



**Learn about research on implicit biases and consciously strive to minimize their influence on your evaluations.**

- Awareness of the problem and a desire to evaluate fairly can reduce the impact of implicit biases.

**Increase the diversity of the search committee.**

- If necessary, bring in faculty from related departments to ensure a diverse group will be reviewing applications.

**Increase the diversity of the applicant pool.**

- Having 30% or more women in the pool increases the likelihood that a woman will be hired.
- Be active in seeking out qualified female candidates – don't wait for them to apply.
- Ensure that the job ad is sufficiently broad to cast a wide net.

**Develop evaluation criteria prior to evaluating candidates and apply them consistently to all applicants.**

- Research shows that people use different standards to evaluate male and female candidates, and can shift the weight of these criteria to favor male candidates.
- Establishing *a priori* structured, job-related criteria produces more accurate evaluations.
- Requiring both positive and negative comments for every candidate helps avoid bias.

**Spend at least 20 minutes reviewing each applicant's file.**

- When rushed or distracted, evaluators tend to rate women lower than equally qualified men.

**Consider all elements of an applicant's file, and avoid weighting one or two items most heavily.**

- Letters of recommendation, in particular, tend to be weaker for women than for men due to the implicit bias of the letter writer.
- Consider the quality, not the quantity, of publications.

**Consciously ask yourself whether each female candidate is being fairly reviewed.**

- Are certain assumptions being made, *e.g.*, about authorship, accomplishments, possible family responsibilities, whether the candidate would "fit in", etc. that would unfairly impact female candidates?

**Be able to defend each decision, whether to eliminate or advance a candidate.**

- Holding reviewers to a high standard of accountability reduces the influence of biases and assumptions.

**Require every search committee member to discuss each candidate during the committee meetings.**

- Don't let a vocal minority unfairly sway the discussion of candidates.

**Place at least two women on the short list / campus visit list.**

- Having more than one woman prevents "tokenism".
- Consider creating several short lists, weighting different criteria highly (*e.g.*, research productivity vs. teaching experience); then take the top candidates from each separate list as your final short list.
- If you don't have two highly qualified women in your pool, take a step back and engage in additional active recruiting efforts to produce a more diverse pool.

**During interviews, focus on the candidate's scholarship and his/her ability to perform the functions of the job.**

- Send the message to candidates that the university and department are interested in their scholarship and skills, not their demographic characteristics.
- Again, have pre-determined evaluation criteria and interview questions that are applied consistently to all applicants; be sure they are distributed to all faculty members meeting the candidate.
- Every faculty member (not just members of the search committee) should review the types of questions that are illegal or inappropriate.

**During interviews, provide opportunities for candidates to meet a diverse range of people.**

- Ensure that candidates will see people "like them" on campus
- Market the campus as a positive and welcoming environment

Want to learn more? Institutions involved in the NSF ADVANCE program have produced numerous on-line resources. These are good places to start:

[http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/recruitment\\_stride](http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/recruitment_stride)

[http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure\\_2ndEd.pdf](http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_2ndEd.pdf)