SEARCHING FOR EXCELLENCE AND DIVERSITY: EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP FOR THE COLLEGE OF LETTERS & SCIENCE PRESENTED SEPTEMBER 23, 2011

Submitted to:

Eve Fine Researcher and Workshop Coordinator, WISELI

Submitted by:

Julia Nelson Savoy Associate Research Specialist, WISELI

> Christine Maidl Pribbenow Evaluation Director, WISELI

> > January 27, 2012

Preparation of this document was made possible by grants from the National Science Foundation (NSF #0619979). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Table of Contents

I. DEMOGRAPHICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS	1
II. RATINGS AND COMMENTS ON WORKSHOP CONTENT	1
III. OUTCOMES: GAINED KNOWLEDGE AND RESOURCES THAT PARTICIPANTS WILL APITHEIR ROLE ON A SEARCH COMMITTEE	
IV. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS GIVEN BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS	3
A. IMPROVING THE WORKSHOP EXPERIENCE	3
B. TOPICS THAT PARTICIPANTS HOPED WOULD BE COVERED IN THE WORKSHOP, YET WERE NOT	3
C. WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS WORKSHOP TO OTHERS?	3
V. GENERAL COMMENTS	3
APPENDIX I. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	4

I. DEMOGRAPHICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Out of 16 invitees, 5 people responded to this survey for a response rate of 31%.

Title/Role on campus	%
Associate Professor	2 (40%)
Professor	2 (40%)
Other	1 (20%)

Role on Search Committee	%
Member of Search Committee	3 (60%)
Search Committee Chair	1 (20%)
Other	1 (20%)

The source that informed them of	
the workshop offering	%
Department Chair	2 (40%)
Attendance Required	1 (20%)
College Dean	1 (20%)
Email	1 (20%)

II. RATINGS AND COMMENTS ON WORKSHOP CONTENT

(Note: Written comments in this document are verbatim responses from workshop participants, altered in some cases to remove identifying information.)

Overall rating of workshop	0/0
Very Useful	3 (60%)
Somewhat Useful	2 (40%)
Not at all Useful	0 (0%)

Workshop Component	Not at all Valuable	Somewhat Valuable	Very Valuable	NA
Session I: Introduction (Fine)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)
Session I: Running an Effective and Efficient Search Committee (Fine)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)
Session I: Actively Recruiting an Excellent and Diverse Pool of Candidates (Stern, Palau, and Fine)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)
Session I: Evaluating the Pool of Applicants: Raising Awareness of Unconscious Assumptions and Their Influence (Martin)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)
Session I: Ensuring a Fair and Thorough Review of Candidates (Fine)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)
Session II: Small Group Discussion of Your Efforts to Recruit an Excellent and Diverse Pool of Candidates	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
Session II: Small Group Discussion of Your Evaluation of Candidates	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
Session II: Developing and Implementing an Effective Interview Process (Pinero)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
Session II: Questions and Answers about Dual Career Couples Program and Other Aspects of Interviewing Finalists (Mayberry)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)

Two comments were provided about the workshop's components.

- The last two segments probably could have been handled as a handout. The breakout sessions within each group could have been done as one group because everyone in the group could have taken advantage of the information provided. Some of this detail went unspoken.
- Many aspects of the workshop were obviously geared toward 'beginners.' I've been in the
 profession now for more than 30 years, so many of the points were redundant information
 for me.

III. OUTCOMES: GAINED KNOWLEDGE, ACTIONS PLANNED OR TAKEN, AND RESOURCES APPLIED ON PARTICIPANTS' SEARCH COMMITTEES

Knowledge, Action, or Resource	0/0
Created a diverse search committee.	0 (0%)
Consulted with the presenters or others on campus about conducting an effective search process.	1 (20%)
Discussed and/or established ground rules for the committee (e.g., about decision-making, attendance, expectations).	2 (40%)
Publicized the position in different venues (compared to previous searches).	0 (0%)
Used networking and other means to recruit a diverse pool of candidates.	0 (0%)
Used "Recruiting Resources" on WISELI's website.	0 (0%)
Used resources in the HR Recruitment Toolkit.	0 (0%)
Used resources provided by the Provost's Faculty Diversity Initiative (Strategic Pipeline and Recruitment Fund).	1 (20%)
Shared/distributed the brochure, "Reviewing Applicants: Research on Bias and Assumptions."	1 (20%)
Shared information about biases and assumptions.	4 (80%)
Developed and prioritized specific criteria for evaluation.	0 (0%)
Spent more time reviewing applications.	1 (20%)
Shared information about inappropriate questions for on-campus interviews and events.	2 (40%)
Considered needs and comfort of candidates when planning on-campus interviews.	2 (40%)
Relied on advice/resources in the Guidebook.	3 (60%)
Referred another person to this workshop.	1 (20%)

Some participants commented on additional actions that they completed or planned to do.

