Welcome!

The webinar will start at 3:30 p.m.
Debriefing and Auditing Completed Faculty Searches

Chadwick Allen, UW Office for Faculty Advancement
Joyce Yen, UW ADVANCE Center for Institutional Change
Sapna Cheryan, UW Department of Psychology
Tech Check: Participation

Use CHAT for comments or to share ideas with other attendees

Use Q&A to pose questions to Chad, Joyce, and Sapna
Ex: Can you say more about _______?
Webinar Outline

- Levels of Reflection and Feedback
  - Broad debrief
  - Focused audit
- Debriefing Completed Searches around Open Questions
- Auditing Completed Searches around Key Decision Points
- Auditing Case Study
- Q&A
Why reflect on completed competitive faculty searches?

• Pause and assess the committee’s experience of the search process while details are still fresh

• Preserve useful institutional memory

• Prepare for future faculty searches

• Promote learning and continuous improvement
Levels of reflection: debriefing and auditing

Debriefs
- high level reflections on what did and did not work
- less structured
- usually tied to single hiring cycle or a specific competitive search

Audits
- deeper dive into processes and materials
- more structured (e.g., around key decision points)
- potential foci:
  - a single search
  - a single hiring cycle
  - a series of searches
  - several years of completed searches
Considerations

Framing considerations
- Analysis goals
- Desired feedback
- Expected outcomes
- Potential future action

Logistical considerations
- Timing
- Scope
- Who should be involved
Debriefing Completed Searches Around Open Questions
Debrief discussion prompts

• What worked well?
• What didn’t work well?
• What lessons did we learn?
• What notes do we want to pass on to the next search committee?
• What do we wish we had known before we started this search?
Typical debrief topics

- Timeline
- Committee membership and structure
- Committee culture
- Outreach efforts
- Criteria, rubric(s), and assessment
- Interview structure and questions
- Engagement with and reporting back to the larger unit
- Recruitment (did we do a good job recruiting finalists)
- Feedback mechanisms
- Processes
- Logistics
Auditing Completed Searches Around Key Decision Points
Faculty Hiring and Evaluation Process for Active Competitive Searches
Four Key Decision Points

1. Large Pool of Applicants
2. Prelim Interview List of Candidates
3. List of Finalists
4. Offer(s)

Outreach → Applicant pool review → Candidate preliminary interviews → Finalist visits → Recruitment
Interfolio Data Reports:
(a) Large Pool of Applicants
(b) Preliminary Interview List of Candidates
# Key Decision Point Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Decision Point</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Pool of Applicants</td>
<td>Prelim Interview List of Candidates</td>
<td>List of Finalists</td>
<td>Offer(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Active Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During an Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerations by decision point

- What can you learn from each decision point?
- What information can help improve your process in the future?
- What worked well?
- What needs improvement?
- What types of data would be useful at each decision point?
- Where can you best improve the process for the next search?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Decision Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Pool of Applicants</th>
<th>Prelim Interview List of Candidates</th>
<th>List of Finalists</th>
<th>Offer(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Large Pool of Applicants Decision Point:

1. Is the pool of applicants large enough to proceed with assessment?
2. Does the applicant pool look like what you were expecting based on known availability?
3. Does the applicant pool align with your goals for the search?
During the **search**, looking forward:

- Should the search committee begin their assessment process?
- Should the search committee delay assessment and continue outreach?
- Should you fail the search and plan to launch it again in the future?
During an *audit*, looking back:

What was the source of any problem(s) with the large pool?

- Language or structure of the job ad?
- Placement of the job ad?
- Lack of active outreach?
- Something else?
Preliminary Interview List of Candidates Decision Point:

1. Is the pool of qualified candidates large enough to proceed?
2. Does the candidate pool look like what you were expecting based on known availability and the applicant pool?
3. Does the candidate pool align with your goals for the search?
During the search, looking forward:

- Should the search committee continue their assessment process?
- Should you fail the search and plan to launch it again in the future?
During an audit, looking back:

- How well did the early rounds of assessment work?
- How well did specific assessment criteria work?
- Did you ask for the right materials from applicants?
- If you have data, how representative was the preliminary interview list?
List of Finalists Decision Point:

