

Search Committee Member Training: Searching for Excellence
September 25th, 2014

Attendance

Twenty-six individuals attended the training and twenty completed evaluations.

- Eleven (55.0%) participants identified as faculty members, four (20.0%) identified as students, two (10%) identified as administrators, one (5.0%) identified as a staff member, and two (10.0%) didn't respond.
- Seven (35.0%) participants reported that this was the first time they have served on a search committee and six (30.0%) reported that it was not.
- Eleven (55.0%) participants identified as committee members and one (5.0%) participant identified as a faculty member.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

I feel that my knowledge of how to identify and recruit a diverse pool of applicants has increased after today's training.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	5.0	5.3
Agree	10	50.0	57.9
Strongly Agree	8	40.0	100.0
Missing Data	1	5.0	
Total	20	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new information or understanding about how to address gender inequity during the search process.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	5.0	5.3
Disagree	1	5.0	10.5
Agree	5	25.0	36.8
Strongly Agree	12	60.0	100.0
Missing Data	1	5.0	
Total	20	100.0	

I will be able to implement new strategies to address unconscious bias during the faculty search process as a result of my participation in this training.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	5.0	5.3
Agree	9	45.0	52.6
Strongly Agree	9	45.0	100.0
Missing Data	1	5.0	
Total	20	100.0	

I will be able to use the information that I learned today in my role on search committees.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	5.0	5.3
Agree	6	30.0	36.8
Strongly Agree	12	60.0	100.0
Missing Data	1	5.0	
Total	20	100.0	

The training was clear and well-organized.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	5.0	5.3
Agree	6	30.0	36.8
Strongly Agree	12	60.0	100.0
Missing Data	1	5.0	
Total	20	100.0	

I would recommend this training to others.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	5.0	5.3
Agree	8	40.0	47.4
Strongly Agree	10	50.0	100.0
Missing Data	1	5.0	
Total	20	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this training?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Poor	1	5.0	5.6
Average	1	5.0	11.1
Above Average	6	30.0	44.4
Excellent	10	50.0	100.0
Missing Data	2	10.0	
Total	20	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. What questions about unconscious bias do you still have after attending this training? Please list any areas of the training that you would like to receive additional information about or that need further clarification in order for you to be an effective search committee member.
 - How to deal with combative/senior faculty that don't want to mess around with the appropriate methods.
 - I've done this three times – learned new stuff! Thank you!
 - Addressing power issues within the community.
 - I need more specific advice on the time management during the search process.
 - Isn't respecting diversity a bias? One participant stated given a white person and a black person she would choose the latter due to diversity. However, many aspects of diversity (cultural background, personal interests, gender questions, etc.) are not superficially as visible as race or gender. So that participant's choice is highly biased!
 - How to deal with equal candidates with gender differences isn't it bias to evaluate someone on the gender/ethnicity just because we need more diversity?
 - Learning more about ranking the applicant pool with numbers.
 - Should we lean-in regarding diversity?
 - The meaning of concept "bias" is different for different persons. It is itself a matter of discussion. Besides, how to distinguish "biased" reasons from "unbiased" reasons?

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the training you attended today?
 - The lists of unconscious bias and discussion. Also examples were helpful.
 - Discussion questions throughout the training about how to address sticky situations.
 - Discussion clarified procedures and university positions on borderline cases.
 - Awareness of bias information.
 - Addressing the unconscious bias and the tips for best practice.
 - Learning how to not over-evaluate candidates before discussion.
 - Listening to discussion between the audience.
 - Developing position description; developing evaluation criteria.
 - Discussion and questions were great.
 - Procedures.
 - The discussion. Details brought by attendees.

3. How could this training be improved to be more beneficial to you?
 - I liked it a lot. I don't have strong ideas about improvement.
 - Time management.
 - It may have been useful to force people to change tables – for the discussion/activity portion it would have been useful to get examples/insights from other fields. There was a “math” table.
 - The first several slides made an impression that we must hire a female, no matter what. I do not think this was the intention.
 - Consider realistic situations, not obviously contrived ones.
 - Allow more time for debate/discussion among the audience.
 - I thought it was great – could have actually been longer.
 - Maybe 15-20 minutes more time, but two hours is good.

4. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's training and/or the FORWARD program in general on the back of this page.
 - It was great!
 - Grey sheet does not include entire list of biases from the slides. Recently, Scott Page's the mathematical foundations of conclusions have been called into question. It might be work looking into. (Source: Notices of the American Mathematical Society).
 - Look at the audience and see raised hands, don't keep cutting off others that are speaking. The attendees could have innovative views/ideas.