INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON

POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND BEST PRACTICES FOR FACULTY RECRUITMENT

A Guide for Search Committees and Administrators

September 2015 (Version 1.1)
Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs
Indiana University, Bryan Hall 111, 107 S. Indiana Avenue
Bloomington, IN 47405, Phone: (812) 855-2809
Email: vpfaa@indiana.edu, Website: http://vpfaa.indiana.edu/

Table of Contents

Policies, Procedures, and Best Practices for Faculty Recruitment: A Guide for Search Committees and Administrators

Preface

The recruitment of new faculty members is among the most important enterprises in which a university can engage. When done well, it can revitalize the intellectual dynamism of a department or program, bolster its teaching capacity and breadth, and elevate the long-term research profile and prestige of an institution. The hiring of tenure-track faculty in particular can have trans-generational implications for a university, making recruitment activities all the more important to an academic community's vibrancy and longevity.

At the core of most faculty hiring is a search committee, typically comprised of faculty members drawn from the recruiting unit. These bodies work in collaboration with other offices and university personnel—including department chairs, deans, the Provost, and so forth—to attract talented candidates to advertised job positions. Predicated upon the principles of peer review and shared governance, the search committee acts as a screening mechanism to ensure the quality of the academic mission of the university and to perpetuate excellence among its faculty. Consequently, these committees serve a vital role in preserving and enriching the research, pedagogical, and societal functions of the university.

This guide is designed to familiarize search committees, department chairs, program directors, deans, and other campus personnel with the policies, protocols, and best practices that should inform faculty recruitment efforts at Indiana University-Bloomington. While any given search sponsored by any given unit (whether program, department, or school) will have unique candidate pools, job expectations, and (inter)disciplinary requirements, the procedural parameters and recruitment practices set forth in this document should provide search committees and other interested parties with the information necessary to recruit a qualified, diverse, and productive faculty across units and in accordance with the University's mission. This guide is not meant to be an exhaustive or final treatise on faculty recruitment. Rather, the purpose here is to offer a reference manual that reiterates existing campus policies, codifies best practices, and updates campus search procedures in a fashion that will position Indiana University to take advantage of the available faculty talent of the twentieth-first century.

The Search Committee

Purpose and Charge

The most fundamental purpose of a search committee is to facilitate the generation of a robust and qualified pool of job applicants, as well as to advise the unit head (typically a department chair or program director), unit faculty, and those with hiring authority (usually a dean or similar administrator) of candidates who best meet the needs of the recruiting unit and the campus. One of the great values of search committees is that they provide a mechanism for the assessment of often large volumes of job applications in a manner that is consistent and fair and that benefits from multiple perspectives and areas of expertise. Ideally, search committee members should play a central role in the recruitment, screening, and evaluation of job applicants and are expected to regularly participate in committee activities and engagements. Furthermore, search committee members should always remain cognizant of the fact that they represent the larger University in their dealings with job candidates, which is an especially crucial part of the reputational elements that are bound up in every recruitment process.

Committee Composition

In most instances, the unit head selects the members of the search committee. This individual should endeavor to construct a committee that reflects expertise in the advertised recruitment area(s) and which incorporates women and minority faculty members. Multiple studies have shown that a diverse search committee is more likely to generate a robust and heterogeneous candidate pool. Units and schools with low numbers of minority and women faculty should consider inviting faculty of color and female colleagues from related departments or schools to serve on search committees.

Ideally, at least one member of the committee should have a past experience of having participated in a successful recruitment process. Moreover, graduate student participation is desirable in many instances; however, unit heads should be clear about the role that such student members are expected to play on the committee. Prior to inviting a graduate student to participate in a search process, the recruiting unit should determine whether the student member will be allowed to vote on committee motions, to review all candidate materials, to attend (and participate in) departmental discussions, and to share information with other students. If in doubt about the appropriate parameters of student participation in a search, the unit head should solicit advisement from relevant campus offices, such as the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs, the Office of Affirmative Action, or the dean's office of the school in question. Graduate students can be valuable members of recruitment processes, for they can showcase a unit's intellectual rigor, be useful advocates and allies regarding diversity, and make

Indiana University more attractive to candidates seeking employment at a Research I university with a strong commitment to post-baccalaureate training.

A significant variable that can impact the work and progress of a search committee is size. In general, a search committee should have at least three members, including a chair. This quantity should guarantee some diversity of opinions and insights, as well as minimize scheduling conflicts. Larger committees, while perhaps maximizing the array of perspectives that can be brought to bear on a candidate pool, will not benefit from an economy of scale in terms of scheduling or time management. However, sometimes more fully populated committees are unavoidable, especially in instances in which a search involves multiple units and interested parties. In all cases, members of search committees of every size should commit to attending scheduled meetings as faithfully as possible and participating in discussions in an informed and civil fashion that recognizes the time investment and efforts of other members. Moreover, the committee should decide at the outset that the recruitment process will move forward even if every member cannot attend every meeting.

Conflicts of Interest

In selecting members of a search committee, the unit head should be careful to avoid potential conflicts of interest. It is preferable to refrain from empaneling a committee that includes members with a relationship that could lead to a real or perceived imbalance in terms of influence and assessment, such as partners or spouses, or a tenured faculty member and a graduate student advisee. Search committee members should not write recommendation letters for applicants, nor should members of the recruiting unit. All individuals in a decision-making capacity should disclose any conflicts of interest candidly and early on in order to avoid potential complication of later stages of the recruitment process.

