subject/unconscious-bias.



Key Recommendation

How to weigh the bias inherent in these inputs is up to the committee, but the co-Chairs must define a process.

As a search committee member, you will be asked to evaluate candidates based on many of the inputs listed on the next page.

One potential process is to 1) discuss the reflection questions in Appendix A, 2) discuss the case study in Appendix D, and 3) at the start of any evaluation discussion, remind the committee to be mindful of these biases.



BIAS IN HIRING

Here is a sample of how common biases influence the search process:



CV Evaluation

A study of 238 psychologists found that both men and women were more likely to select a male applicant than a female applicant with an identical record. Both men and women also reported that the male applicant had more teaching, research and service experience compared to the female applicant with an identical record.⁷



Publications

A study of postdoctoral fellowships found that women needed 2.5 times more publications as men to achieve the same rating on scientific competence. The analysis also revealed that knowing someone on the review panel improved their rating of scientific competence.⁸



Letters of Recommendation

A study of recommendation letters for successful medical faculty applicants at a large American medical school found that letters for females differed systematically from those for male applicants. Letters for women were shorter, contained more “grindstone adjectives” such as “hardworking,” were less likely to include stand-out adjectives such as “brilliant,” and emphasized teaching whereas those for men emphasized research abilities.⁹



Vision

In a study conducted by Harvard Business School, Wharton, and MIT Sloan, researchers found that investors preferred entrepreneurial ventures pitched by a man over an identical venture pitched by a woman by a rate of 68% to 32%. Investors found the male pitches more “persuasive, logical, and fact-based” than the *identical* female pitches.¹⁰



Grants

A 2011 study commissioned by the NIH revealed that black Ph.D. scientists were far less likely to receive NIH funding for a research idea than a white scientist from a similar institution with the same research record.¹¹



Interviews

Resumes with traditionally white names such as Emily and Greg elicited 50% more interviews than similar resumes with black/ethnic names such as Lakisha and Jamal.¹²



Hiring

In a study by researchers at Yale, science faculty rated a male for a lab manager position as significantly more competent and hireable than the (identical) female applicant. Both male and female faculty were equally likely to exhibit bias against the female student.¹³

INITIATING THE SEARCH

HMS APPROVAL

Searches at the full professor level begin with the department chair or hospital president submitting a letter to the HMS Dean, along with a suggested list of committee members. This should be sent to PCSA (rthadhani@partners.org, abaker10@partners.org) and copy HMS (seniorprofsearch@hms.harvard.edu). Note that HMS will send invitations to the committee co-chairs and members. The Brigham should not directly invite anyone to serve on the committee.

While not required, HMS welcomes receiving ads for all faculty searches, and will post them on the HMS website. Full details available at <https://fa.hms.harvard.edu/FoMhandbook>.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

The search process begins by compiling a list of potential search committee members.



Key Recommendation

The Brigham's institutional expectation is that every search committee will be at least 40 percent diverse. (Diverse is defined on page 4.)

This is a best practice for leading academic institutions across the country.

A diverse search committee is fundamental to enhancing the quality of the search process and increasing the likelihood of hiring a diverse candidate. For every additional woman on a seven-member panel reviewing a hire or promotion at the full professor level, the chances of success by a female candidate increased by 14%.¹⁴

The professional networks of a diverse search committee will compliment the networks of the faculty as a whole, contributing to a diverse candidate pool. Representation of diverse faculty on a search committee sends a message

about the department and institutional climate, drawing more serious consideration of diverse candidates.

Keep in mind that the structure of a search committees signals what a department values—e.g., subfield autonomy, seniority, broad consensus, or issues of diversity and equity. It also reinforces how a department distributes and enacts power. Who gets to provide significant input during the hiring process? Who gets to ask questions? And who makes decisions?

The procedures for a search are at the highest rank included in the search. For searches at the Instructor, Assistant, or Associate Professor level, any medical staff member can serve on the search committee. For searches at the Professor level, HMS governance states that all voting members of the committee must be full professors. If a search is at the Associate or Full professor level, then one Associate professor will be allowed to serve on the search committee, provided that the Associate professor enhances the diversity of the committee. A member of the Brigham Health Board of Trustees is also permitted to serve as a voting member of the committee.

