

## CONCISE<sup>1</sup> GUIDANCE FOR SEARCH|OUTREACH|SELECTION COMMITTEES

1. OUTREACH: Do what is necessary<sup>2</sup> so the search can name outstanding prospects who are women, underrepresented minorities, or members of other 'protected classes' (not just the names of people who might know of prospects) persuaded to apply, and describe the persuasion and its outcome.
2. TIME: Compare applicants only after the time(s) stated in the position description (or minimally 30 days after the print publication of the ad) and after outreach (#1) has been sufficient. Encouraging some but not all prospects and treating an academic visit as a job interview are all premature comparisons. Urging all prospects to complete their application, is not
3. COMPARISON: Compare only those with complete applications and who meet the minimum qualifications. In successive comparisons (e.g., long list, short list, interview list, finalists, etc.), compare all surviving applicants uniformly and either continue or exclude each according to only the qualifications and preferences stated or implied in the position description.
  - a. Take care when composing the position description, as the rest of the search will need to honor it. Don't impede your own outreach (#1). The search can't change qualifications and preferences as it proceeds, so at the start get them right.
  - b. Have valid reasons for continuing or eliminating applicants. Be certain to record those reasons in case you are audited.
  - c. Valid reasons must relate to the qualifications and preferences in the position description. They cannot include considerations of gender, race, ethnicity, or any other protected class status, nor result from bias.
4. FAVORITISM: If anyone being considered is known to the searchers (e.g., a trainee here, a past trainee, the protege of someone with whom searchers are friends, etc.), avoid favoritism. For example, include as searchers some who are 100% unbiased and do not know the individual.
5. ASK FOR HELP when you need it, and immediately if you break a rule.

---

<sup>1</sup>This document is consistent with the authorized practices of the BSD. A longer version is at <http://tiny.cc/searchresource>. Deviations may delay or void an appointment unless authorized by the Dean.

<sup>2</sup>This includes (a) identifying prospects who'd qualify as faculty and (b) escalating (from letters/emails to voice and personal contacts) as needed to persuade. Searches are especially urged to review the extended explanation of BSD's expectations in <http://tiny.cc/searchresource>, Section 6.

For BSD track searches beginning after 1 July 2017, the Dean expects outreach sufficient to yield at least one URM applicant who warrants an interview. Before inviting anyone to interview, if the expectation **is** met please discuss the interviewees with the Dean for Academic Affairs or, if the expectation **is not** met, please discuss with the Dean.

# Expanded Guidance for Busy<sup>1</sup> BSD Faculty on Search | Outreach | Selection

## PREFACE -- YOU MAY SKIP THIS

This resource is part checklist, part toolkit, part practical wisdom on academic searches in the BSD. It is not a rulebook, although it does contain the "authorized practices" that exist [in red]. It assumes that faculty who want understanding or more advanced treatment of related issues (e.g., cognitive errors, the 'business case' for diversity, relevant law and policy, etc.) can self-educate or use various resources both live ([BSD Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#), [University Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Leadership, Advancement and Diversity](#), and the various programs/training they offer) and online (<https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/page/job-searches-academic-appointees>). This resource is not intended to be comprehensive.

Some may find other resources more helpful than this one. You are welcome to use them.

With the exception of the "authorized practices" [in red], you are not required to follow this document in detail. Doing so, however, will usually help avoid delays or denials when searches are reviewed.

This and the following pages are an expanded presentation of the preceding concise guidance. It breaks the search|outreach|selection process into phases so that busy faculty can deal with one phase at a time; you can skip to each by clicking on its link:

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
<a href="#">Who will search?</a>	<a href="#">Think about the position</a>	<a href="#">Search before formal search</a>	<a href="#">Attractive job ad</a>	<a href="#">Advertise</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVELY persuade to apply</a>	<a href="#">Assess the pool</a>	<a href="#">Obtain any additional information</a>	<a href="#">Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</a>	<a href="#">Select the best</a>	<a href="#">After the choice</a>

Most of all, please bear in mind [POINT 5 from the preceding page](#):

## **ASK FOR HELP when you need it, and immediately if you break a rule.**

**If you ask, we can try to help** with your search|outreach|selection process, avoid or overcome difficulties, deal with exceptional circumstances, and rescue searches in jeopardy if they can be rescued (and help begin again quickly if they can't). We also offer a brief live presentation of the one-pager to search|outreach|selection committees. [Once the search|outreach|selection process is complete, we may reluctantly need to turn it back if there are fatal flaws.]

Feel free to ask for help from any of the following, who will refer you to the best helper:

Office of Academic Affairs email: <a href="mailto:oa@bsd.uchicago.edu">oa@bsd.uchicago.edu</a> Phones: (773) 702-6504, 5-5413, and 5-5413	Office of Diversity and Inclusion email: <a href="mailto:iromero@bsd.uchicago.edu">iromero@bsd.uchicago.edu</a> Phone: (773) 702-6421	Dean for Academic Affairs email: <a href="mailto:m-feder@uchicago.edu">m-feder@uchicago.edu</a> Phone: (773) 299-8096
---	--	--

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Who will search?	Think about the position	Search before formal search	Attractive job ad	Advertise	ACTIVELY persuade to apply	Assess the pool	Obtain any additional information	Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias	Select the best	After the choice

### Decide who will conduct the search

If you form a search committee, anticipate the following as you compose it:

- Previously the job of such committees often was only to winnow the surviving applicants at each stage of the search. Presently searches must also actively look for outstanding prospects and persuade them to apply. Either make these additional duties clear from the start, or make alternative arrangements to accomplish them.
- There are no University or BSD restrictions on member eligibility. You may include trainees, staff, Lecturers and Research/Clinical professors, personnel from other BSD units, personnel from outside the BSD – or only faculty who are eligible to vote. A BSD ‘strategic search’<sup>2</sup> may require a SAC member on the committee, however.
- The committee will handle confidential information<sup>3</sup>, so include only trustworthy members and remind them of their obligation to respect confidentiality.
- To avoid problems, members should know the search rules -- so educate them.
- Include > 1 women and/or underrepresented minority (URM) member<sup>4</sup>. If too few are on the existing faculty, consider including trainees or members from outside the department.
- You may add additional members in mid-search.
- Favoritism*: If a current/former trainee or a person with links to the department is a likely applicant, prevent both real and apparent favoritism. Do not appoint to the committee those who are/were supervisors, co-authors, trainees, and/or close friends of the prospective applicant, or anyone who will provide a letter of reference. Do include an impeccably objective colleague from outside the searching department or section, who can assure equitable treatment of all applicants. Clearly state that members who find they cannot be objective should recuse themselves.