Role of the Search Committee Chair

Similar to the search committee, the search committee chair is usually selected by the unit head to lead the candidate review process. As a general rule, the chair should have some experience in the discipline or field in which the search is defined, enjoy the confidence and respect of colleagues, and have a record of conducting unit business with integrity, civility, and punctuality. The search committee chair has the same review and assessment responsibilities as the other committee members when it comes to the candidate pool. However, this position also entails other obligations that are unique to its role on the committee.

In terms of fundamental duties, the chair is tasked with leading the search committee in all matters and ensuring that the review process is a fair, consistent, and timely one that values and incorporates the perspectives and judgments of the other committee members. Moreover, the chair is responsible for scheduling and setting the agenda of committee meetings, along with keeping the group on task and cultivating consensus. The chair should be the sole spokesperson regarding the reportage of the committee's findings to the unit head and interested colleagues. The chair should also be solely responsible for answering inquiries, whether verbal or written, from job candidates, as well as regularly apprising applicants of the progression of the search. Once an offer is accepted by a candidate, the search committee chair is responsible for immediately informing unsuccessful candidates of their status so that they may direct their attention and energies to job prospects elsewhere. Very importantly, the chair is charged with maintaining the confidentiality of committee deliberations and candidate records in accordance with University policy. On this score, the chair should feel free to consult with the unit head or the University's human resource officers when questions concerning privacy and access emerge. Finally, the search committee head should always obtain written authorization from the unit head before making any financial commitments related to the search process.

It is essential that the search committee chair remain aware of his/her role as a public face of Indiana University throughout the entire recruitment endeavor. Most candidacies will not advance to the point of a job offer, thus most applicants will only deal with the search committee as a representative of the University. Timely decision-making, cordial correspondence, confidentiality, and equitable assessment are all hallmarks of a good search, and it is incumbent upon the committee chair to make these factors intrinsic features of their stewardship over the candidate review process.

Hiring Authority

Nearly all searches must be ultimately authorized and approved by officials or bodies external to the hiring unit. At Indiana University-Bloomington, much of this function resides within the purview of deans' offices, where hiring priorities and job lines are created and acted upon. When it comes to the hiring of tenure-track faculty and many other types of long-term, professional employees, hiring authority is typically shared between various offices, including the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs, the campus Provost, IU President, and the IU Board of Trustees (see Appendix). Search committees should be informed of the layers of hiring authority in advance. While departments and programs (via search committees) perform the important task of attracting and evaluating candidates, any subsequent job offer to an applicant—typically conveyed by the head of the recruiting department or program—must be authorized and approved by deans and other campus-level officials, with a final binding decision delivered by a vote of the IU Board of Trustees. As a general policy, campus and University-wide administrators with hiring authority should refrain from serving on search committees charged with hiring personnel whose appointments are principally as faculty members. To do otherwise would blur distinctions between the purviews of executive authority and faculty governance, thus jeopardizing the ability of departments and programs to screen candidates and make hiring recommendations independent of administrative influence and control.

Role of the Unit Head

Unit heads are administrative officials with responsibilities that include unit-level budgeting, course scheduling, committee assignment, staff management, and planning. These offices typically include those of department chair, program director, and unit heads in non-departmentalized schools. Since they do not have control over the budgets for creating and maintaining faculty lines, these administrators almost never have hiring authority, but instead are beholden to school deans for hiring authorizations and approvals. In instances where a unit head has the discretion to determine the membership of a search committee, that individual should neither lead nor serve as a voting member of the recruitment panel.

Beyond populating the search committee, the unit head should work closely with the unit faculty and other campus stakeholders to draft the job advertisement and to formulate a recruitment strategy for the search. The unit head is also responsible for giving the search committee its charge, which (at minimum) should include a detailed description of the job, its duties, and the required credentials; a statement regarding how the search reflects the short- and long-term priorities of the unit; recommended methods for generating a strong and diverse applicant pool; deadlines for completing each stage of the search process, including a reporting schedule; the number of final candidates that can be brought to campus; the University's requirements regarding confidentiality; and the kinds of authorized expenses that the search will likely incur (aside from any compensation package tied to a prospective job offer). The Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Statement and a statement from the unit head, school dean, or Provost affirming Indiana University's commitment to diversity should be part of the charge to the committee.

Following the completion of the candidate selection process, the unit head, in consultation with the dean, human resources, and/or other relevant offices, checks candidate references, interviews candidates during the campus visit, and makes a job offer to the applicant deemed by the unit faculty to be the most deserving of employment. Search committee members do not negotiate the terms of employment with candidates, a task that is left to the unit head and those with hiring authority (namely, deans). Any inquiries by candidates regarding salary, tenure, rank advancement, start-up funds, leave time, and so forth should be directed to the unit head.

Types of Recruitment Processes

Inter-Unit Searches

Recruitment initiatives that involve joint appointments or positions that have responsibilities across units should entail early and candid discussion of expectations and search procedures. These conversations should touch on potential teaching assignments, research requirements, committee and other service obligations, the conduct of promotion processes (including the location of the tenure home), the valuation of interdisciplinary engagement, and so forth. It is essential that the search committee reflects the expertise and interests of each recruiting unit and that the members of the committee have a clear understanding of both the process and desired outcomes. If the committee is unclear regarding its charge or the progression of its work, it is unreasonable to assume that candidates will have a lucid understanding of the job's expectations. Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) can illuminate various aspects of multi-unit appointments. However, such documents should be carefully crafted to highlight unit procedures and expectations, avoiding any specific suggestions or commitments regarding future performance outcomes—particularly related to the issues of promotion and tenure—that are not typically discernible at the time of hire.

