

Diversity and Inclusion in Faculty Recruitment

Best Practices Checklist

As colleges and universities shift to electronic systems for managing the hiring process, institutions are using a new generation of best practices for building a diverse faculty and advancing inclusive excellence. These frontier strategies provide actionable, data-driven guidance customized for each department and help administrators surface institutional trends, set priorities, and make smarter decisions about allocating scarce resources.

Building the Foundation for Data-Driven Recruiting Strategies

I. Collecting Key Points

- | | Yes | No |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Do you collect and archive the following data for every applicant to every faculty position at the institution: | | |
| a. Sources driving traffic to the job posting: the specific job boards, websites, and advertisements from which viewers clicked into the job posting landing page | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Immediate digital path to application: the specific job boards, websites, and advertisements through which actual applicants entered the application portal | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Initial sources: applicants' statements on how they first learned of the position | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Applicants' doctoral programs: the institutions and specific doctoral programs that trained applicants for the position | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Recommenders: names and institutional affiliation of individuals who advised and/or provided letters of recommendation for applicants | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. EEOC data: applicants' responses to federally required survey on gender and racial and ethnic background? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. If yes to above, is the data for every search at the institution stored in the same format and in the same central system? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Can institutional administrators with responsibility for faculty hiring and diversity initiatives access the data to analyze trends and generate actionable insights? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Advance Inclusive Excellence in Individual Searches

II. Developing Effective Advertising Strategies

- | | Yes | No |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Do you help search committees develop effective advertising strategies by providing the following data from recent searches in their department: | | |
| a. The share of applications from candidates from underrepresented groups associated with each of the immediate digital paths to application (job boards, websites, and advertisements used to access the application portal) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. The share of all views of the job description (by users who may or may not have later applied) generated by different job boards, websites, and advertisements | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Where candidates from underrepresented groups first learned about the position? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are search committees shown how to use Facebook, LinkedIn, and other social media platforms to direct advertisements to candidates from underrepresented groups? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Are 100% of job descriptions reviewed prior to posting by a central or unit-level administrator who provides feedback on how the language of the job description might encourage or discourage applications from candidates from underrepresented groups | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

III. Maximizing the Impact of Personal Outreach

- | | Yes | No |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Does every search committee use personal outreach to actively recruit an applicant pool that reflects inclusive excellence? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Do search committees seek out each of the following key types of contacts: | | |
| a. Likely “influencers” of talented candidates from underrepresented groups—peers and mentors who may connect search committee members with individuals in their networks and/or encourage those individuals to apply for the position | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Active job seekers from underrepresented groups—outreach from the search committee may lead to applications from those who had not previously intended to apply for the position | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. “Passive candidates” from underrepresented groups—individuals not actively on the job market who may decide to apply as a result of personal interactions with someone in their professional network or on the search committee? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Best Practices in Faculty Affairs: Faculty Information Management

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. Do you give search committees leads for networking with likely “influencers” of strong candidates from underrepresented groups by sharing data on: | Yes | No |
| a. Advisors and recommenders of candidates from underrepresented groups on the short list in previous departmental searches | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Heads of graduate programs where candidates from underrepresented groups who were short-listed in previous departmental searches completed their doctoral training | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conferences where candidates from underrepresented groups on the short list of previous searches first learned of the position or developed a connection with someone in the department? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

IV. Addressing Gaps in Pool Diversity

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Yes | No |
| 1. Do you ensure that 100% of applicants complete the EEOC survey at the time of application by using a digital application platform that requires applicants to complete the survey? ¹ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does every search committee chair monitor the diversity of their applicant pool in real time (with aggregated data) throughout the submission window and adjust recruiting efforts if initial strategies are failing to attract a diverse pool? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Before interviews are scheduled, does the dean review the aggregate diversity of the applicant pool and proposed interviewee pool ² to identify any unexpected drop off in diversity during the review process? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. If a significant drop off in diversity occurs, do the dean and search committee meet to discuss the recruiting process and whether additional recruiting efforts should take place before the search proceeds? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

V. Supporting Equitable Review

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Yes | No |
| 1. Prior to evaluating applications, does every search committee develop a rubric that identifies the dimensions on which candidates will be evaluated and includes a scale of values for reviewers to record their ratings on each dimension? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does the search committee use the rubric for every candidate to mitigate the impact of unconscious bias and address other factors (such as criteria creep) that can get in the way of equitable review? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Do all search committees use first-round private review —scoring candidates without seeing the scores of other reviewers—so that initial assessments are not unconsciously influenced by others’ evaluations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. Do you ensure that rubrics are easy for search committees to use effectively by providing a way to: | Yes | No |
| a. Automatically tabulate each candidate's average overall score and average score on individual rubric dimensions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Automatically sort candidates by their averaged scores | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Automatically sort candidates by the individual reviewer's scores (visible only to the individual reviewer)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Advancing Ongoing Efforts Institution-wide

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| VI. Building a Culture of Continuous Recruiting in Every Department | Yes | No |
| 1. Do departments hold annual debrief sessions in which all faculty hear an update on their department's recruiting efforts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Do the debriefs include data on the institution's and the department's performance in attracting applications from attracting applications from candidates from underrepresented groups by sharing data on applicant pool diversity and relevant benchmarks, such as the diversity of recent PhD graduates? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Do the debriefs include data from recent departmental searches on the relative effectiveness of different advertising and outreach strategies for generating applications from candidates from underrepresented groups? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Do the debriefs emphasize the importance of all faculty developing recruiting networks on an ongoing basis to support the department's ability to attract talented applicants from underrepresented groups in future searches? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. At the debriefs, do you share success stories of personal connections developed before the formal search period that later resulted in applications from candidates from underrepresented groups? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. At the debriefs, do you share success stories of personal outreach during open searches that resulted in applications from candidates who either were not actively on the market or had not intended to apply for the position? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Do you help faculty develop effective networking strategies by providing information on: | | |
| a. Graduate programs where candidates from underrepresented groups who were short-listed in previous departmental searches completed their doctoral training | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Best Practices in Faculty Affairs: Faculty Information Management

- | | Yes | No |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Conferences where candidates from underrepresented groups on the short list of previous searches learned of the position or developed a connection with someone in the department? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Do the debriefs present institutional and departmental data on how the offer acceptance rate for candidates from underrepresented groups compares to that of other candidates? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

VII. Identifying Highest-Impact Opportunities at the Institutional Level

- | | Yes | No |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Do central administrators with ownership for faculty hiring get visibility into institutional recruiting patterns by reviewing the following data annually and comparing it to data for previous years: | | |
| a. Applicant pool diversity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. How the diversity of interview pools and pools of candidates receiving offers compares to that of applicant pools | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. How the offer acceptance rates of candidates from underrepresented groups compares to that of other candidates | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. The diversity of new hires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does the institution benchmark its faculty diversity against that of best-in-class peer institutions annually, with analyses broken down for tenure-track faculty and tenured associate and full professors? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does the institution benchmark the diversity of its recent hires against those of best-in-class peer institutions? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Is the above data used to inform the institution's strategies for advancing inclusive excellence and direct resources to the avenues with the greatest potential to impact change? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Interested in learning more? Contact us at team@interfolio.com.

1 Best practice institutions require applicants to answer EEOC questions but applicants may select "prefer not to answer" for their response to any question. Most institutions find fewer than 10% of applicants choose this response

2 Deans would receive only aggregated data on applicant pool and proposed interview pool prepared by an EEOC officer. To protect candidates' information, data on the aggregate diversity of interview pools which typically contain a small number of candidates) would not be shared with the search committee. No one other than EEOC officers would access individual candidates' personal demographic information.