

Best Practices for Search Committees

Search Committee Composition

- A diverse search committee is often an important factor in identifying and attracting a wide range of talented candidates. Efforts should be made to include women and minorities on hiring committees, perhaps by utilizing faculty from adjoining departments.

Advertising

- Define the search as broadly as possible to increase the chances of greater diversity on the applicant pool.¹
- Add language signaling a special interest in candidates who contribute to the department's diversity priorities. For example, one might say: "The search committee is especially interested in candidates who through their research, teaching, and/or service will contribute to the diversity and excellence of the academic community."²

Pool Development

- Expanded recruitment efforts produce diverse applicant pools. Search committees, for example, might directly contact graduate programs with high numbers of women and minority PhD candidates and utilize databases and fellowship directories that identify outstanding and diverse candidates.
- When asking colleagues at other schools about potential applicants, always specifically ask: "Do you know any outstanding women or minority candidates?" This question often elicits names of candidates who are otherwise overlooked.
- Be alert for potential future appointment possibilities, especially women and minorities, when attending conferences and professional meetings and keep a department list of "people to watch." These might be post-docs, graduates students, or rising assistant professors. Consider inviting them to campus for talks to cultivate their interest in Columbia.

Candidate Selection

- Make multiple lists with multiple criteria (Georgi, 2000).
- Use a standardized candidate evaluation form. Discuss these forms in search committee meetings. Rater accountability has been shown to increase the accuracy and objectivity of ratings (Mero & Motowidlo, 1995).
- Encourage a discussion format that requires contributions from all members. Asking each member of the committee to comment on a candidate ensures that a vocal minority does not dominate the discussion. This format also provides an incentive for everyone to "do their homework."
- Do not eliminate a name from the list for personal reasons (e.g., dual-career needs) until you have actively tried to recruit the candidate. Often, qualified potential candidates are struck from the list based on assumptions about their personal life.³

Beware of Bias in:

- Letters of Recommendation A study of over 300 recommendation letters for successful medical faculty applicants found that letters for females were shorter, placed less emphasis on research, more emphasis on teaching, contained more "grindstone adjectives" such as "hardworking" and "diligent," contained twice as many "doubt raisers," and were less likely to include "stand-out" adjectives such as "brilliant" and "superb" (Trix & Psenka, 2003).
- Performance Evaluation Social psychology research has found that both men and women are more likely to hire a male applicant than a female applicant with an identical record (Steinpres et al., 1999). Deaux & Emswiller (1974) found that success is more frequently attributed to "skill" for males and "luck" for females, even when the evaluators are presented with evidence of equal success for both genders. Beginning in the 1970s symphony orchestras started requiring musicians to audition behind screens; since that time, the number of women hired has increased fivefold and the probability that a woman will advance from preliminary rounds has increased by 50% (Goldin and Rouse, 2000).
- Publications A study of postdoctoral fellowships awarded by the Medical Research Council in Sweden found that women candidates needed substantially more publications to achieve the same rating as men, unless they personally knew someone on the panel (Wenneras and Wold, 1997).
- Small Numbers Research has shown that women and minorities are judged more fairly when they are at least 30% of the applicant pool (Sackett et al., 1991; Heilman, 1980).

¹ Smith et al., 2004.

² Excerpt from the University of Michigan Faculty Handbook, 2004-2005

³ See, e.g., American Physical Society Best Practices for Recruiting Women

References

- American Physical Society. (2004). Best practices for recruiting and retaining women in physics. Available online at: <http://www.aps.org/educ/cswp/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=55144>.
- Babcock, L. and Laschever, S. (2003). *Women Don't Ask*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Columbia University Presidential Advisory Committee on Diversity Initiatives. (2005). Working paper: Sub-committee on search culture and hiring practices.
- Davies, P.G., Spencer, S.J., and Steele, C.M. (2005). Clearing the air: Identity safety moderates the effects of stereotype threat on women's leadership aspirations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 276-287.
- Deaux, K. and Emswiller, T. (1974). Explanations for successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29, 80-85.
- Freedman, S.M. & Phillips, J.S. (1988). The changing nature of research on women at work. *Journal of Management*, 14, 231-251.
- Georgi, H. (2000). Is there an unconscious discrimination against women in science? *APS News*, January 2000, available at <http://schwinger.harvard.edu/~georgi/women/backpage.htm>.
- Gladwell, M. (2005). *Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking*. New York / Boston: Little, Brown.
- Goldin, C. and Rouse, C. (2000). "Orchestrating Impartiality: The Impact of 'Blind' Auditions on Female Musicians." *American Economic Review* 90.4 (2000):715-741.
- Heilman, M. E. (1980). The impact of situational factors on personnel decisions concerning women: Varying the sex composition of the applicant pool. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26, 286-295.
- Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group memberships. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 26, 293-355.
- Mero, N. P. and Motowidlo, S. J. (1995). Effects of rater accountability on the accuracy and the favorability of performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 517-524.
- Sackett, P. R., DuBois, C. L., Cathy, L., & Noe, A. W. (1991). Tokenism in performance evaluation: The effects of work group representation on male-female and white-black differences in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 263-267.
- Smith, D.G., Turner, C.S., Osei-Kofi, N., Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 133-160.
- Steinpreis, R.E., Anders, K.A., and Ritzke, D. (1999). The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants, *Sex Roles*, 41, 509-528.
- Trix, F. and Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the color of glass: letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. *Discourse & Society*, 14, 191-220.
- University of Michigan. (2004-2005). Faculty recruitment handbook. Available online at: <http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/handbook>.
- Valian, V. (1998). *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Wenneras, C. and Wold, A. (1997). Nepotism and sexism in peer review. *Nature*, 387, 341-343.