Strategic Recruitment

With authorization from the school dean, a unit may seek to hire an especially qualified faculty member through means not formally tied to an advertised search process. Such strategic recruitment should be predicated upon broad support among the unit faculty and based upon peer review of the candidate's application materials. Even in cases where a single candidate is being considered for a position, the screening process should be thorough and comprehensive, allowing unit faculty various opportunities and mechanisms for expressing opinions about the applicant and their work.

Internal Candidates

Occasionally, a unit may consider hiring an internal candidate for an advertised position. Such scenarios could involve the consideration of an IUB non-tenure-track faculty member, postdoctoral scholar, or recent doctoral student for a tenure-track appointment. When an internal candidate is being considered for a position advertised as an external or global search, the unit head should not lead or serve on the search committee. In addition, the unit head should consider selecting at least one search committee member from outside of the recruiting department or program to ensure fairness.

Spousal and Partner Hiring

Units should draft fair and equitable procedures for considering spousal and partner hires. Under no circumstances should one spouse or partner serve on a committee or in a key decision-making capacity related to the possible employment of that person's spouse or partner. If a screening committee is used to evaluate credentials, the unit head and faculty should consider including at least one member from outside of the recruiting department or program.

The University endeavors to accommodate spousal and partner placement and has made resources available for this purpose. In applicable instances involving the recruitment and retention of faculty members, unit heads are encouraged to consult their dean's office to learn more about the campus's dual-career procedures for securing employment for spouses and partners.

Alternative Search Committee Models

While the hiring policies and procedures outlined above are meant to guide faculty recruitment practices on the Bloomington campus, these requirements and recommended approaches do not preclude other possible methods. For example, some institutions have increasingly turned toward the use of omnibus search committees tasked with generating and reviewing candidates for multiple job postings. Often these committees are designed to scrutinize candidates from various fields and disciplines, and the searches themselves are purposefully geared toward attracting candidates who satisfy research, teaching, and service needs across a number of units and schools. In other instances, units at various institutions have empaneled standing search committees that continually explore markets of job candidates, with an eye to strategically launching a targeted recruitment process at any given time of the year. Additionally, there are universities with departments and programs that, en masse, review the entire candidate pool for a job vacancy, the unit itself acting as a committee of the whole.

The benefits of each of these approaches to faculty recruitment seem readily apparent, whether one considers the intellectual linkages that the omnibus committee could help forge across various academic boundaries, the nimble opportunism that the standing search committee might facilitate, or the unit buy-in and collegial consensus-building that could result from committees of the whole. Of course, the challenge for each of these alternative types of search committees and processes is to make sure that the recruitment process benefits from the informed knowledge of field specialists while not becoming unwieldy or unduly complicated due to the number of individuals (and agendas) involved in the review process. At bottom, any search process or recruitment enterprise should serve the intellectual, pedagogical, and collegial needs of the unit in question, as well as the interests of the school and campus—that is, the process itself is simply a means for reaching hiring goals.

Search Committee Preparations and Protocol

Ground Rules and Committee Meetings

Sufficient preparation is essential to the effective and timely operation of a search. Immediately following the authorization of a faculty line, the unit head or school dean should provide all search committee members with a copy of this guide, requiring that they read it before beginning the recruitment process. During the first meeting of the committee, the chair should lead a discussion focusing on the key sections of the guide and be prepared to answer any questions that members might have about University policies governing job searches. The chair might consider inviting the unit head to this meeting to clarify expectations regarding the reporting schedule, deadlines, job ads, recruitment goals, record keeping, and so forth. A campus official specializing in faculty diversity or HR matters might also be invited if the chair anticipates committee questions that could best be addressed by these individuals. The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs conducts an information session each fall that is highly recommended for search committee chairs and others interested in becoming familiar with University policies and best practices related to faculty recruitment endeavors. The Director of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity is similarly available to address questions from the search committee and can provide assistance understanding targeted hiring procedures.

During the first meeting of the search committee, the chair should set the tone for how subsequent discussions will be conducted. Members should be required to participate in search deliberations, even if this requires the chair to call upon them individually for input. By soliciting members for perspectives and assessments, the chair can avoid a situation in which discussions are dominated by a vocal minority. This approach also strongly encourages each member to review applicant files and other relevant materials prior to the meeting.

Discussions at subsequent committee meetings should be geared toward achieving a consensus, though differences of opinion and debate should not be discouraged. Committee members should be encouraged to speak with candor, with the knowledge that committee deliberations are confidential. Committee meetings will proceed more productively and smoothly if all members understand upfront what they are looking for in candidates and what the priorities of the unit are in terms of hiring. Substantive decisions about committee expectations, assessment methodology, and diversity goals should be made at the start of a search, not once the committee has reached the latter stages of the process. Once committee members have devoted many hours of time and effort to scrutinizing candidate files, it is harder to establish procedural ground rules and desired outcomes that are wholly detached from individual candidacies and related considerations.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality is an important feature of any faculty recruitment process. Many highly qualified candidates will not apply for a position that does not ensure their privacy or may withdraw from a search process that appears to take issues of confidentiality lightly. As in the larger world, security breaches involving personal or professional information can ruin faculty careers, especially in instances where a candidate seeks to leave a current employer for another job opportunity. In addition to being the public face of Indiana University in relation to candidate pools, search committees are also expected to be the guarantors of applicant privacy, a responsibility that is inextricably tied to the reputation and integrity of the institution itself.