Search committees should not include anyone who is a potential candidate for the position, or anyone who will report in to the position.

One alternative to a large search committee (5-10 people) is forming a smaller search committee, with the expectation that committee members will commit to attending at least 90 percent of the meetings.

The Brigham's Center for Diversity & Inclusion is a resource to help identify diverse committee members.

COMMITTEE ROLES

This document introduces two changes to our typical search committee process at the Brigham.



Key Recommendation

All search committees will have two co-chairs. This arrangement brings a greater range of knowledge and perspectives to the search process, and sets the stage for more balanced group dynamics.



Key Recommendation

Searches at the associate/full professor level will have someone in the role of Diversity Advocate, who advocates for diversity as a core component of excellence in the search process.

A co-chair can serve as Diversity Advocate if desired. Concrete steps that the Diversity Advocate can take during the search process include:

- Advocate for diversity throughout the search process
- Monitor recruitment outreach
- Help with extra recruitment efforts aimed at direct and personal contact
- Review the diversity of the long/intermediate/short lists
- Monitor the consistent evaluation of all applicants
- Track the reasoning for removing candidates from the pool
- Discuss, call out, and speak out against bias in the search process

ISSUES TO COVER AT FIRST MEETING

One of the most important qualities in a co-chair is the capacity to ensure that diverse points of view are honored throughout the committee's deliberations.

During the first meeting, the co-chairs should set the tone for how discussions will be conducted. Some committee members may be more vocal and dominate conversations, when it is vital that other voices and opinions be heard. Search chairs should therefore be vigilant against a narrow range of voices dominating committee discussions. Strategies to mitigate this risk include:

- Allocate time to each committee member for views and discussion.
- Randomize committee members to start discussion.
- Set an expectation that all committee members participate in search deliberations, even if this requires the chair to call upon them individually for input.
- Before leaving a topic, ask if there are any more comments, or specifically ask members of the committee who have not spoken if they have anything to add.

The committee should agree upon how it will conduct its business in a fair and consistent manner. Points of discussion include:



Key Recommendation

Talent Pool: Review national demographic data for the academic rank/discipline. The Center for Diversity & Inclusion can provide you with this data (BWHCDI@partners.org).



Key Recommendation

Data Collection: Searches at the associate/full professor level should track all candidates, including why they were winnowed from the candidate pool. See Appendix E for a sample table. The Brigham's Center for Diversity & Inclusion will collect this information later in the search.

Scheduling: Institutional bias includes policies that unintentionally discriminate against certain groups, creating unintended barriers to their participation in the search process. Be mindful of times that might conflict with family responsibilities (i.e., childcare).

Decorum: During committee meetings, agree to not look at emails or phones. Reviewers rely less on implicit biases when they focus their full attention on reviewing candidates.¹⁴

Confidentiality: All search committee members must be sure that they can confidentially share their views with colleagues.

Conflicts of Interest: All individuals should disclose conflicts of interest candidly and early.

Outcome: Committees are encouraged to provide an unranked list, as this provides more flexibility.

BUILDING THE CANDIDATE POOL

POSITION DESCRIPTION

Develop a clear position description that includes essential qualifications and experience. (See Appendix F for potential categories.) Think carefully about the qualifications you list, and how you will measure/evaluate them. Limit required qualifications to those that a candidate absolutely must have.



Key Recommendation

At the Brigham, we place great value on being a diverse and inclusive community. Please include the following wording in your position description and advertisements:

Brigham Health and the Department of _____ are committed to ensuring our diverse community feels welcome, cared for, and valued. Candidates who have experience working with a diverse range of faculty, staff and patients, and who can contribute to the climate of inclusivity are encouraged to identify their experiences in these areas.

Pay attention to the language used in the description. Masculine language such as “competitive” and “determined” results in women perceiving they would not belong in the work environment.



Key Recommendation

For searches at the associate/full professor level, scan the job description with an online debiasing tool that provides suggestions for debiasing your text, such as <http://gender-decoder.katmatfield.com> or <http://taprecruit.co>.

ADVERTISEMENT

Per HMS policy, an advertisement in a print or a web-based journal likely to reach the broadest, most appropriate pool of candidates must be posted for thirty days prior to candidate selection.