Regardless, in the BSD the search is responsible for the diversity of the applicant pool and 'short list'. This includes **finding outstanding prospects who are women, URMs, or members of other protected classes<sup>5</sup>, persuading them to apply**, and minimizing implicit bias that may eliminate otherwise outstanding prospects. Searches that need help<sup>6</sup> in discharging this responsibility are also responsible for seeking it proactively. The BSD Offices of [Academic Affairs](#) and [Diversity and Inclusion](#) can help train your searchers in best search|outreach|selection practices. Although such training is not presently mandated, it may be beneficial and help avoid problems that delay a successful conclusion to the search.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Who will search?	Think about the position	Search before formal search	Attractive job ad	Advertise	ACTIVELY persuade to apply	Assess the pool	Obtain any additional information	Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias	Select the best	After the choice

**Phase 1: Think about the position you are seeking to fill**

Decide what you are searching for. Academic appointees<sup>7</sup> can vary widely in the jobs they are expected to perform. Will you search for someone who can:

- \_\_\_ Qualify for a senior faculty rank at initial appointment?
- \_\_\_ Qualify for tenure within 6.25 years, and promotion to full professor in due course?
- \_\_\_ Qualify for promotion on the SOM track within 8 years?
- \_\_\_ Best complement or expand the unit, with many specialities allowable?
- \_\_\_ Provide specific expertise or opportunities (in education, patient care, and scholarship) to learners, patients, and/or colleagues? What expertise and opportunities?
- \_\_\_ Interact with other units in the BSD, outside the BSD, in affiliated institutions? Which? What is required to enable these interactions?
- \_\_\_ Educate and/or mentor specific audiences (College, PhD, MD, postdoctoral researchers, clinical residents and fellows, colleagues, etc.)? Which?
- \_\_\_ Contribute to meeting our diversity, inclusion, and equity goals?
- \_\_\_ Provide leadership or administration? If so, for what programs/needs?
- \_\_\_ Flexibly take on new areas or tasks as academic needs change in the future?
- \_\_\_ Other?

Next, for each component, ask:

- (a) What will its importance be relative to the other required or preferred components?
- (b) What information can be requested from applicants or references that will help determine how well the applicant could perform each component?

Those searching (and ultimately voting) should reach consensus on the above. The consensus will inform subsequent steps. For example, depending on your expectations, you may want to request (or not request) a teaching statement, , a vision statement, suggested references for a tenure case, etc. [As [Phase 3](#) will emphasize, not all documents need be required with the initial application if they are not critical to initial screens, and could be requested only of finalists or semifinalists.]

These expectations, once stated in the [position description](#) and other materials, can't change afterwards without delaying/voiding the the search. Thus, think carefully in Phase 1, and include/exclude criteria that you'll not regret subsequently.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<u>Who will search?</u>	<u>Think about the position</u>	<u>Search before formal search</u>	<u>Attractive job ad</u>	<u>Advertise</u>	<u>ACTIVELY persuade to apply</u>	<u>Assess the pool</u>	<u>Obtain any additional information</u>	<u>Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</u>	<u>Select the best</u>	<u>After the choice</u>

## Phase 2: Begin the search well before the formal search begins

- Treat everyone<sup>9</sup> as a potential applicant for an academic position. This includes in personal and electronic meetings. That is, convey that UChicago is a great place to be a faculty member, we may someday be searching in their area, we would welcome an application if/when the time comes, and they should pass the word. You do not need an approved search to do this.
- Even if you do not or likely will not have an approved search, discuss which areas are emerging, which people are rising stars, who is moveable, etc. We have a strategic search process (see endnote 5), in which the best ideas can become approved searches.
- It is OK to invite to campus people whom you may wish to interview for a position in the future – as long as you do not characterize or treat the academic visit as a job interview<sup>10</sup>.
- The timeline for academic searches and competition with other institutions frequently means too little time for outreach. As soon as you are sufficiently sure there will be a search and even if the search has not officially begun, you may begin active prospecting. For example: “We expect to be advertising for X, and you would be a wonderful applicant. Please begin thinking about this. May we send you a link to the ad when it appears?”

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
<u>Who will search?</u>	<u>Think about the position</u>	<u>Search before formal search</u>	<u>Attractive job ad</u>	<u>Advertise</u>	<u>ACTIVELY persuade to apply</u>	<u>Assess the pool</u>	<u>Obtain any additional information</u>	<u>Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</u>	<u>Select the best</u>	<u>After the choice</u>

### Phase 3: The position description or job ad

Basic premise: Write an ad that will allow you to consider outstanding but unexpected applicants but not force you to exclude them. The Office of Academic Affairs will work with you to improve the wording. You may wish to preview some [actual examples](#).<sup>11</sup>

These encourage applications:

- Minimal documents required *with the initial application* (more can be required later)
- Words that convey opportunities and resources
- Broad and unrestricted field of interest (you can restrict once you have the application)

These discourage applications:

- Extensive or demanding qualifications above the minimum (you can always request these after you have the application)
- Preferences; e.g., for particular subfields, approaches, models, backgrounds (you can always express these after you have the application). Explanation: some outstanding applicants will decide they don't 'fit the profile', even when they do, and not apply.
- Agentic words applied to applicants, such as: outstanding, strong, lead, established, track record, distinguished, prolific, productive, extraordinary, highly qualified, highly capable, etc. Explanation: some outstanding applicants will decide they don't 'fit the profile', even when they do, and not apply. Once you have the application you may consider such qualities.
- Burdensome requests for documents. These include letters of reference 'upfront' and even names of references. If you ask for these, senior applicants may avoid applying rather than risk disclosing they are 'on the market'. You can always ask for these after you have the application.

With respect to this burden, in requiring application materials you may reasonably:

(a) Request all materials the search will eventually require as part of the initial application. This will deter applications from some, but avoid awaiting supplemental documents.

AND/OR

(b) Request additional materials after the application but before applicants are compared. This both makes initial applications easy and thereby encourages them, but **you must request the additional materials of all applicants by a specified deadline**, which entails some delay. **You cannot consider those who do not supply requested supplemental materials by the deadline.**

AND/OR

(c) Screen the applicants who have supplied all requested materials by the due date, and on this basis ask for additional materials from those remaining after the screen. You are then only 'bothering' applicants (and their references) for materials when needed; on the other hand, this approach delays next steps until the materials are received. **You cannot consider those who do not supply requested supplemental materials by the due date.**

*Each alternative has implications for your search. Don't blindly imitate your last search, but think carefully about how much delay the search can tolerate vs. how many will avoid applying due to burdensome requirements.*

Remember the warning in Phase 1: **minimum requirements and preferences, once stated, cannot change without delaying or voiding a search.** [A common example: If and MD and/or PhD is required, prospects with equivalent doctoral degrees are automatically eliminated.]