At the beginning of the search process, the unit head should inform the committee about the University's policies and protocols on confidentiality. Certain information regarding a job search must be publicly accessible, such as the job description and required qualifications, the names of committee members (though the published job ad need not list them), and the process used for screening candidates (again, not required as part of the job ad itself). Beyond this public information, confidentiality requirements mandate that:

- All discussions and deliberations among search committee members are confidential.
- Application materials should be accessible only to individuals who are involved in some level of the administrative, evaluative, or decision-making phases of the search (e.g., unit faculty, unit heads, deans, relevant tenure and promotion committees, and so forth). These individuals should be informed of the expectation that they not share the application materials with others. Although job applications are processed through the online PeopleAdmin system, any candidate materials submitted in physical form should be kept in a secure location.
- The following information should not be sent through email (or in attachments) or be made available in an unsecure format: Social Security numbers, birthdates, tax information, credit/debit card numbers, bank routing and/or account information, passport or visa numbers, driver's license numbers, or security-related data (PIN numbers, passphrases, access codes, etc.). If such information is needed by a University official or office, it should only be requested and made available through a secure channel.
- Breaches of confidentiality should be reported immediately to the unit head, who should determine the nature of the breach, immediately resolve it (if possible), disclose the existence of the breach to affected parties—along with University Human Resources—on a "need to know" basis, and put in place security mechanism to protect against subsequent information leakages.
- Specific candidates and applicant materials should not be discussed in email messages, listservs, blogs, unit webpages, or similar venues. Campus-visit announcements, job-talk advertisements, candidate video/audio recordings, and other items that identify an applicant should not be posted on unsecure or publicly accessible websites.

- The identities of candidates should not be disclosed to other candidates, nor should candidates be discussed with individuals outside of the institution (aside from referees).
- Unit heads and other administrators should not discuss the specifics of candidate negotiations with members of the search committee, unit faculty, or students.

The unit head should notify the committee early on regarding the kinds of communications that are permissible. While it is allowable to talk about candidates with other members of the faculty, these discussions should not include students who are not members of the search committee. Again, in virtually all instances, the search committee chair should serve as the sole contact person for the committee; other committee members should, in general, direct inquiries to the attention of that individual. When in doubt, it is usually best to err on the side of confidentiality and privacy until it is possible to obtain further advisement regarding the requirements of University policy. The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs, the Office of Affirmative Action, and University Human Resources can each assist units and search committees in determining the boundaries of confidentiality when it comes to recruitment activities.

Timeliness of Action

If there is a single complaint that is commonly leveled against search committees, it has to do with their use of time. Search processes tend to be both effort-intensive and time-consuming, involving the coordination of schedules, the review of sometimes hundreds of applicants, solicitation of faculty input, arrangement of interviews and campus visits, and finally negotiations between unit heads, deans, and candidates. In most instances, there is simply no way to avoid the protracted nature of a job search, given that certain procedures must be followed. Factors such as the time of year and the nature of the position being filled have a significant impact on the duration of a search, as do the relative busyness of the hiring unit and its faculty and staff.

These variables notwithstanding, a well-planned search can at least streamline the longevity of the process by endeavoring to expeditiously transition from one phase of the hiring initiative to another. After a job line is authorized, a search committee should be organized immediately and given its charge. Publication deadlines for ads, payroll cut-offs, visa delays, late or incomplete applications, and other incidental features of the hiring process can often be anticipated and should thus be factored into the early deliberations and actions of both the search committee and the hiring unit. If candidate materials are received from international scholars, the unit chair can expedite visa applications and other immigration-related matters through early consultation with the Office of the Vice President for International Affairs. Of course, there are some things that cannot always be quickly resolved, such as the scheduling of multiple campus visits or the final negotiations between a senior candidate and a unit head. Still, search committees that exhibit a degree of urgency and deliberateness more easily convey their eagerness and seriousness of purpose to job candidates, as well as to unit colleagues, heads, and others. Carelessness with time tends to impart a less than flattering image of both the process and the institution.

Job Advertisement & Defining the Position

As a general policy, advertisements for faculty positions should be tailored to attract the largest pool of qualified candidates possible. Highly specific language about professional pedigree, field specialization, and research focus could have the effect of discouraging viable applicants, thus resulting in a smaller, less diverse pool. The job description should outline the duties and expectations of the position, including teaching assignments, research requirements, and service responsibilities. Other elements of the job may be listed if they are especially important for candidates to be aware of at the time of application. Advertised faculty searches must appear in national print media, though they may also be posted in electronic or digital venues.

Every job ad should specify the start date of the appointment (as well as the duration, when appropriate), the appointment type (tenure-track or non-tenure-track), rank (assistant professor, associate professor, lecturer, etc.), necessary qualifications, the search committee's contact information, and the unit's website address. The posting must list the materials to be submitted by candidates—typically a letter of application, curriculum vita, a statement on research and/or teaching, and names of recommenders, along with the preferred means of submission (regular mail or electronic delivery). The deadline for applications should also be mentioned and should be no earlier than thirty days following the position's announcement in a national publication. To allow for the acceptance of late applications or the extension of a search, the job ad might contain statements such as: "Applications received by (date) will be assured consideration" or "Review of applications will begin (date). The search will remain open until the position is filled."