All advertisements should specify the potential rank(s) of the appointment and may not include appointment as Professor unless the Dean approves the search process. The advertisement must not be limited to a blanket statement of ‘rank commensurate with experience.’

Equal opportunity language should be included in all advertisements which states: “*We are an equal opportunity employer and all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability status, protected veteran status, gender identity, sexual orientation, pregnancy and pregnancy-related conditions or any other characteristic protected by law.*”



ACTIVE RECRUITING

Active recruiting entails soliciting applications from potential candidates by making information about the available position widely known. Examine assumptions, such as “Active outreach to diverse faculty is not necessary because our department’s academic ranking and reputation leads to a high volume of candidates.”

The committee should discuss strategies for actively recruiting diverse candidates, including:

- Nominators (potential sources for candidates), which can include your department alumni network and individuals working to increase diversity in your field. In your outreach, specifically ask for recommendations of candidates from groups that are underrepresented in your department, in addition to other recommendations.
- Nominees (potential candidates) to be notified. If a person declines nomination, ask them to recommend other candidates, and specifically ask them for nominations from groups that are underrepresented in your department. Faculty lists on department websites are another source for potential candidates, including diverse candidates.
- Journals, professional societies, publications, online forums, listservs, blogs, social media channels, and other venues where the position can be posted, including those targeted at diverse faculty.
- Conferences where candidates can be scouted
- Award lists that can be searched for nominees
- Additional resources from HMS are available here:
https://fa.hms.harvard.edu/files/hmsdfa/files/hms_professorial_search_advertising_outreach_guide_12.20.18.pdf
- See Appendix D for an in-depth example of active recruiting.

Use a personal approach to contact potential candidates who have been identified or nominated. If an individual declines a nomination or does not respond to your letter, try to contact the person by phone.

It might take multiple calls to show a candidate you are serious in wanting to recruit them before they agree to participate in the search. A study of MIT faculty found the majority of their URM faculty (63%) entered a search because they were contacted by a member of the department and encouraged to apply, compared to just 21% of non-URM faculty.⁵

Sample language for actively recruiting candidates is in Appendix C. If it would be helpful to have a note from a member of the hospital leadership team sent to a potential candidate(s), please be in touch with the Center for Diversity and Inclusion, who can help facilitate this.

Remember that your goal for this stage is to expand your pool of applicants. Save winnowing of applicants for a later stage.



EVALUATING CANDIDATES

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Once you have created the position description, use that as a basis for creating evaluation criteria that will be consistently used at both early and late stages of the selection process. Comparing candidates using pre-established criteria helps to minimize unconscious bias.¹⁶



Key Recommendation

There are two mandatory evaluation criteria that should be included with every search:

- Ability to work with diverse patient, trainee and faculty populations, and contribute to a climate of inclusion.
- Ability to make positive contributions to the department climate.

Disambiguate criteria as much as possible. For example, what are the indicators of "a strong research record?" In one study in which evaluators were asked to choose between candidates, evaluators more often chose the male candidate and justified their choice by pointing to a strong trait reflected in his resume. When the resumes were reversed, however, evaluators were still more likely to choose the male candidate and identified a different criterion as the basis of their decision.¹⁷



Key Recommendation

For searches at the associate/full professor level: once the committee has finalized criteria for evaluation, please submit them to the Center for Diversity & Inclusion (CDI) along with metrics on the composition of the initial candidate pool and first interview pool via the online portal at <http://j.mp/2nVPU9s>. CDI will generate the populated evaluation form for your search and send to you.

This data collection is non-punitive, and the goal of this effort is to help measure progress on our diversity and inclusion efforts and identify what is working well. If you encountered any barriers to creating a diverse search committee or candidate pool, please email BWHCDI@partners.org. This feedback is valuable as this new process is implemented.

BUILDING LISTS

When creating the intermediate or short lists, build in several checkpoints where the committee discusses whether you are satisfied with the pool of candidates you have generated.

Ask:

- What facts support our decisions to include or exclude a candidate? Where might we be speculating?
- How do the demographics of our shortlist compare with our qualified pool, and with the national pool?
- Have we generated an interview list with diverse candidates?

