

## DEHPD

### 17 Steps in the Hiring Process

1. Assessment of Needs for Positions
2. Role of Appointing Authority / Hiring Manager
3. Interview / Search / Selection Committees
4. Job Announcements / Descriptions (JDs)
5. Outreach, Recruitment, and Advertising (ORA)
6. Application Process
7. Screening Applications
8. Interview Questions (IQs)
9. Interview Process
10. Assessment of Candidates
11. Campus Forums (if applicable)
12. Reference Checks
13. Job Offer
14. Onboarding / Orientation
15. Employee Retention and Inclusion
16. Promotion and Career Advancement
17. Assessing the Hiring Process

*This booklet explains DEHPD's "17 Steps in the Hiring Process," including key questions to reveal potential barriers and best practices for each step.*

**Resources:** <https://sites.google.com/site/dehpdwactc/>

*For more information or to join the DEHPD listserv, send an email to Vik Bahl <vbahl@greenriver.edu>*



## 17 Steps in the Hiring Process

### *Potential Barriers and Best Practices*



**Collective of Professionals from the  
Washington State Community & Technical Colleges**

*Compiled and edited by  
Vik Bahl*

*DEHPD Collective co-founded by  
Vik Bahl, Michael Tuncap, and Tamar Zere*

*"17 Steps" (version 2.0) facilitated by  
Tina Young*

## Acknowledgments

### About DEHPD

- DEHPD (Diversity & Equity in Hiring & Professional Development) is a grassroots collective of employees from the 34 community and technical colleges (CTCs) in Washington state that annually serves approximately 400,000 students. DEHPD was formed in 2014 in order to address the low numbers of faculty, administrators, and staff of color and other underrepresented, marginalized groups throughout the CTC system.
- DEHPD brings together the experiences, expertise, and commitments of stakeholders at multiple colleges in order to develop collective analyses and proposals to address structural racism, unconscious bias, and other forms of exclusion with regard to the hiring process and professional development opportunities, among other aspects of institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- DEHPD has provided training and collaborated with key system stakeholders with regard to the hiring process, recruitment and mentorship, inclusive pedagogy, and professional development. DEHPD has collaborated with but is not an official part of the State Board for Community & Technical Colleges (SBCTC).

Contributors to “DEHPD’s Steps in the Hiring Process” (Versions 1 & 2): Beabe Akpojovwo, Marwa Almusawi, Vik Bahl, Tina Christian, DuValle Daniel, Sy Ear, Yoshiko Harden, Sachi Horback, Sayumi Ireya, Kimberly McRae, Maria Pena, Angel Reyna, Stephen Smith, Yvonne Terrell-Powell, Michael Tuncap, Betty Williams, Tina Young, and Tamar Zere.

*Copyright © 2018 DEHPD Collective. Use and adaptation of this document is permitted for non-commercial purposes with attribution.*

Three Green River College employees, Vik Bahl (English Faculty), Michael Tuncap (formerly Director, Officer of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion), and Tamar Zere (formerly Director, Workforce Education), began meeting in 2013 to strategize around the pervasive inequities and unaccountable leadership on their campus. Joined by Tina Christian (Educational Planner), Sy Ear (formerly Director, Career & Advising), and Liz McKinney (Counseling Faculty), this initial group of six people discerned that hiring practices were at the heart of what made the inequities so seemingly intractable, with all of the related issues around money, status, and the prerogatives of power. Moreover, they speculated that these problems were repeated on other campuses across the WA CTC system, and that the solutions would not be found by working through the highly constrained channels for trying to make change or by simply appealing to the moral conscience of leadership on any given campus.

Hence, drawing on networks established through the Multicultural Student Services Directors Council (MSSDC) and the Faculty & Staff of Color Conference (FSOCC), the original Green River group called the first meeting with representatives from multiple colleges on May 9, 2014. Seven more meetings followed over the next year at the following WA colleges: Bellevue, Seattle Central, Shoreline, Walla Walla, Everett, South Puget Sound, and Olympic.