Also remember the warning to avoid the appearance of favoritism. **Position descriptions must not be tailored to favor a candidate.** If there is a prospect known to the searchers (e.g., a trainee here, a past trainee, the protege of someone with whom searchers are friends, etc.), take extra care that the position description does not even seem to advantage this prospect.

Staff will add the **boilerplate language that must be included.**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
<a href="#">Who will search?</a>	<a href="#">Think about the position</a>	<a href="#">Search before formal search</a>	<a href="#">Attractive job ad</a>	<a href="#">Advertise</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVELY persuade to apply</a>	<a href="#">Assess the pool</a>	<a href="#">Obtain any additional information</a>	<a href="#">Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</a>	<a href="#">Select the best</a>	<a href="#">After the choice</a>

#### **Phase 4: Advertising**

• Unless an exception is approved in advance, the ad(s) must be published for at least 30 days before any consideration of applications or comparison of applicants -- or longer as stated in the ad(s).

During this period do not, for example, email someone submitting an application that they are likely to be a finalist, be interviewed, or be the successful applicant.

• To maximize visibility, repeat your ad in as many communications channels as possible. These may include professional society postings, listserves, mailings, social media, etc.

For example, a recent search tweeted

UChicago X Dept has opened a faculty search for a Y. Help spread the word! <http://tinyurl.com/link>  
 This tweet received >29,000 views, 569 "engagements" with the tweet, and a retweet to the hashtags such as [#BLACKandSTEM](#), [#LATINXandSTEM](#), [#WomenInSTEM](#), [#DisabledAndSTEM](#), [#LATINASinSTEM](#), [#SACNAS](#), [@BlackWomenSTEM](#), [#WomeninScience](#), [#STEMWomen](#),

Here are some additional resources:

Organization name	Link	Contact information	Phone #	Category
American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology - Minority Affairs Committee	<a href="https://www.asbmb.org/minority/">https://www.asbmb.org/minority/</a>	Sonia Flores, Chair - U of CO School of Medicine	(303) 724-6084	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
The American Society for Cell Biology - Minority Affairs Committee	<a href="http://www.ascb.org/community-committee/minorities-affairs/">http://www.ascb.org/community-committee/minorities-affairs/</a>	NA	NA	Cell Biology
Academic Pediatric Association - New Century Scholars	<a href="https://www.academicpeds.org/events/new_century_scholars.cfm">https://www.academicpeds.org/events/new_century_scholars.cfm</a>	Tumaini R. Coker, MD, MBA - Seattle Children's	NA	Pediatrics
Association of Black Women Physicians	<a href="https://www.blackwomenphysicians.org/">https://www.blackwomenphysicians.org/</a>	NA	NA	General Medical
National Medical Association	<a href="http://www.nmanet.org/">http://www.nmanet.org/</a>	NA	NA	General Medical
National Hispanic Medical Association	<a href="http://www.nhmamd.org/">http://www.nhmamd.org/</a>	NA	NA	General Medical
The Society of Black Academic Surgeons	<a href="http://www.sbas.net/">http://www.sbas.net/</a>	NA	NA	Surgery
Minority Postdoc	<a href="http://www.minoritypostdoc.org/">http://www.minoritypostdoc.org/</a>	NA	NA	General Academic
The Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology - Diversity Initiatives Committee	<a href="http://www.arvo.org/About_ARVO/Organizational/Committees/Diversity_Initiatives_Committee/">http://www.arvo.org/About_ARVO/Organizational/Committees/Diversity_Initiatives_Committee/</a>	NA	NA	OVS



J. Robert Gladden Orthopaedic Society (JRGOS)	<a href="http://www.gladdensociety.org/web/ScholGrants/sg_pgy5.html">http://www.gladdensociety.org/web/ScholGrants/sg_pgy5.html</a>	NA	847-698-1633	Orthopedic Surgery
The National Gem Consortium	<a href="http://www.gemfellowship.org/universities/how-gem-can-help/">http://www.gemfellowship.org/universities/how-gem-can-help/</a>	info@gemfellowship.org	1 (703) 562-3646	General Academic
Society for the Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS)	<a href="http://sacnas.org/">http://sacnas.org/</a>	<a href="mailto:Info@sacnas.org">Info@sacnas.org</a>	831-459-0170	General Academic
McNair Scholars Program	<a href="https://mcnairscholars.com/">https://mcnairscholars.com/</a>	<a href="mailto:mcnair@ucf.edu">mcnair@ucf.edu</a>	407-823-1815	General Academic
Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS)	<a href="http://www.abrcms.org/">http://www.abrcms.org/</a>	abrcms@asmusa.org	202.942.9348	Graduate Students
California Diversity Forum	<a href="https://www.caldiversityforum.org/">https://www.caldiversityforum.org/</a>	<a href="mailto:cpmurphy@calstatel.edu">cpmurphy@calstatel.edu</a>	858-822-1492	Graduate Students
Gates Millenium Scholars	<a href="http://www.gmsp.org/">http://www.gmsp.org/</a>			Graduate Students
FORD Foundation Fellowship Programs	<a href="http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/fordfellowships/index.htm">http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/fordfellowships/index.htm</a>	FordFellows@nas.edu	202-334-2872	General Academic
The HERTZ Foundation	<a href="http://hertzfoundation.org/default.aspx">http://hertzfoundation.org/default.aspx</a>		925.373.1642	General Academic
Society for Neuroscience-Neuroscience Scholars Program	<a href="https://www.sfn.org/Careers-and-Training/Diversity-Programs/Neuroscience-Scholars-Program">https://www.sfn.org/Careers-and-Training/Diversity-Programs/Neuroscience-Scholars-Program</a>	<a href="mailto:nsp@sfn.org">nsp@sfn.org</a>	(202) 962-4000	Neuroscience
Harvard Catalyst Profies	<a href="https://connects.catalyst.harvard.edu/Profiles/search/default.aspx?tab=&amp;action=modify">https://connects.catalyst.harvard.edu/Profiles/search/default.aspx?tab=&amp;action=modify</a>	NA	NA	General Academic
Howard University Medical School	<a href="https://medicine.howard.edu/">https://medicine.howard.edu/</a>	NA	NA	General Academic
Morehouse School of Medicine	<a href="http://www.msm.edu/Education/GME/">http://www.msm.edu/Education/GME/</a>	NA	NA	General Academic
Meharry Medical College	<a href="http://www.mmc.edu/education/som/academicdepartments/index.html">http://www.mmc.edu/education/som/academicdepartments/index.html</a>	NA	NA	General Academic
APA: Concil on Minority Health	<a href="https://www.psychiatry.org/about-apa/meet-our-organization/councils/minority-mental-health-and-health-disparities">https://www.psychiatry.org/about-apa/meet-our-organization/councils/minority-mental-health-and-health-disparities</a>	Ijeoma Chukwu, M.D., M.P.H	NA	Psychiatry
Boston University Minority Faculty	<a href="http://www.childrenshospital.org/bcrp/program/diversity-and-inclusion/minority-faculty">http://www.childrenshospital.org/bcrp/program/diversity-and-inclusion/minority-faculty</a>	NA	NA	General Academic
Harvard: Dean's Post-Doc Fellows	<a href="https://mfdp.med.harvard.edu/The%20Dean%27s%20Postdoctoral%20Fellowship%20%7C%20Fellows">https://mfdp.med.harvard.edu/The%20Dean%27s%20Postdoctoral%20Fellowship%20%7C%20Fellows</a>	NA	NA	Basic Science
Black Psychiatrists of America	<a href="http://www.bpaincpsych.org/about.php">http://www.bpaincpsych.org/about.php</a>	NA	855-435-5077	Psychiatry