When generating intermediate/short lists, committees should consider diversity. While this may be perceived to be a source of bias itself, a robust body of peer reviewed research has shown that candidates with identical achievements are often regarded as unequal based on their gender or racial/ethnic identification.¹⁸



Key Recommendation

It is the Brigham's institutional expectation that all search committees will document consideration of at least two diverse candidates. Whenever possible, interview at least two members of diverse groups.

Diverse candidates are more likely to be evaluated fairly when they are not the only candidate of their gender, race or ethnicity under consideration. This phenomenon may result from the gender and/or race of the applicant becoming less prominent in a more diverse pool of applicants.²⁰

If a high percentage of diverse candidates were weeded out, do we know why? Can we reconsider our pool with a more inclusive lens, or extend the search?

COMMON COGNITIVE ERRORS

As you evaluate candidates, be mindful of combatting these errors in judgement:

- Shifting standards: Holding different candidates to different standards based on stereotypes; for example, women and underrepresented minorities may tend to be held to higher expectations regarding their number of publications and name recognition.⁸
- The longing to clone: Undervaluing a candidate's education and experience because they are not the same as most of those on the committee.
- Seizing a pretext: Using a minor reason to disqualify a candidate without properly considering all other criteria.
- Ranking prematurely: Designating some candidates as more promising than others without fully considering strengths and weaknesses of all applicants.
- Rushing to judgment: Having strong group members reach consensus without sufficient discussion. This may make it difficult for others to challenge those conclusions.
- Gut reactions: "Intuition" and "fit" are often cited; ask the committee members to explain their perspective and provide details for their views.



INTERVIEWS



To help make interviews consistent, fair, and effective:

- Conduct all interviews in the same format, including for internal candidates.
- Develop core questions to ask all candidates. Structured interviews provide more equitable evaluation of candidates.
- Focus on behavioral interview questions, which discover how a candidate performed in specific work related situations. This interview technique seeks to uncover how a candidate actually did behave in a given situation, not on how they might behave in the future. See Appendix G for additional information about behavioral interviewing, including sample questions that align with our Brigham leadership competencies.
- Ask questions about diversity, equity, and inclusion of every candidate. Designate one person to lead asking these questions; this person should not be the only diverse committee member. Examples include:
 - Please describe how you have worked in the past to create welcoming, inclusive and diverse environment.
 - What have you done to enhance your knowledge/skills related to diversity? How have you demonstrated what you learned?
- Pay attention to the climate of the interview process, including nonverbal and verbal communication.¹⁹ Become familiar with common patterns of micro-messages in formal and informal conversations that may convey bias.
- Keep in mind the dual nature of the interview process, when the committee can assess candidates while the candidate assesses whether our department/institution offers the opportunities, colleagues, and other factors that meet their personal and professional needs. Invite candidates to say what's important to them in considering this position, and write it down.
- Work to achieve rapport, understanding that it could be more difficult across demographic divides.

REVIEWING THE SEARCH & CAMPUS VISITS

REVIEWING THE SEARCH

Once the candidate pool has been narrowed for potential campus visits, the search committee should reflect on the search process, including issues that arose during the search.



Key Recommendation

For searches at the associate/full professor level: When the candidates are presented to the person making the final hiring decision, please include a summary of the search process reflection so that this information can be weighed in making a decision.

CAMPUS VISITS

The campus visit is an opportunity for the department to make finalists feel welcomed in a new community. Consistency in the campus visit is very important. Candidates should be asked the same interview questions, be provided the same opportunities to share their scholarly and teaching credentials, and generally receive the same high degree of welcome and attention during their visit.

Facilitate campus visits that highlight the Brigham's commitment to diversity. Have all candidates, regardless of their diversity, meet with a broad array of diverse individuals during their visit. Invite candidates to meet with a Brigham Center for Diversity & Inclusion representative, so they have an opportunity to learn about resources and programs without needing to discuss their personal lives with members of the search committee.

For interactions with current faculty and staff:

- Provide people interacting with the candidate in both interview and social settings with the candidate's CV as well as the position description, so that they are familiar with the candidate.
- Specify how the committee would like to receive feedback.
- Be explicit about confidentiality expectations.