Indiana University's commitment to diversity and inclusion should be explicitly apparent in advertisements for all faculty positions. Job postings must include the following statement: "Indiana University is an equal employment and affirmative action employer and a provider of ADA services. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to age, ethnicity, color, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation or identity, national origin, disability status or protected veteran status." Recruiting units are encouraged to include additional language in job ads that stresses the high value that the University places on recruiting faculty from various cultural, intellectual, and demographic backgrounds. The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs, the Office of Affirmative Action, and University Human Resources are available to assist units in developing more inclusive recruitment plans, as well as to provide guidance in expanding the scope of a search.

Diversity and Fairness in Recruitment

A Note on Terminology and Current Policies

Due in large part to its frequency of usage, the term *diversity* is one of the more nebulous words in the University's lexicon. It is variously characterized as a means and an end, as potentially abundant and but usually fragile (which can lead to its scarcity), and as being as comprehensible as numbers and colors but as abstract as notions of "climate" and feelings of "inclusion" or "exclusion." At Indiana University and elsewhere, our ideas about diversity encapsulate all of these things and more, but our sometimes imprecise, catch-all deployment of the term is indicative of its ever-evolving meaning against the dynamism of a larger society undergoing notable degrees of demographic, social, and economic change. Thus, the term is a moving target of values, aspirations, and goals operating within a larger historical and contemporary context that defies static or simple characterizations. As an institution dedicated to inquiry, experimentation, and the incessant revision of received wisdom, we should take comfort in our ability, indeed, our mission to grapple with subjects and terms that are ever evolving in substance and meaning. In acknowledging this definitional fluidity, diversity—in regard to faculty, staff, students, curricular offerings, (inter)disciplinary cultures, and so forth—will ultimately be defined by what Indiana University is and will become in the twenty-first century. Although our institution is the sum total of its history, we have the opportunity to shape the arc of its future.

As a publicly funded institution supported in part by federal monies, Indiana University is required by law to establish hiring goals for women and racial minorities when their representation in the University workforce is below their representation in the local or national labor pool. That is, the University is obligated to take "affirmative action" toward addressing hiring practices or outcomes that may unfairly or discriminatorily limit the number of women or racial minorities who are employed by the institution. The University, in compliance with federal mandates, collects and maintains statistical data designed to determine whether women or particular minority groups are underutilized in the University's workforce, as compared to their percentages in the available national and regional labor forces of any specific field of employment.

In accordance with federal definitions, minority includes persons legally eligible to work in the United States from the following groups: Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, and those identifying as having more than one race. While individuals of Asian descent are considered minorities by federal and University standards, the campus does not typically consider them as underrepresented, particularly as a percentage of the overall faculty and student body. Along with women and certain racial minorities, the University includes veterans and individuals with disabilities as among those groups warranting "affirmative action, positive and extraordinary, to overcome the discriminatory effects of traditional policies and procedures."

Affirmative Action does not mandate that individuals lacking the fundamental qualifications for a position be interviewed or hired. However, it does require that proactive and aggressive efforts be made to employ and advance women and minorities in areas where their numbers are few and inconsistent with their availability in the relevant labor market. In this way, Affirmative Action is not the same as simply a policy of nondiscrimination. The specific objective of Affirmative Action in regard to faculty recruitment is to make active efforts to expand applicant pools to be broad and inclusive of all groups, including the historically underrepresented. In such enhanced candidate pools, women and minority applicants commensurately gain a better chance of attaining employment in areas in which their presence has been traditionally marginal.

Since their inception in the 1960s and 1970s, Affirmative Action statutes and decrees have been the subject of periodic litigation, including a number of U.S. Supreme Court cases. It is likely that such legal actions designed to expand, limit, or abolish Affirmative Action policies and practices will continue into the foreseeable future. Further, it is possible that mandated changes occasioned by court rulings or legislation will have immediate implications for faculty recruitment at Indiana University and elsewhere. For information on the status and applicability of Affirmative Action policies on campus, please contact the IU Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity.

Enhancing the Candidate Pool

There are a number of recommended protocols and best practices that can both help bolster the number of women and minorities in applicant pools and assist institutions in successfully recruiting such faculty members. The suggestions in this section are by no means a comprehensive or exclusive list of such approaches. Units and schools are strongly encouraged to experiment with other methods and strategies that might better suit their circumstances.

It warrants mentioning here that women and minority faculty candidates, like other job applicants, desire to be evaluated for academic employment based upon their professional credentials. Most will not appreciate implicit or obvious indications that they are being recruited and judged primarily based on characteristics such as gender or race. Consequently, it is crucial that interactions with women and minority candidates for faculty positions be predicated upon their scholarship, qualifications, and potential academic role in the recruiting unit and Indiana University more generally.

In units that are especially successful in recruiting (and retaining) women and minority faculty members, contact with potential candidates often begins prior to the search process and continues well after the conclusion of any particular recruiting endeavor. One proven strategy for attracting talented applicants is the pipeline method. This approach may involve directly contacting graduate programs with large numbers of women and minority doctoral candidates, consulting fellowship directories and databases that list women and minority recipients, and inviting potential candidates to campus for events outside of official recruitment processes (e.g., brown-bag talks, campus conferences, and so forth). Such proactive measures should assist in diversifying candidate pools and, at minimum, help a unit to construct a “people to watch” list—which might include post-docs, graduate students, and/or rising assistant professors—that could be useful in future recruitment activities.