ACR Commission for General Diversity	<a href="https://www.acr.org/Membership/Committees-Operational/Women-and-Diversity/Committee-for-General-Diversity">https://www.acr.org/Membership/Committees-Operational/Women-and-Diversity/Committee-for-General-Diversity</a>	Johnson Benjamin Lightfoote, MD, FACR		Radiology
Ecological Society of America (Inclusive Ecology)	<a href="http://www.esa.org/inclusive-ecology/">www.esa.org/inclusive-ecology/</a>	NA		Ecology
National Institutes of Health (Women in Science)	<a href="https://womeninscience.nih.gov/">https://womeninscience.nih.gov/</a>	NA		General Academic
NIH: Women in Biomedical Careers	<a href="https://womeninscience.nih.gov/resources/societies.asp">https://womeninscience.nih.gov/resources/societies.asp</a>	NA		General Academic
American Society for Microbiology	<a href="https://www.asm.org/index.php/women-in-microbiology/93-policy/7819-helpful-websites-for-women-scientists-interested-in-fellowships-scholarships-and-funding-opportunities">https://www.asm.org/index.php/women-in-microbiology/93-policy/7819-helpful-websites-for-women-scientists-interested-in-fellowships-scholarships-and-funding-opportunities</a>	NA		Microbiology
Diversity Programs in Neuroscience	<a href="https://www.sfn.org/careers-and-training/diversity-programs">https://www.sfn.org/careers-and-training/diversity-programs</a>	NA		Neuroscience
Harold Amos Faculty Development Program	<a href="http://www.amfdp.org/for-scholars">http://www.amfdp.org/for-scholars</a>	NA	NA	General Academic
American Association for Cancer Research (AACR) - Minorities in Cancer Research (MICR)	<a href="http://www.aacr.org/Membership/Pages/Constituency%20Groups/minorities-in-cancer-research__1C81B8.aspx#.WaWQCMiGPIW">http://www.aacr.org/Membership/Pages/Constituency%20Groups/minorities-in-cancer-research__1C81B8.aspx#.WaWQCMiGPIW</a>	<a href="mailto:micr@aacr.org">micr@aacr.org</a>		
Association of American Indian Physicians	<a href="https://www.aaip.org/job-center">https://www.aaip.org/job-center</a>	Phone: (405) 946-7072		General Medical
American Indian Science & Engineering Society	<a href="http://www.aises.org/careers">http://www.aises.org/careers</a>	Phone: (505) 765-1052		General Academic
Keystone Symposium on Molecular and Cellular Biology - Fellows Program	<a href="http://www.keystonesymposia.org/index.cfm?e=Web.Diversity.Fellows">http://www.keystonesymposia.org/index.cfm?e=Web.Diversity.Fellows</a>	Phone: 970-262-1230 ext. 137 / Category: Molecular and Cellular Biology / Contact Information: Irelene P. Ricks, Ph.D. - Director, Diversity in Life Science Programs: <a href="mailto:IreleneR@keystonesymposia.org">IreleneR@keystonesymposia.org</a>		
National Council of Asian Pacific Islander Physicians	<a href="http://www.ncapip.org/policyadvocacy/workforceandleadership/">http://www.ncapip.org/policyadvocacy/workforceandleadership/</a>	Phone: 202-441-1192 / <a href="mailto:dhawks@ncapip.org">dhawks@ncapip.org</a>		General Medical

The Doctoral Scholars Program (Directory and Job Posting)	<a href="https://dspdirectory.sreb.org/default.aspx">https://dspdirectory.sreb.org/default.aspx</a>	Phone: (404) 875-9211 / <a href="mailto:doctoral.scholars@sreb.org">doctoral.scholars@sreb.org</a>		General Academic
The Association for Academic Minority Physicians, Inc.	<a href="https://www.aampinc.org/">https://www.aampinc.org/</a>	Phone: (410) 916-4996 / Donald Wilson, MD, Executive Director: <a href="mailto:avantido@aol.com">avantido@aol.com</a>		General Medical

*[Please feel free to suggest additions to this list, which we will include in revisions.]*

Contact the Office of Diversity & Inclusion for additional assistance with

- use of social media in your job search.
- advertising in arenas targeted to underrepresented groups in your field.

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
<u>Who will search?</u>	<u>Think about the position</u>	<u>Search before formal search</u>	<u>Attractive job ad</u>	<u>Advertise</u>	<b>ACTIVELY persuade to apply</b>	<u>Assess the pool</u>	<u>Obtain any additional information</u>	<u>Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</u>	<u>Select the best</u>	<u>After the choice</u>

**Phase 5: Active persuasion to apply, or OUTREACH**

\*\*\*\*\***BE ADVISED**\*\*\*\*\*

*The following applies to all searches for BSD track faculty begun after 1 July 2017; the Dean writes:*

It is expected that searches will identify and convince to apply at least one underrepresented minority who warrants an interview, and to interview the applicant(s). URM and any other protected class status cannot be a consideration in ranking those candidates who are interviewed. When a search cannot meet this expectation, I ask that this be discussed with me before inviting any candidates to interview.