MAKING AN OFFER & FAILED SEARCHES



MAKING AN OFFER

The search committee and/or larger faculty group should meet as soon as possible after the completion of the interviews so that information is fresh, the process continues moving efficiently, and candidates are contacted in a timely manner. Ensure that the final discussion of the candidates remains focused on the search criteria.

All input should be considered. One of the most useful aspects of stakeholder input is that it can represent diverse viewpoints that are not present in the committee. Stakeholders sometimes pick up on things that others may miss because their experiences, perspectives and needs are different. When some input differs significantly from the majority of assessments, follow up to find out more.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: FAILED SEARCHES

A failed search is one in which candidates were interviewed but no one was hired. There are many reasons this could happen, including that the search did not yield any viable candidates, or all viable candidates turned down the position.

The first step is to evaluate opportunities to strengthen the process going forward: Would stronger recruiting efforts be helpful? Are changes needed to the position description? Were candidates getting mixed messages while interviewing? Would it be helpful to reevaluate benchmarks for the offer package? Talking to the finalists about how the search was conducted could be particularly insightful, so that changes can be made during the search process to ensure better results the next time around.

The search can be re-launched after taking into account this feedback and searching for a broader applicant pool, taking the position in a new direction, or making changes to the composition of the search committee.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Reflection Questions for Search Committees

- Why is it important to factor in diversity considerations when searching for an exceptional candidate?
- What factors work against the organic growth of diverse leadership?
- What is the benefit to conducting a search, when there’s already a promising internal candidate?
- What are the benefits to having a diverse faculty?

APPENDIX B: Candidate Pool

Please complete the table below about the initial candidate pool (long list), and submit this and your evaluation criteria to the Center for Diversity & Inclusion at <http://j.mp/2nVPU9s> CDI will generate the evaluation sheet for your search and send to you.

	Diverse faculty nationally in this specialty, at this rank*	Your initial candidate pool	Your initial interview pool
Percent diverse (encompasses race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, national origin, disability, and protected veteran status.)			

*Please reach out to CDI for this data if you do not have it.

APPENDIX C: Sample Language for Actively Recruiting Candidates

- Do not state that you are looking especially for diverse applicants.
- Mention some accomplishment that you know about the possible applicant: the topic of a published paper or presentation, the prestige of an award received, the recommendation of a colleague, etc. This is to convince the person that this is not a generic letter; it is the quality of the person’s work that prompted this initial contact.
- Suggest that, on the basis of their past accomplishments, you think they may be good faculty material.
- Provide information about the search by attaching a copy of the search ad/position description.
- Ask if they are attending any upcoming professional conferences, as you or colleagues attending would like to speak with her/him about the Brigham as a good place to pursue a career.

APPENDIX D: Case Study: Pro-Active Chemical Engineering Search, University of Chicago

The process by the Chemical Engineering Department discovered and actively recruited women graduate students and postdocs to be faculty candidates:

1. The search chair located a ranked list of Chemical Engineering departments. Contacts in each of the top 20 departments were identified and faculty members closest to them volunteered to make contact.
2. Faculty members phoned their friends in the top 20 departments and asked them to suggest names of outstanding candidates for the open position. This part is important: they specifically asked them about women post-docs or graduating students who may be likely faculty candidates. They in turn gave the search chair the names for follow-up.
3. The search chair looked in the latest Directory of Graduate Research for the top 20 Chemical Engineering departments to create a list of women faculty. To verify accuracy, the search chair looked at the web sites of each of these departments. Many faculty research group pages reveal either names of grad students and postdocs or photos; the search chair retrieved the women from names or photos. Some departments instead have a separate directory for postdocs and for graduate students; the search chair retrieved the female names from these. The search chair wrote e-mails to nearly all the women faculty identified. Some replied and some suggested names of other women candidates.
4. The search chair retrieved the CVs posted for female-sounding names coming from top twenty institutions posted on the CACHE web site at U Texas Austin, which lists faculty openings in Chemical Engineering and also CVs of grad students/postdocs who are applying for faculty positions.
5. The discipline's national meeting has a poster session called "Meet the Faculty Candidates"; the search chair retrieved the female names, checking Google Images when in doubt.
6. With the names collected from the above sources, and using Google Images, if unsure about the gender, the search chair found achievements and contact information by Googling the name and copied and pasted their publications and presentations into a Word document to create a profile of the individual. Finally, the search chair composed an e-mail personalized with some particulars about the individual, stating why the department was interested in her, and attached a copy of the search ad. These constituted the female applicant "leads" that were encouraged to apply. Do not tell the student/postdoc that the search is looking for a woman; that would be a huge turnoff.
7. The search chair provided each departmental faculty member attending the national meeting with the list of talks/posters (including photos) collected for the prospective female applicants (as well as males whose applications had been received who were presenting talks or posters at the meeting). The chair of the search committee distributed the responsibility to attend these talks and posters among the faculty who were attending. The latter discovered additional prospective applicants at the meeting and encouraged them to apply.
8. Follow-up e-mails were sent to those who had face time with our faculty at the meeting, encouraging them to send in application packages. Follow-up e-mails were sent upon receiving the