1. Is the pool of finalists large enough to proceed?
2. Does the pool of finalists look like what you were expecting?
3. Does the finalist pool align with your goals for the search?
During the search, looking forward:

- How many of the interviewed candidates are viable as finalists?
- How many finalists do you want to interview / bring to campus?
- How many finalists can you interview / bring to campus?
During an **audit**, looking back:

- Did we ask the right questions in the preliminary interviews to identify finalists?
- What worked and what didn’t work in the preliminary interviews?
- Did we interview an appropriate number of candidates?
Offer(s) Decision Point:

1. Are the finalists viable for the position?
2. Do you want to make an offer or offers?
During the **search**, looking forward:

- How many of the finalists are viable for the position?
- How many offers do you want or need to make?
During an audit, looking back:

- How effective were the finalist visits?
- To whom did you make offers?
- Did you have choices among viable candidates?
- What were the reasons for accepting or declining offer(s)?
Auditing Case Study
Case study timeline

- What went well and should remain the same?
- What could be improved and should be changed?
- Where to focus committee discussions?
Five decision points where we focused our audit

1. Large pool of applicants
2. Preliminary interview list of candidates
3. List of finalists
4. Offer(s)
5. Hire(s) / Acceptances
Overarching steps

• Determined department identities of interest (e.g., most underrepresented)
  – Attended to intersectionality

• At each decision point:
  1. Obtained data
  2. Shared findings and discussed improvements
Obtaining data

Aggregated data broken out by identities of interest
  – e.g., What % of the candidates on the preliminary interview list are URM vs. White

Compared those percentages to a standard
  – Previous decision point
  – Previous searches
  – Our expectations

Dug deeper into data when possible (e.g., examining criteria)
1. Large Pool of Applicants

**Data:** Percentage breakdown of URM vs. White applicants
1. Large Pool of Applicants

Findings: We thought we did ok (e.g., compared to other searches in our department) but wanted to do better
Things we tried that seemed to work

• Active recruitment
  – Asking colleagues for names
  – Looking through conference programs for speakers and graduate award winners
Email sent to potential applicants

Hi <name>,

Hope you are doing well.

I’m on the search committee of the professor (any rank) social/personality job at UW, and we are reaching out to colleagues to let them know of the position. We are especially interested in researchers who study societal inequities, intergroup and interracial relations, prejudice, stereotypes, culture, diversity, racial and ethnic identity, racism, institutional and systemic bias, and social groups, broadly construed. Review of applications will begin on September 19th, but applications will be thoughtfully reviewed and considered until the position is filled.

Please feel free to forward to colleagues, and if you are interested in UW, we would also encourage you to apply. The application does not require letters of recommendation at this stage.

Thanks!
Sapna

--
Sapna Cheryan
Professor
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
http://faculty.washington.edu/scheryan
Things we tried that seemed to work

• Active recruitment
  – Asking colleagues for names
  – Looking through conference programs for speakers and graduate award winners

• More relationship building before search started

• Created a more welcoming job ad
The Department of Psychology at the University of Washington invites applicants at any rank for a tenure-track or tenured faculty position in social/personality psychology. We seek applicants who research the causes and consequences of social inequities and how to remedy them. We are most interested in research specializations that address issues of diversity, intergroup and interracial relations, prejudice, stereotypes, culture, racial and ethnic identity, racism, institutional and systemic bias, and social groups, broadly construed.

Applicants will be expected to provide high quality teaching and mentoring at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. We are particularly interested in candidates who have a strong commitment to promoting the success of students from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups in academia. The successful candidate is expected to have or develop a record of high-quality publications and a funded research program. Applicants should have the Ph.D. degree, or foreign equivalent, by the start of the appointment.