\*\*\*\*\*

"Active" means escalating as necessary to persuade outstanding prospects to apply or complete applications. There should be active outreach to all outstanding prospects, but **active outreach to outstanding prospects who are members of 'protected classes' is explicitly expected and will require documentation.** Some prospects need no persuasion beyond the publication of the job ad. Some will respond to mailed or emailed announcements, mention by a third party, and/or social media. Some will not respond to the above, and in addition need persuasion by direct and/or repeated email correspondence. Some will additionally need persuasion by voice or equivalent; e.g., by telephone or at professional society meetings. At the extreme end, BSD chairs and deans have visited prospects to persuade them to apply.

Searching faculty should contact those who would be outstanding applicants, escalating persuasion as necessary for each individual prospect in time to yield completed applications. **At its end, this effort will be reviewed.**

What form will this review take (so that faculty can anticipate and satisfy it)?

First, the review will ask for

- **the names** of outstanding women and URM prospects (and those who belong to other protected classes) who have been persuaded to apply [outstanding = equivalent in quality and promise to our existing faculty with comparable time in rank and track]
- the outcomes of this persuasion (i.e., have they completed an application?)
- if they have not completed an application, evidence that this is not due to insufficient escalation or time to complete the application

Second, it will look for behaviors such as:

- Appropriate escalation
- Conducting outreach in time for persuaded prospects to complete an application
- Outreach to individuals who would plausibly be competitive for our academic positions<sup>12</sup>
- Appropriate assessment of academic merit in choosing those to be persuaded<sup>13</sup>

Ordinarily a diverse interview or finalist pool is evidence that outreach has been sufficient; other evidence may be acceptable. Ordinarily, “there are none” is not an acceptable explanation<sup>14</sup>; if you use it, prepare to discuss it with the Dean.

Be aware that, to perform this review, the credentials of applicants and non-applying prospects may be reviewed, and searchers, those persuaded to apply, and third parties may be interviewed.

### How much outreach is enough?

For BSD track searches, the Dean's expectation is enough so that at least one URM applicant is of sufficient quality (by academic criteria, not race) to warrant an interview. In all searches, "enough" means enough to convince those who will review the search that the search has done its utmost to identify outreach targets and persuade those targeted to complete their applications.<sup>15</sup> In recent years, at its end every search has been able to provide names of outreach targets. Thus, if yours can't, something is wrong.

### How do you tell which prospects or applicants are women, URMs, or members of other protected classes?

- Some will be obvious from their application materials
- See [Phase 6](#).
- Search on the internet
- Because you have pre-selected outreach targets who are women and URMs, you already know their names

### Identifying prospects to be persuaded to apply or complete applications:

How to identify prospects is at the discretion of the searching unit. The review at the end of the search will be more interested in the names themselves than in how they were identified. Here are some suggestions for potential tactics:

- Search | outreach | section committee members may, through personal experience and networks, knowledge of the literature, professional service, and professional meetings, know of prospects worth persuading.
- Others may have similar knowledge and can be queried:
  - Members of the searching department (faculty, other academic appointees, learners/trainees, and staff).
  - Members of other departments within and outside the BSD
  - Knowledgeable persons at other institutions, in professional societies, on study sections, directors of training programs, etc.
- Online searches

- Programs that train women and URMs<sup>16</sup>
- Women- and URM-serving organizations, meetings, and directories
- Persuading knowledgeable women and URMs to interrogate their own networks on behalf of the search
- Participation in professional activities, societies, and interest groups that involve women and URMs<sup>17</sup>
- Via the [BSD Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#) and University [Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Leadership, Advancement and Diversity](#)
- Individuals who have begun but not completed applications for the position. The departmental staff academic affairs specialist should be able to provide their names and often their contact information. If you do this, be certain to do so identically for all with incomplete applications.
- Others that may occur to the searchers. That is, identifying names need not be restricted to the tactics listed above.

Importantly, [academic snobbery and implicit bias](#) may lead searchers to overlook outstanding prospects and "diamonds in the rough". Take steps to avoid this. However, do spare those who clearly will not meet the minimum qualifications in the position description.

#### Persuading prospects to apply or complete applications:

As stated above, it is the responsibility of the search|outreach|selection process to escalate as necessary to persuade each prospect. Higher levels of escalation are not required when lower levels suffice.

All those attempting to persuade contacts should maintain contemporaneous records of these attempts. Such records will be very helpful in the event that the outreach is challenged in a review.

Expect that individual prospects will vary in their need for escalation. For example, research shows that some individuals will apply after direct or even indirect contact ("what have I got to lose?"), whereas others will reflexively reject lower levels of escalation and, even after escalation, require multiple attempts to persuade before they will complete applications. Anticipate this.

Presumably *lower levels of escalation* need no instruction here.

*Third parties:* Searches may ask a prospect's acquaintances, current/former supervisors, colleagues, and trainees, or other individuals to persuade the prospect to apply.

*Escalating to telephone*

-Some prospects will object to persuasion by telephone. Note this and move on.

-It is legitimate to email or ask an assistant to schedule a time for the conversation if the caller prefers not to surprise the prospect.

-Some faculty are reluctant to telephone prospects with whom they are unacquainted [they are not alone; google 'cold call reluctance']. If this impedes escalating to telephone when needed, the search needs to devise a solution. Solutions might include helping the reluctant faculty member, assigning the call to another, hiring an individual to make the call, etc.

In response to faculty requests, here we provide sample scripts that can be used or modified when escalating to telephone:

-Direct approach: “My name is X. I am calling to let you know we are searching for a faculty colleague. [Describe interests of department and search.] I hope you will consider submitting an application. I will follow up this call by sending you a position description containing the weblink that can be used to apply. Are there any questions I can answer or issues I can discuss? Would you be interested in talking to others of my colleagues about this? Our process here also requires me to ask if you know of any others whom I should contact, and to spread the word yourself?”

-Indirect approach: “My name is X. My chair/dean/search committee colleagues asked me to contact you for advice as we search for a faculty colleague. [Describe interests of department and search.] Which individuals we should contact as we search? Are there any you’d recommend for this position? Any women or underrepresented minorities?”

[Conclude first portion of the conversation.]

“Please spread the word. By the way, you wouldn’t have any interest in applying for this position yourself, would you? I think you’d be a strong candidate if you did. Are there any questions I can answer or issues I can discuss? I will follow up this call by sending you a position description containing the weblink that can be used to apply. In any event, thanks for your advice on our search.”