application package. The search chair tried to maintain communications with the women candidates before and after their applications were received so that they would know we are interested in them, e.g., an e-mail was sent to an applicant whose proposal was vague asking for clarification; an e-mail was sent to an invited candidate whose original field was not Chemical Engineering with suggestions about the interview process.

9. Each of those invited was carefully briefed by the chair of the search committee on how a typical interview would be conducted. Each candidate was met at the airport (except for one coming from Northwestern U), taken to the hotel for check-in and then to the department. The candidate was ferried by faculty to and from interviews, especially with those outside the department. The tone of the one-on-one interviews with faculty was intended to sell the university and the department to the candidate, rather than to probe the candidate’s weaknesses. Seminars were followed by lively question and answer exchanges involving faculty and graduate students. Particularly for the proposal talk, the questions were intended to elicit additional information and to clarify the candidate’s plans for future work.

Summary of Search Outcomes

Stage	Metric
Total applications (all genders)	112
Number of female applicants	26
Long list	12 female, 5 male
Invited to interview	6 female, 1 Hispanic male
Accepted interview	5 females
Offer	One of 5 female finalists (first offer accepted)

APPENDIX E: Suggested Candidate Tracker Sheet

Name	Degree(s)	Title(s)	Department	Institution	Area(s) of Focus	Contact Information	Comments from Committee Discussion	Move Forward? (Y/N)

APPENDIX F: Potential Qualifications for Position Description

Clinical expertise: Measured/evaluated by _____.

Research expertise: Measured/evaluated by _____.

Teaching expertise: Measured/evaluated by _____.

Leadership: Measured/evaluated by _____.

Ability to work with diverse populations and contribute to a climate of inclusivity: Measured/evaluated by _____.

APPENDIX G: Behavioral Interviewing²¹

Behavioral interviews focus on discovering how a candidate performed in specific work-related situations. This interview technique seeks to uncover how a potential employee actually did behave in a given situation; not on how they might behave in the future. The premise behind this technique is that a good predictor of future performance is how someone performed in the past in a similar situation. Candidates can and should draw on previous work related experiences as well as non-work related experiences that are relevant to the interview questions.

Key points for behavioral interview questions:

- All behavioral interview questions should focus on what the interviewee did, said, felt or thought in the past. The interviewer should be looking for phrases such as “I did...”, “I said...” etc.
- Behavioral interview questions do not ask about what the interviewee would do in a given situation or what they would have done differently. The focus is on what the interviewee actually did/said/thought/felt in the past.
- The interviewee should focus on what they did as an individual, rather than what “we” did. While working as part of a team is very common and desirable, it is important to understand what the candidate’s individual role was.