Much of the task of recruiting a strong and diverse faculty involves networking and information sharing. Employment opportunities and hiring decisions in many professions often revolve as much around who one knows as what one knows. Academia operates in much the same way. On this score, professional conferences and other such gatherings can be rich venues for meeting and cultivating potential faculty recruits. Personal, face-to-face encounters can heighten a prospective candidate’s interest in a university, since such direct, human contact tends to make institutions less abstract and remote. When these types of initial interactions are not possible, search committees should strive to present themselves as proactively engaged in encouraging a broad and diverse candidate pool. Such a recruiting posture sends a positive, welcoming message to potential applicants. Committees are advised to take full advantage of their own collegial contacts and networks to facilitate search objectives. This strategy might include contacting colleagues at other IU campuses to solicit nominations of candidates; sending job ads directly to women and minority candidates to encourage them to apply; sending job announcements to units and institutions that serve large minority populations; reaching out to post-docs and faculty candidates who may be under-placed at lower-ranked institutions; and requesting that faculty and graduate students of the recruiting unit distribute copies of job announcements at conferences and professional meetings that they attend. Even in instances in which a recruitment process does not result in the hire of a woman or minority applicant, it may be desirable to maintain contact with selected candidates for the purpose of future job searches.

Dealing with Unconscious Biases

Human beings are the sum totals of their experiences, values, and environments. As such, we are all susceptible to individual preferences and prejudices. Even when it comes to endeavors such as assessing job candidates, studies have shown that forms of unconscious bias and subliminal discriminatory impulses often shape the ways that we think about and convey our reactions to applicants. These kinds of responses might be triggered by the (assumed) gender or race of a candidate, or the disability status, academic credentials, or current employment profile of a job seeker. Since our biases condition our expectations, presumptions about a candidate’s “fit” or suitability for a particular position can operate to exclude applicants from a pool based on criteria unrelated to the advertised job description. Identifying such biases can assist a search committee in reducing the impact of extraneous considerations and judgments that often serve to unduly limit a candidate pool.

As with other aspects of the search process, committees should agree early on to allow for the open airing of opinions during every stage of the recruitment enterprise. Moreover, members should be encouraged to speak up in instances where unfounded assumptions may be shaping the committee's deliberations and conclusions. Conscientious leadership can keep most discussions on topic, and the search chair should also model assessment methods that avoid the negative influences of bias and baseless speculation. It should be noted that research has demonstrated that unconscious bias is not limited to one subset of the population, and committee members should not assume otherwise. That is, women sometimes harbor unsubstantiated presumptions about female candidates, and minorities can sometimes attribute unproven qualities and characteristics to candidates of color.

Unconscious biases come in all shapes and forms, thus it is not possible to catalog them in either their quantity or complexity. However, a number of common biases identified by researchers are triggered by assumptions and stereotypes regarding:

- Candidates with nonconventional career paths
- Candidates with nonconventional research interests
- Faculty applicants coming from minority-serving institutions
- Applicants from institutions other than major research universities
- Candidates who "fit" or are "like us"
- Job seekers with spouses or partners, who are believed to be harder to recruit or to accommodate
- Women who are pregnant or have small children (especially if they are single and untenured)
- Minority candidates who are presumed to not like small Midwestern towns
- The perceived capacity of women or minority applicants to run research labs, fundraise, negotiate the publishing realm, and supervise students and staff of a different gender or race/ethnicity

Furthermore, minority candidates who research subject areas that are not considered to be traditional often experience further marginalization when hiring committees do not value (or attempt to fairly evaluate) their research agendas, the venues in which they publish, or the communities that they perceive their scholarship as serving. Additionally, research has found that women applying for leadership positions routinely receive less favorable evaluations than men, since some view these female applicants as transgressing gender norms.

While it may in fact be impossible to completely exclude unconscious biases from candidate evaluations, there are a number of ways for search committees and recruiting institutions to recognize and address it. Beyond initially agreeing to talk freely and confidentially about job applicants, committees should endeavor to assess the whole application of each candidate, thus avoiding too much dependence on any single aspect, such as letters of recommendation, the prestige of the candidate's doctoral program, or the reputation of his/her current employer. Committees should periodically reevaluate their assessments in order to make sure that they have thought deeply about the issues of "merit" and "qualification," or whether there might be candidates "less like us" in the pool who could bring particular strengths and talents to the advertised position. At every step of the review process, the search committee should be able to defend any decision that ends or advances a candidacy. In a similar fashion, members should consider ahead of time whether certain decisions about the candidate pool will reduce the number of qualified minority and women applicants available and whether such outcomes are a product of influences unrelated to the job description or the agreed upon criteria for judging candidates.

Meeting the Candidate

Interviews

The interview stage is one of the most exciting and angst-inducing parts of the entire recruitment process for both the candidate and the search committee. This phase is usually the first time that the committee, as a whole, has the opportunity to talk with the candidate about research interests, teaching style, collaborative engagements, and other matters pertinent to the advertised position. While interviews convey to applicants that they have successfully passed a series of checkpoints in the search process, they also signal that the recruitment endeavor has entered a zone in which the stakes are more immediate and the scrutiny more probing.

Prior to interviewing candidates, a search committee should compose a list of questions related to the job as described in the advertisement. Each applicant should be asked the same basic questions, even if related follow-up inquiries (by either committee members or the candidate) may take the conversation into an unpredicted direction. The search committee chair should ensure that each committee member has a chance to ask questions and that no inappropriate queries are posed. The chair should also be certain to avoid inquiries and assessments based on unfounded assumptions about a candidate's race, gender, sexuality, age, personal appearance, marital status, religion, national origin, disability, military/veteran status, alma mater, cultural background, surname, and so forth.