[And then send the information regardless of stated disinterest. They may change their minds.]

*Common ploys:*

Target: “Sounds interesting, but now is not a good time.”

Response: We can be patient and flexible. But we need an application in order to be patient and flexible.

Target: “I’m not certain I’m interested.”

Response: Why not apply anyway? Worst outcome is you have a nice visit here and talk to interesting people. Nothing obligates you to accept a position if one is offered.

Senior target: “I don’t want word to get out that I’m ‘on the job market’”

Response: We can be very discreet, and will not contact references without your permission (provided your job ad does not require such contact).

Finally, a persuader should never imply that a prospect or applicant is likely or unlikely to advance in a search. The only truthful statements are: "We need to follow our process, and it's not up to me alone" and "If you don't complete an application, you can't advance in the search."



0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<u>Who will search?</u>	<u>Think about the position</u>	<u>Search before formal search</u>	<u>Attractive job ad</u>	<u>Advertise</u>	<u>ACTIVELY persuade to apply</u>	<u>Assess the pool</u>	<u>Obtain any additional information</u>	<u>Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</u>	<u>Select the best</u>	<u>After the choice</u>

**Phase 6: Assess the pool**

**Before proceeding to the next step**, assess the composition of the applicant pool. Your departmental administrator can provide you with aggregate numbers of total, women, and URM applicants to your position, and how many of your persuaded prospects have actually applied. Compare these with your benchmark, expectations and aspirations. If the comparison is unfavorable, you may postpone comparison of applicants to continue outreach. If your position description prohibits this with a fixed closing date, contact the Office of Academic Affairs for potential work-arounds (which are not always possible).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<u>Who will search?</u>	<u>Think about the position</u>	<u>Search before formal search</u>	<u>Attractive job ad</u>	<u>Advertise</u>	<u>ACTIVELY persuade to apply</u>	<u>Assess the pool</u>	<u>Obtain any additional information</u>	<u>Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</u>	<u>Select the best</u>	<u>After the choice</u>

### Phase 7: Obtaining additional information required of all applicants

[See [Phase 3](#); you may already have done this.]

If you've made it easy to apply (for example, by requiring only a curriculum vitae), you may want to request some additional information of all applicants. Depending on the job description, this might be statements on research and teaching interests, potential contribution to diversity and inclusion, letters of reference, names of references, etc.

If you want this – and you may not – **you must contact all applicants**. For example:

Dear Dr. X:

Thank you for your application to the X search. I am writing to ask you to provide some additional information: [Describe]. You can do so by returning to the website at which applied. I must further notify you that we are unable to consider your application further unless these additional materials are provided before the end of MM-DD-YYYY.

[This is because notifying only some applicants provides them with an unfair advantage.]

- A final form of active convincing: convince those who have begun but not completed their application to do so, typically by providing one or a few required documents that haven't been received. Incomplete applications can't be considered no matter how strong. If you do this, however, **you must do so for all with incomplete applications**. **You must not do this only for partial applications that seem promising to you**.

[This is because notifying only some applicants provides them with an unfair advantage.]

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
<u>Who will search?</u>	<u>Think about the position</u>	<u>Search before formal search</u>	<u>Attractive job ad</u>	<u>Advertise</u>	<u>ACTIVELY persuade to apply</u>	<u>Assess the pool</u>	<u>Obtain any additional information</u>	<u>Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</u>	<u>Select the best</u>	<u>After the choice</u>

## Phase 8: Winnowing the applicant pool

### Rules:

Only those with complete applications and who meet the minimum qualifications can be considered, and all of those not excluded from consideration at any stage must be compared fairly. Consideration/comparison cannot begin until the announced application closing date or consideration date, no earlier than 30 days after the ad appeared in print, and prospects persuaded to complete applications have had sufficient time to do so.

Those considered should be compared only on their ability to perform the job, where the job varies with track, rank, department, and search [see [Phase 1](#)]. Age, gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, marital/parental/veteran status (or any other status protected by law) cannot be any part of this comparison. To repeat in another way, you must **not** favor applicants because they are women or URM, or for that matter disfavor them. However, past and prospective contribution to meeting our diversity, inclusion, and equity goals -- to which persons of every protected status can contribute -- can be among the criteria if you've made it so in [Phase 1](#). You cannot favor or disfavor any candidate because of friendship, they are already here, are known to you personally, have been promised the position, are part of a pipeline program, would suffer hardship if not offered the position, etc. You cannot add or ignore criteria to favor a candidate. Certain information must be excluded from consideration in decision-making: past/present/future marital status, parental status, age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, birthplace, national origin, citizenship, and languages of the candidate and relatives (for an official document, see <http://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/issues/UC%20academic%20interview%20guidance.pdf> ).

Be cognizant of the role of implicit bias and consciously seek to minimize its influence on your evaluation. The one best able to perform the job might not have a brand-name pedigree. Look beyond only training at an elite institution and with elite supervisors, publishing only in premiere journals, and having strong letters from well-known references – for these may indicate cultural advantage rather than superior merit. This bias can take many forms -- books have been written about it<sup>18</sup> -- and we urge that one or more searchers become expert in it and constructively challenge<sup>19</sup> assessments of the search; e.g.,:

- Applicants with familiar male names will automatically receive more favorable consideration than applicants with female or URM-typical names.
- Letters written on behalf of male applicants will on average stronger and focus more on academic performance than letters written on behalf of female applicants
- Searches will automatically prefer applicants from brand-name institutions and who have published in brand-name journals and have letters written by brand-name references.

- Often applicants from UChicago will receive preferential treatment because they are known to us (and may be friends and/or protégés).
- Even if UChicago searchers can successfully compensate for implicit bias, outsiders' implicit bias may have influenced applicants' track records.

Some examples of searches gone awry due to implicit bias are in the endnotes<sup>20</sup>.