• Right before the search committee evaluated applicants, we invited a guest speaker who studies how first generation college students are disadvantaged in higher education. I believe that it helped search committee members realize and be attentive to the situations facing people coming from diverse social and cultural contexts.

- Prepare the search committee and the interview committees to prepare appropriate questions. Remove items of bias from their discussions.
- Most of this is not currently applicable, as we do not have a search in the pipeline this year.
- The workshop did not change my view of the search procedure, it helped me to reconfirm what we already had in place.

IV. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS GIVEN BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS

A. Improving the workshop experience (2 responses)

- Bring someone back from this group who had a successful recruitment/interview/hiring
 experience and have that individual present how this workshop benefited their
 recruitment and ultimately their department.
- My department does not have a problem with identifying diverse candidates. The problems arise with vetting and evaluation.

<u>B. Topics that participants hoped would be covered in the workshop, yet were not</u> (1 response)

• More emphasis on evaluation, including the screening that takes place before finalists are brought to campus.

C. Would you recommend this workshop to others?

100% percent of survey respondents reported they would recommend the workshop to others. One comment was provided about this question.

• It will be very hel[p]ful for colleagues who are new in the profession and never participated in a search before.

V. GENERAL COMMENTS

No general comments were provided about the workshop.

APPENDIX I. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Evaluation of Searching for Excellence and Diversity: A Workshop for Search Committees

1.	Your	title o	r role	on	campus:	
				1		



2. Your role on the search committee or in the search process:



3. Please rate the value of each of the aspects of the workshop (both Session 1 and Session 2) using the scale from 1-3. Also, feel free to include additional comments in Question 4.

	Not at all Valuable	Somewhat Valuable	Very Valuable	N/A
Session 1: Introduction (Fine)	\circ $_1$	° 2	° 3	O _{N/A}
Session 1: Run an Effective and Efficient Search Committee (Fine)	° ₁	° 2	° 3	° _{N/A}
Session 1: Actively Recruit an Excellent and Diverse Pool of Candidates (Stern, Palau, and Fine)	° ₁	° 2	° 3	° _{N/A}
Session 1: Evaluating the Pool of Applicants (Martin)	° ₁	° 2	° 3	° _{N/A}
Session 1: Ensure a Fair and Thorough Review of Candidates (Fine)	° 1	° 2	° 3	° _{N/A}

Disc	sion 2: cussion of uitment efforts	0	1	C	2	0	3	0	N/A
Disc eval	sion 2: cussion of uation of licants	O	1	c	2	0	3	0	N/A
Dev Imp Effe Inte	sion 2: elop and lement an ective rview Process ero)	0	1	c	2	0	3	0	N/A
Dua	sion 2: l-Career ng (Mayberry)	0	1	c	2	0	3	0	N/A
5. W	Thich of the follose check all that a	wing hav	ve you	done (or pl		-	-		rkshop?
	Created a divers Consulted with t campus about co process.	the prese	enters	or others on					
	Discussed and/o the committee (e attendance, expe	e.g., abo	ut deci						
	Publicized the p (compared to pro	osition i	n diffe						
	Used networking diverse pool of o	g and otl	ner me		iit a				
	Used "Recruiting website.			on WISELI's	s				
	Used resources i	in the HI	R Reci	uitment To	olkit.				
	Used resources praculty Diversit and Recruitment	y Initiati	•		eline				

	Shared/distributed the brochure, "Reviewing Applicants: Research on Bias and Assumptions."
	Shared information about biases and assumptions.
	Developed and prioritized specific criteria for evaluation.
	Spent more time reviewing applications.
	Shared information about inappropriate questions for on-campus interviews and events.
	Considered needs and comfort of candidates when planning on-campus interviews.
	Relied on advice/resources in the Guidebook.
	Referred another person to this workshop.
4	lease describe other activities you have done, or plan to do, because of this workshop:
	elease provide us with ideas or suggestions that would have improved your experience in this exshop:
8. V	What topics did you hope would be covered in this workshop, yet were not?
	Please provide an overall rating for this session. at all Useful Somewhat Useful Very Useful 2 3 C C
10.	How did you hear about this workshop?
11.	Would you recommend this workshop to others? Yes

	No
	Why or why not?
<u>12.</u>	Any other comments?
	<u>^</u>
4	

Please click on the SUBMIT button below. You will know that your results have been recorded if you see WISELI's website about Searching for Excellence & Diversity. Feel free to browse through these resources. Thank you for completing this survey!