Beyond the line of questioning, there are a number of acceptable methods and venues through which to conduct interviews. Non-campus interviews, or pre-interviews, usually take place prior to the more advanced stages of a search where finalists are invited to visit the recruiting institution. Interviews at professional conferences, by telephone, and via Skype or similar communications technology are all acceptable, as long as the candidate knows that the event is part of the formal screening process. Interviews in private residences, hotel bedrooms, bars, or forums that do not allow for real-time exchanges (including email, message boards, etc.) are to be avoided. If an interview is to be audio- or video-recorded, the committee should first ask the candidate for permission and disclose who will have access to the record. Such preserved interviews should be treated with the same confidentiality standards that govern other parts of the search process and documentation.

Campus Visit

Subsequent to pre-interviews and other early contacts with candidates, finalists for faculty positions are typically invited to campus for a multi-day visit. These trips—which require authorization by a dean and pre-approval by the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs in the case of tenured appointments—allow for both the recruiting unit and the applicants to gain a better sense of their compatibility, routinely incorporating meetings with faculty and students, appointments with administrators, and job-related demonstrations, including formal talks and classroom exercises. It is during these visits that further questions about the candidate's research interests, teaching methods, and service engagements can be more thoroughly explored, as well as the recruiting unit's expectations in these areas. The ideal campus visit fills in knowledge gaps about a candidacy that are not addressed by the submitted application materials and pre-interviews.

Once final candidates are selected, the search committee, working with the unit head, should immediately contact the short list of applicants. Finalists should be given a number of possible dates to consider visiting campus, since many will have to rearrange other commitments in order to travel to Bloomington. The search committee and the unit head, in consultation with each candidate, should draft an itinerary for the visit and provide a copy to each applicant prior to their arrival on campus. This schedule should include contact information for the department chair, search committee chair, and any staff members responsible for coordinating the visit.

Itineraries should be similar for each candidate, with designated meetings with the search committee, unit faculty, and selected students, as well as appropriate members of the campus administration (e.g., dean, vice provost, etc.). Since each candidate and their potential contributions are unique, itineraries can be customized to enhance the attractiveness of Indiana University as a prospective employer. Prior to the visit, candidates should be asked whether there are particular people—inside or outside of the unit—whom they would like to meet or places that they would like to go during their stay. It is best to refrain from assuming that candidates of particular demographic backgrounds will want to primarily see people, places, or events presumably related to their racial, gender, or cultural identity. Committee members should allow the candidate to offer suggestions, but be ready to supplement these requests with useful and relevant recommendations. Additionally, visitors should be asked whether they require any special accommodations or services that would make their time in Bloomington more pleasant.

A campus tour should be a required part of any recruitment itinerary, and a guided exploration of Bloomington is recommended. As a matter of course, candidates should be accompanied to appointments in a punctual fashion and occasionally allowed “down time” during various points of the visit. Hosted meals should be scheduled in advance at venues that reflect well on the University, with seating and noise levels that facilitate conversation. At no time during the visit should a candidate’s whereabouts be unknown to either the unit head or search committee chair. Nearly every university can recall its share of stories about visitors being inadvertently stranded at airports or lost somewhere on campus, tales that do nothing for the reputation of the host institution.

During the campus visit, each candidate must meet with a dean of the recruiting school. Optional meetings between applicants and other administrators, such as the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs, may also be arranged if such appointments might potentially facilitate the recruitment effort. The final meeting is typically with the unit head, who should be prepared to answer any lingering questions that the candidate might have about the position.

Campus visits are undeniably social and at least partially designed to gauge the collegiality of potential hires. However, like professional interactions in any other workplace, such visits should always be governed by professional protocols that are respectful of both the time and qualifications of the candidate and the integrity of the recruitment process. To this end, all questions or negotiations involving the specifics of job offers should be deferred to the department chair, the dean, or others in the chain of hiring authority. Personal inquiries unrelated to the advertised position should generally be avoided. Applicants may, in fact, offer details about themselves, such as age, marital status, or a diagnosed disability, but it is not the place of search committees or others to proactively inquire. Importantly, the only tactile interaction that is universally permissible in the workplace environment is a handshake, and all individuals involved in the recruitment process should be careful not to initiate any other forms of touching, including embraces, back-patting, hand-holding, and the like.

Final Stages

The Selection Process

Once the search committee determines that it is ready to make a hiring recommendation, it should make sure that this decision is based on the evidence accumulated regarding the qualifications of the chosen candidate(s) for the job as advertised. If committee members are explicit and clear about their evaluative criteria at the beginning of the process, the final decision-making should be correspondingly transparent and reasonable. In determining a finalist, the search committee members might want to separately rank the short list of candidates based on various criteria—for example, research productivity, pedagogical strengths, interdisciplinary engagement, potential contributions to the unit's mission, and so forth—and then compare rankings. Additionally, this final moment of the selection process provides yet another opportunity to reflect on whether known women or minority candidates have been eliminated from the candidate pool based on reasons or assumptions unrelated to the qualification requirements detailed in the job description. The committee chair should seek a consensus on a hiring recommendation that can be forwarded to the unit head and faculty for consideration. In the event of a less than unanimous committee decision, the majority opinion will determine the recommendation. Separate minority reports are discouraged, though the objections of dissenting members should be noted in the majority recommendation and allowed airing in any subsequent faculty meetings.