Successive rounds of elimination (long list, short list, interview list, finalist):

First, recall the minimum qualifications from the position description. **Eliminate from further consideration all who do not meet them. If this causes you to eliminate a promising individual who has failed to complete the application, you may reach out to this individual – but if you do so you must likewise and identically reach out to all other individuals with incomplete applications and give them the same opportunity to complete their application.**

Next, it is recommended that you again return to the job description (**Phase 1**), and design a corresponding evaluation scheme and scoring metric, and apply this to every surviving applicant; e.g.,

	First Can- didate	Next Can- didate	...	Last Can- didate
Novelty of scholarship: 1-routine to 10 - highly innovative, breaks new ground				
Scholarship complements or extends but doesn't duplicate existing strengths: 1 - would add little 5 - would make a big difference				
Collaborations and impact outside home department: 1 - little 5 - large				
Likelihood of being an outstanding teacher/trainer: 1- low 5 - high				
Prospects of contributing to diversity/inclusion/equity efforts: 1 low or can't tell 5 - high				
Quality of training/publication/funding track record/letters/letter writers: 1 - low 5 - high				

[An example appropriate for some searches but not all]

You might wish to weight rows differently, add or delete rows, etc., depending on the job description and application materials you have requested. The last row in the sample above traditionally receives almost all weight. Avoid overweighting this category; in this way outstanding candidates can rise to the top in multiple ways, including outstanding candidates who trained at "off-brand" institutions<sup>21</sup>.

It is best if multiple searchers evaluate each applicant privately and independently, and that these individual assessments be anonymized and pooled before group discussion. This minimizes certain cognitive errors.

Units should then proceed to eliminate applicants from further consideration until a manageable number remain for detailed scrutiny. In this winnowing,

- You may request additional materials or information as long as you **do so identically from/for all surviving applicants**. These might include letters, publication samples, and certain statements if not requested previously. You can do virtual interviews online. You may ask for names of references or for the applicant to arrange for letters to be sent. You may contact named references directly, and/or those not named who could provide a reference. [Be very careful with applicants who have a job elsewhere. If reference-seeking publicizes their application, this can result in serious negative repercussions for the applicant. While you must respect confidentiality and should ask for it in any correspondence with references, you can discuss with the applicant in generic terms their comfort with your proposed due diligence.] You could add corresponding rows to your grid to accommodate these additional data.
- You may appoint one or more provocateurs whose job it is to challenge retention/elimination decisions reflecting cognitive errors and/or implicit bias. It is more important that these be knowledgeable, capable, and outspoken critics than they be women or URM.
- Avoid basing elimination/retention decisions on the judgment of a single individual (i.e., if multiple searchers reach the same judgment independently, it may be a good one.)
- Be aware that all deliberations are subject to audit at higher levels. Thus, follow the rules and keep records that enable you to prove that you have done so.

### On-campus interviews

These are already so well-established that little need be said other than:

- **Certain questions are prohibited and can be bases for legal action if asked.** See <http://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/issues/UC%20academic%20interview%20guidance.pdf>. Please review these with the interviewers. Consider obtaining faculty recruitment packets from the University's [Dual Career Office](#)<sup>22</sup>; these packets contain general information that may pre-empt some of these questions. Interviewees may spontaneously touch on these questions (e.g., What child care resources have you?). If asked a question where a response might serve as a basis for future legal action, interviewers should refer the candidate to the materials in the information packet. Interviewers will be tempted to provide relevant information out of hospitality; don't!!!
- Some units may wish to prepare standard interview questions to be posed of all candidates. This is ok, but it is not required that every interviewer ask these questions. Each interviewer can be assigned to ask a subset.
- Please publicize the research seminar broadly and well in advance. You can never tell which faculty and which other units may be interested in (and want to support) your interviewee.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<u>Who will search?</u>	<u>Think about the position</u>	<u>Search before formal search</u>	<u>Attractive job ad</u>	<u>Advertise</u>	<u>ACTIVELY persuade to apply</u>	<u>Assess the pool</u>	<u>Obtain any additional information</u>	<u>Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</u>	<u>Select the best</u>	<u>After the choice</u>

### Phase 9: The “appointive action”

At some point (could be after Phase 10) departmental faculty should discuss the finalists and vote on a motion to recommend the successful candidate(s) for appointment at a specific rank and for a specific term (or with tenure). Eligibility to vote varies among departments, but for recommendations of tenure the vote tally of tenured faculty must be included.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<u>Who will search?</u>	<u>Think about the position</u>	<u>Search before formal search</u>	<u>Attractive job ad</u>	<u>Advertise</u>	<u>ACTIVELY persuade to apply</u>	<u>Assess the pool</u>	<u>Obtain any additional information</u>	<u>Compare FAIRLY; avoid bias</u>	<u>Select the best</u>	<u>After the choice</u>

### Phase 10: After the 'successful candidate' has been identified

You are now free to inquire about the candidate's needs/circumstances outside the workplace, and to discuss how to meet them. Be very careful, however, prior to the issuance of an approved Letter of Offer. If an informal offer is changed coincident with disclosure of personal information unrelated to job performance, the burden could be on you to demonstrate that this is only coincidence.

### Last steps

Sometimes these are taken by the department chair or administrator:

- The terms of the offer are negotiated with the successful applicant
- A letter to the Dean is prepared in which the appointment is formally recommended
- Information is entered in CLO-matic, which discusses
  - How the position description was disseminated
  - Genuine outreach beyond advertising/dissemination
  - How the selection was made

Neither the offer nor the appointment will go forward if the search, as described in the Search Narrative, is defective.

We welcome information and advice, whether in the Search Narrative or by sharing with the Deans Office, on search practices -- both successful and unsuccessful -- so that we can learn and improve.

---

<sup>1</sup> If you are a busy faculty member, you probably just want to get on with the search. For this reason, explanation is in the end notes and <https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/page/job-searches-academic-appointees>. Look there if you want it.

<sup>2</sup> Under the aegis of the Dean for Basic Science. For information contact [cmlee@bsd.uchicago.edu](mailto:cmlee@bsd.uchicago.edu)

<sup>3</sup> <http://humanresources.uchicago.edu/fpg/policies/600/p601.shtml>

<sup>4</sup> Research shows that if there is only one, that person (rather than the entire committee) becomes the diversity specialist whether otherwise qualified as such or not.

<sup>5</sup> "There are none" and "we can't find any" are not acceptable outcomes, but rather usually synonyms for "we didn't try hard enough" or "we really don't care" or "we are too busy with other things". See [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/09/26/an-ivy-league-professor-on-why-colleges-dont-hire-more-faculty-of-color-we-dont-want-them/?utm\\_term=.2799a406dae2](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/09/26/an-ivy-league-professor-on-why-colleges-dont-hire-more-faculty-of-color-we-dont-want-them/?utm_term=.2799a406dae2)

<sup>6</sup> Online see <https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/page/job-searches-academic-appointees>. In person see <http://bsddiversity.uchicago.edu/> and <http://provost.uchicago.edu/directory/melissa-gilliam> . For a tongue-in-cheek guide, consult <http://learn-to-search.com/> - slide-0 .