Examples of behavioral interview questions aligned with Brigham leadership competencies:

- Values differences: Share an example of how you were able to leverage diverse thoughts and perspectives to accomplish a goal.
- Communicates effectively: Describe a situation in which you modified your communications and/or behavior to address different cultures or backgrounds.
- Courage: Share an example of when you were an architect/originator of a change effort. How did you approach this endeavor? How did you garner support for this effort? What challenges did you face and how did you handle them?
- Nimble learning: Describe how you have created an environment of learning and knowledge sharing in the past.
- Collaborates: Discuss a time when you worked with individuals in a different department or institution to accomplish a goal. How did you build and leverage relationships? What was the outcome?
- Instills trust: What are a couple of the more unpopular/controversial stands you’ve taken in your career so far?
- Customer/patient focus: What types of patients are difficult, and why?
- Builds effective teams: Describe a time when you intervened to resolve a conflict between two individuals or groups with conflicting priorities. How were you able to resolve it to everyone’s satisfaction?
- Cultivates innovation: Give me an example of when someone presented an innovative new idea to you that was a bit unusual. How did you react? What did you do?
- Drives engagement: Describe a time when you had to manage people to accomplish a difficult or undesirable task. How did you motivate them?

CITATIONS

1. Johnson SK, Hekman DR, Chan ET. If there's only One Woman in your Candidate Pool, There's Statistically No Chance She'll Be Hired. HBR. 2016; April 26.
2. Smith DG, Turner CS, Osei-Kofi N, Richards S. Interrupting the Usual. J Higher Ed. 2004;75(2):133–60.
3. Smith DG. How to Diversify the Faculty. Academe 2000;86(5):48–52.
4. National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering. National Academies Press (US) 2007.
5. Report of the Initiative for Faculty Race and Diversity. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 2010. Available at: <http://web.mit.edu/provost/raceinitiative/report.pdf>
6. Bilimoria D, Buch KK. The Search Is On: Engendering Faculty Diversity Through More Effective Search and Recruitment. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning. 2010;42(4):27-32.
7. Steinpreis RE, Anders KA, Ritzke D. The Impact of Gender on the Review of the Curricula Vitae of Job Applicants. Sex Roles. 1999;41:509-28.
8. Wenneras C, Wold A. Nepotism and Sexism in Peer-Review. Nature. 1997 May 22;387(6631):341-3.
9. Trix F, Psenka C. Exploring the Color of Glass: Letters of Recommendation for Female and Male Medical Faculty. Discourse & Society. 2003;14:191-220.
10. Brooks AW, Huang L, Kearney SW, Murray FE. Investors Prefer Entrepreneurial Ventures Pitched by Attractive Men. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014 Mar 25;111(12):4427-31.
11. Ginther DK, Schaffer WT, Schnell J, Masimore B, Liu F, Haak LL, et al. Race, Ethnicity and NIH Research Awards. Science. 2011;333(6045):1015-19
12. Bertrand M, Mullainathan S. Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal?: A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination. National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Working Paper Series;2003:WP9873.
13. Moss-Racusin CA, Dovidio JF, Brescoll VL, Graham MJ, Handelsman J. Science Faculty's Subtle Gender Biases Favor Male Students. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2012 Oct 9;109(41):16474-9.
14. Jaschik S. Impact of women on search committees. Inside Higher Ed; 2011 Jan 3.
15. Martell RF. Sex Bias at Work: The Affects of Attentional and Memory Demands on Performance Ratings for Men and Women. Journal of Applied Social Psychology. 1991;21:1936-60.
16. Casey PM, Warren RK, Cheesman FL, Elek JK. Helping Courts Address Implicit Bias: Resources for Education. National Center for State Courts. 2012. Available at: <http://www.ncsc.org/~media/Files/PDF/Topics/Gender%20and%20Racial%20Fairness>
17. Uhlmann EL, Cohen GL. Constructed Criteria: Redefining Merit to Justify Discrimination. Psychological Science. 2005;16:474-480.
18. Moss-Racusin CA, Dovidio JF, Brescoll VL, Graham MJ, Handelsman J. Science Faculty's Subtle Gender Biases Favor Male Students. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2012 Oct 9;109(41):16474-9
19. Heilman ME. The Impact of Situational Factors on Personnel Decisions Concerning Women: Varying the Sex Composition of the Applicant Pool. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 1980;26:286-95.
20. Dovidio JF, Gaertner SL. Aversive Racism in Selection Decisions: 1989 and 1999. Psychological Science. 2000;11:315-9.
21. National Institutes of Health Leadership & Management Behavioral Interview Guide. 2019 Dec 2. Available at: <https://hr.nih.gov › docx › behavioral-interview-guide-leadership-management>



The future depends
on what you do today.

—Mahatma Gandhi