Making an Offer

A job offer may be negotiated with a candidate once the eligible unit faculty has voted on the search committee's recommendation and the unit head has approval from those with hiring authority (typically a dean) to negotiate terms of appointment. The unit head is the lead person in the negotiation process, and search committee members should avoid discussing any specifics of employment—such as salary, sabbatical leave, course scheduling, and so forth—with the candidate. A muddled negotiation process, like an uncompetitive job offer, can needlessly derail a recruitment enterprise.

During the negotiation process, the unit head should explicitly explain in writing the various terms of employment. These items would include beginning salary, start-up and research funding, course load and teaching expectations, service duties, appointment start date, any applicable leave time, the benefits package (including health insurance and retirement funding), and the availability of office space. The unit head should be careful not to promise items that cannot be delivered or that have not been previously approved by administrators with hiring authority. Offers to all candidates should be commensurate with rank and qualifications, ensuring women and minority finalists receive the same compensatory consideration as majority candidates. Additionally, the offer letter should clearly state that the appointment is ultimately contingent upon an affirmative vote by the Indiana University Board of Trustees.

After the Search

The search committee, unit head, faculty, and staff should all actively welcome new faculty members to Indiana University. Faculty recruitment is a collective endeavor and an institution-defining process, and these ramifications should figure prominently in the way that new colleagues acclimate to the campus. New faculty, particularly women and underrepresented minorities, often encounter significant challenges within various departments and schools. Consequently, units should be careful not to overburden them with extra "diversity" or gendered obligations that distract from their scholarship, teaching, and other duties as described in the terms of employment. Many new faculty members, including tenured professors, can benefit from both formal and informal mentoring, at least during the first years of employment. Consequently, departments, schools, and the campus in general should offer an array of options and opportunities for mentoring and collegial collaborations within and across unit boundaries.

Every search process should be wrapped up with a debriefing that includes the search committee, the unit head, and any other integral participants. Such a meeting allows for the discussion of the strengths and successes of a recruitment endeavor, as well as the identification of areas of difficulty that could have been better prepared for. At bottom, a thorough search process should produce institutional memory, reputational capital, and demonstrable best practices that serve the unit and the campus for years to come.

APPENDIX

Faculty Recruitment and Authorization System

Indiana University-Bloomington

Indiana University Offices & Resources

Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs
Indiana University
Bryan Hall 111
107 S. Indiana Avenue
Bloomington, IN 47405
Email: vpfaa@indiana.edu
Phone: (812) 855-2809

Office of Affirmative Action
Indiana University
400 E. Seventh Street
Poplars 825
Bloomington, IN 47405-3085
E-mail: affirm@indiana.edu
Phone: (812) 855-7559

University Human Resources
Indiana University
Poplars E165
400 E. 7th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405
Phone: (812) 855-2172

Indiana University (Bloomington). *Academic Guide*. <https://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/academicguide/index.php/Main_Page>

Indiana University. “University Policies.” <http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/academic-faculty-students/index.shtml>

Information Policy Office & Information Security Office. Indiana University. *Protecting Red-Hot Data: A Guide to Safe Handling of Critical Information*. <https://protect.iu.edu/sites/default/files/SensitiveDataFlippyBook2012.pdf>

Office of Affirmative Action. Indiana University. *Academic Recruitment & Search Guide*. <http://www.indiana.edu/~affirm/pdf/Publications/search_guide.pdf>

Office of Affirmative Action. Indiana University. “eDoc Lite Recruitment Guidelines.” <http://www.indiana.edu/~affirm/pdf/E-Doc%20Lite%20Recruitment%20Guidelines.pdf>

Additional References

ADVANCE Center for Institutional Change. University of Washington. "Interrupting Bias in the Faculty Search Process." < http://www.engr.washington.edu/lead/biasfilm/best-practices/>

"Best Practices for Search Committees."
<http://provost.upenn.edu/uploads/media_items/search-best-practices.original.pdf>

Division of Student Affairs, Equity and Diversity. Washington State University. *Best Practices for Recruiting and Hiring a Diverse Workforce*.
<https://hrs.wsu.edu/utils/File.aspx?fileid=3346>

Office for Equity and Diversity. University of Minnesota. *Best Practices in Recruiting and Retaining Under-represented U.S. Minority Faculty*.
<https://diversity.umn.edu/idea/sites/diversity.umn.edu.idea/files/Newest%20Verion%20of%20Supplement.pdf>

Office for Faculty Advancement. University of Washington-Tacoma. *Faculty Search Committee Briefing Handbook*.
<http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/global/documents/academic-affairs/uw_search_committee_handbook_-_april_2013_draft.pdf >

Office of Faculty Equity & Welfare. University of California-Berkeley. *Faculty Search Guide.*
<http://ofew.berkeley.edu/resources/fsg_prepsearchcom.shtml>

Office of Human Resources. University of Colorado. "Search Processes for Officer/Exempt Professionals." <http://hr.colorado.edu/es/OEP/recruiting/Pages/SGCommitteeRole.aspx>

Stacey W. Meyer and Shelli A. Herman. "Leading the Search Committee: A Guide for the Committee Chair." < http://www.aahea.org/aahea/articles/deptsearch.htm>

University of Minnesota. "Getting the Most from the Search Committee Process" (appendix to policy). < http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/hr/Hiring/RECRUITFACPA_APPD.html>

Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute. University of Wisconsin-Madison. *Reviewing Applicants: Research on Bias and Assumptions*.
<http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_2ndEd.pdf>