

Search Committee Member Training: Searching for Excellence
February 16, 2016

Attendance

Twenty individuals attended the training and 16 completed evaluations.

- Of those who completed evaluations, ten (62.5%) identified as faculty members, three (18.8%) as students, two (12.5%) as staff, and one (6.3%) as an administrator.
- Five (31.3%) participants reported that this was their first time serving on a search committee, seven (43.8%) reported that it was not their first time, one (6.2%) said that they were not currently on a search committee, but have been in the past, and three (18.7%) did not respond.
- Eight (50.0%) participants identified as committee chairs, two (12.5%) as committee members, five (31.3%) did not respond, and one (6.3%) identified as a committee chair and committee 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
Disagree	1	6.3	6.3
Agree	6	37.5	43.8
Strongly Agree	9	56.3	100.0
Total	16	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	6.3	6.3
Agree	6	37.5	43.8
Strongly Agree	9	56.3	100.0
Total	16	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
Agree	5	31.3	31.3
Strongly Agree	11	68.8	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	1	6.3	6.3
Strongly Agree	14	87.5	93.8
N/A	1	6.3	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

The training was clear and well-organized.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	5	31.3	31.3
Strongly Agree	11	68.8	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

I would recommend this training to others.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	6.3	6.3
Agree	1	6.3	12.5
Strongly Agree	14	87.5	100.0
Total	16	100.0	

How would you rate the overall quality of this training?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Poor	1	6.3	6.3
Above Average	8	50.0	56.3
Excellent	7	43.8	100.0
Total	16	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.
 - Raising the bar in order to narrow focus of candidates.
 - I was not expecting this to be more of a diversity training. I have one concern that there may actually be reverse discrimination potential based on the stressing of diversity.
 - In the last three job searches (two plant pathologists and one soil specialist) we have had a VERY low percentage of Americans apply. Some feel foreign students are more interested in living in USA rather than acquiring position.
 - How to deal with this is a little more when having face-to-face interactions with candidates.
 - I doubt I will and HOPE I won't encounter this, but how to deal with people who don't understand that racism and discrimination are systemic – people who don't believe/understand privilege, actively resist the idea of 'white privilege' or 'male privilege'.

2. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the training you attended today?
 - What I can say.
 - Ideas for questions.
 - Learning about how easy it is to have a bias.
 - Discussing best practices.
 - Slides concerning appropriate and inappropriate interview questions.
 - Different types of cognitive errors.
 - North Dakota is open records. Information regarding references.
 - Opened my mind to diversity issues; rules that we need to follow during search.
 - The cognitive error worksheet.
 - Ability/effort to check references. Didn't know you can contact 'off list' references.
 - Procedural suggestions were helpful.
 - All was good.
 - The importance of anchoring the search on the advertised qualifications. The NDSU FORWARD card summarizing the info (portable info!)

3. How could this training be improved to be more beneficial to you?
 - Better time management.
 - Longer, hour and a half.
 - Share examples of rubric.
 - Time organization.
 - All presenters should come better prepared – read the latest changes to rules.
 - Don't have people introduce themselves to the entire group as nobody remembers all the names nor even care. It simply wastes valuable time. Speakers seem to have a feminist agenda.
 - The training seemed tilted toward reverse discrimination. For example, the focus on diversity seemed to neglect the need to simply select the best candidate. Also, it is not good to have a presenter say it would be ok to tally points for diversity.
 - More about bias/preference FOR NDSU alumni. More about how group dynamics can influence/derail the search process. More about situations when one (or a limited number of people) 'draft' the job description.