<sup>7</sup> These are BSD faculty in the BSD and SOM tracks, Research Assistant/Associate/Full Professors, and Lecturers, among others. Except with prior permission from the Dean c/o the Office of Academic Affairs, all are subject to normal search expectations.

<sup>8</sup> ~~deleted~~

<sup>9</sup> "Any good" is in the eye of the beholder. See subsequent sections on how our biases may cause us to ignore outstanding applicants. So maybe it would be better to say: Treat everyone as potential applicants.

<sup>10</sup> **An interview or invitation to interview must not precede the fair comparison of all qualified applicants** (see below). If you find that an academic visit has inadvertently become an interview, immediately contact the Office of Academic Affairs for help/advice.

<sup>11</sup> [Advice on language in position descriptions and advertisements, https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/sites/bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/jobadlanguage.pdf](https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/sites/bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/jobadlanguage.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> As a counterexample, outreach that encourages applications only from those who do not meet the minimum qualifications would be in bad faith.



<sup>13</sup> What is inappropriate? Jumping to inappropriate conclusions about individuals' ability to perform based on their academic pedigree, track record, etc, and due to failure to compensate for implicit bias [other than being aware of and seeking to minimize the manifestations of implicit bias, how does one go about “compensating for” it? This almost implies that “credit” should be given for URM status, for example, or that one should simply look upon a URM candidate more favorably because of his/her status]. This topic is treated in greater detail [later](#). For now, remember that there are "diamonds in the rough" that will be overlooked if outreach is restricted to only those with brand-name academic pedigrees.

<sup>14</sup> “...[over the last 20 years, there has been a seven-fold growth in the Ph.D.s who are from underrepresented groups that are in biomedical research. The actual number is about 1,760 every year. So there is an adequate pool to be able to draw from to diversify the biomedical research workforce in academia.](#)”

<sup>15</sup> Once the outreach phase is complete, searches are no longer able to consider gender and race in continuing or eliminating applicants -- only the ability to perform the job if appointed. We know, however, that academic talent is equally distributed among men and women, and among URMs vs. non-URMs. Therefore, if our application and interview pools contain no or relatively few women and URMs, the implication is that outstanding prospects have not completed applications so we can't even consider them -- and that more outreach is warranted.

16



This graphic representation illustrates that individuals from institutions that have a strong track record of attracting URM graduate students are not applying to our faculty positions. To the left are the major institutions producing URM PhDs in the area of a recent BSD faculty search, and to the right are the PhD institutions in the applicant pool. .

<sup>17</sup> These are field/department/subspeciality - specific, and not all will be appropriate in every instance:

- a) Contact chairs, chiefs, training program directors, prominent individuals, NIH/NSF grant officers, professional society leaders, etc -- both current and past. It is recommended that these be contacted by voice, with follow-up if necessary, **and** they be asked explicitly for the

---

names of women and URMs. Why? Voice contacts are more difficult to ignore, forget, or dismiss. Research shows that contacts will commonly neglect to mention women and URMs unless they are asked specifically.

- b) Ditto, but reach out to individuals who are institutions that are the principal producers of women and URM doctorates, even if they are not top-tier institutions. The internet or professional societies may yield the names of these institutions. Ask the contacts about recent graduates who have gone on to advanced training or beginning faculty positions; these are prime targets. [In the long term, cultivate relations with these institutions by instigating research seminars/grand rounds given by our faculty.]
- c) Have faculty routinely attend meetings of organizations and interest groups that serve women and URMs. [The BSD needs to assemble a list of these. And, if they don't already exist in your field, recommend to your professional societies that these be started.]
- d) Circulate the position description to job aggregators, interest groups, mailing lists, and organizations that serve women and PhDs. [The BSD needs to assemble a list of these.]
- e) Ask UChicago faculty and trainees of color and women if they know of targets. Due the nature of social networks, they may be aware of targets outside their home field.
- f) When faculty attend professional society meetings and major conferences, they can be on the lookout for promising women and URMs. Canvass these faculty, even if they are not on the search committee, and ask for names.
- g) Dr. Regina Dixon-Reeves, the Assistant Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion, has a directory of URM postdocs, some of whom may be appropriate for any given search [[Rdixonre@uchicago.edu](mailto:Rdixonre@uchicago.edu) , 2-3557]

<sup>18</sup> Some examples are: <http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/searchguidebooks.php> and [http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure\\_2ndEd.pdf](http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_2ndEd.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> "Yes, James Conant [do you want to use the name of a faculty member in the Department of Philosophy?] trained at Peer University, has published in *Nature Medicine* and *NEJM*, and has strong letters from people with outstanding reputations, whereas Jamila Rodriguez trained at Second-Tier State University, has published in lesser journals, and has weaker letters from people we don't know. But could this result from implicit bias and the accumulation of social capital? Adjusting for this and considering what each has accomplished, Jamila has overcome considerable obstacles whereas James has had every advantage. I think she deserves a closer look."

<sup>20</sup> [Job ad and criteria. In the last part of the video are commentaries from two of the committee members in support of including diversity as part of the evaluation criteria. In A, this message is given by a minority and a majority faculty member. In B, the message is given by two minority faculty members.]

A: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EmW0tUwGKag>

B: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aGO\\_SqE9r5w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aGO_SqE9r5w)

[Selecting candidates to be interviewed]

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H0\\_EHJN\\_TDs&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H0_EHJN_TDs&feature=youtu.be)

[Choosing among those interviewed]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=88DEXARp5lw&feature=youtu.be>

---

[Less entertaining, poorer production values, but richer is <http://www.engr.washington.edu/lead/biasfilm/request-form.html> (after you fill in form, it automatically provides access)]

<sup>21</sup> ["If a search committee is trying to look at a resume quickly — and they don't even know they're doing this — they're looking for the one-word journals and for certain, big-name institutions. That automatically cuts out a lot of diversity. \[Editor's Note: "One-word journals" is a light-hearted shorthand for science's most prestigious journals, such as Nature, Science, and Cell.\] It is important to note that having published in those one-word journals is not a reflection of how good you are as a scientist. It's a reflection of the reputation of the lab that you worked in and of your boss. That's why the situation is perpetuated. You continually make decisions not on the potential of the person, but really on their boss, who happens to be wildly successful. There has been data showing that these elite labs are very low in postdoctoral and graduate students who are women or from underrepresented groups, so you see where this goes. We're going to the same pool all the time."](#)

<sup>22</sup> <https://dualcareers.uchicago.edu/>