Applications should include a curriculum vitae, a statement of research interests, a statement of teaching interests, the names and contact information for three individuals who can provide references, a research sample of no more than two reprints or preprints, and a diversity statement of no more than 500 words. The diversity statement should address leadership, commitment, and experiences with diversity, equity, and inclusion. Applications must be submitted electronically through Interfolio: https://apply.interfolio.com/77799

We are committed to creating a diverse and inclusive departmental climate. You can learn more about our department at: https://psych.uw.edu/about

Review of applications will begin on September 19, 2020, but applications will be thoughtfully reviewed and considered until the position is filled.
2. Preliminary interview list of candidates

**Data:** Breakdown of URM vs White candidates on the preliminary interview list and compared to the large pool
2. Preliminary interview list of candidates

Findings: Did not find a drop off from large pool but wanted to dig deeper on criteria
Digging deeper

• Obtained individual-level data to the best that we could

• Went through each criterion and assessed the % of URM vs White scholars who made the threshold to move forward

• Identified potentially biased criteria as the ones where URM scholars were disproportionately not making the threshold
Addressing potentially biased criteria

• Asked whether this criterion was actually necessary for evaluation? If not, considered dropping 
  (e.g., open science)

• Otherwise, considered revising 
  (e.g., productivity)

• Or assessing other criteria more strongly 
  (e.g., mentorship)
Diversity statement scoring changes

2017

Contributions to diversity – focusing on race (Black, Latino, Native American, underrep Asian categories, Pacific Islanders), Trans/non-binary gender identities, First generation college student
- Participant population
- Research question
- Mentoring/teaching
- Leadership
- Experiences

2020

Contributions to diversity (focusing on race: Black, Latinx, Native American, multiracial with one of these identities)
- Participant population
- Perspective of marginalized population
- Leadership with diversity
- Experience/role model
3. List of finalists

**Data:** Breakdown of URM vs White candidates on the finalist list and compared to the preliminary interview list
3. List of finalists

Findings: Did not find a drop off of URM candidates from the preliminary interview list to the list of finalists
List of finalists

Things we kept
  – Structured interview questions
  – Used preliminary interviews in combination with all other materials

Things we improved
  – Sent questions to candidates in advance
    e.g., Three questions sent ahead of time: 1) Future research, 2) How would work contribute to and expand work we have here, 3) Why do you want to work in our dept

If we had seen a drop off, figure out why
  – Interrogate the process as before
4. Offer(s)

**Data:** Breakdown of URM vs White candidates on the list of offers and compared to the final interview list
4. Offer(s)

Findings: We saw a drop off in URM candidates at this stage (caveat of small numbers)
Offers

Figure out why
- Interrogate the process as before

Things we improved
- Dropping biased criteria
- Figured out who was above threshold and the right order to make offers
- Solicited feedback from everyone (faculty, students, staff) in multiple ways but looked for bias in the feedback
- Mentorship checks
Sample mentorship check questions

• What is your relationship with <candidate>?
• How would you describe <candidate>’s mentoring style?
• How would you describe <candidate>’s interpersonal style?
• All mentors have things they need to work on. What do you think <candidate> needs to work on with respect to mentoring?
• What are your experiences with voicing concerns or disagreements, either in class or on research, with <candidate>?
• How frequently did you feel like your ideas showed up in your studies and projects?
• To your knowledge, have any students broken off their relationship with <candidate> in terms of switching to a different advisor. If so, how many and why?
5. Acceptances

Looked at who ended up accepting compared to offer list

No data in our case
Things we improved

- Department culture

- How our culture showed up during the interview process
  - Every meeting had a purpose/goal; few or no 1:1 meetings
  - On Zoom: highly structured with someone responsible for starting and ending meetings
  - Focused on recruiting candidates and showing our supportive environment (e.g., reminder about questions in talks)
When should you do a retrospective audit?

- Anytime after the search concludes
- What worked for us? Summer before next search
Key Takeaways
Key Takeaways

- Improve faculty hiring processes through debriefs and audits
- Anchor auditing reflections around four key decision points
- Understand what went well and what can be improved
- Look back to prepare for the future
Chadwick Allen
Associate Vice Provost
UW Office for Faculty Advancement
callen3@uw.edu

Joyce Yen
Director
UW ADVANCE Center for Institutional Change
joyceyen@uw.edu

Sapna Cheryan
Professor
UW Department of Psychology
scheryan@uw.edu
Questions?