A DEHPD conference, bringing together more than 100 staff, faculty, and administrators from the CTC system, was hosted at Bellevue College in January 2016. DEHPD representatives were also invited to present different aspects of our framework at MSSDC, the Human Resources Management Commission (HRMC), the Community and Technical College Leadership Association, the Instruction Commission (IC), and the WACTC Board of College Presidents.

In addition to the Green River 6, the following people should be recognized as having hosted or participated in the various meetings and presentations of DEHPD and for sharing their knowledge, experiences, passion, and large-heartedness: Beabe Akpojovwo, Marwa Almusawi, DuValle Daniel, Yoshiko Harden, Athena Higgins, Sachi Horback, Sayumi Ireya, Teresa Jones, Kimberly McRae, Neera Mehta, Maria Pena, Leslie Potter-Henderson, Angel Reyna, Stephen Smith, Yvonne Terrell-Powell, Rachel Wellman, Betty Williams, Leander Yazzie, Eileen Yoshina, and Tina Young. We also wish to acknowledge the support of Vice Presidents of Instruction Kenny Lawson (Skagit Valley College) and Rosemary Sutton (Cascadia College); Jan Yoshiwara and Devin DuPree of the SBCTC; and Rhonda Coates. We apologize if we have inadvertently excluded anyone from this list.

Together, we will strengthen our movement for diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education, one that demands accountability from leadership and institutions, while working to eliminate white privilege, exclusionary policies and practices, and institutional racism. Our movement recognizes the power of our histories, identities, and knowledges to carve out new collective spaces for building relationships of mutual support and mentorship. We will continue to develop impactful collective analyses and proposals, collaborating purposefully with inspiration, creativity, and camaraderie, in order to fulfill our commitment to social justice and institutional transformation.

## WA CTC DEI Initiatives and Organizations

- Multicultural Student Services Directors Council (MSSDC)
- Faculty & Staff of Color Conference (FSOCC)
- Student of Color Conference (SOCC)
- Social Justice Leadership Institute (SJLI)
- Cross-Institutional Faculty of Color Mentorship Program
- Administrators of Color Leadership Program
- American Federation of Teachers (AFT) – Civil & Human Rights Committee
- Washington Education Association (WEA) – Human & Civil Rights Committee

## DEI Resources and Tools

- DEHPD Resources: <https://sites.google.com/site/dehpdwactc/>
- Multicultural Competency Interviewing Rubric (MCIR), Yvonne Terrell-Powell and Ernest Johnson
- AFT Seattle Colleges District MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) on faculty hiring.
- DEI-KSAs to Diversify Faculty Hiring, SBCTC, Instruction Commission
- Search Advocates Training, Anne Gillies, Oregon State University
- Cognitive Errors, JoAnn Moody
- Departmental Diversity Self Study (D2S2), Green River College

## Table of Contents

- I. About DEHPD
- II. Premises and Propositions
- III. 17 Steps in the Hiring Process
- IV. Frequently Asked Questions
- V. WA CTC Initiatives and Organizations
- VI. Resources and Tools
- VII. Acknowledgments

## Premises and Propositions

- A. DEHPD's framework does not violate Initiative 200 (1998), nor does it give preferential treatment to the hiring of people from any specific groups. Rather it foregrounds 1) how colleges can be in better compliance with Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) law; 2) the DEI-KSAs (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion - Knowledge, Skills, Abilities) that embody institutional commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion; 3) the DEI-KSAs that are critical to establishing a culture of success for all students and more specifically our increasingly diverse students; and 4) the processes of institutional racism and implicit bias that govern both the hiring process and campus culture more broadly in predominantly white institutions.
- B. Closing the demographic disparities between employee racial diversity and our student populations, along with the communities that comprise our service areas, is crucial for the improved success of students of color and other underrepresented, marginalized groups, as well as for achieving social justice and racial equity more broadly.
- C. Racial equity and accountability to the needs and aspirations of the increasingly diverse communities in WA state become possible when we place the hiring practices of the CTCs at the center of our efforts.
- D. DEHPD leads with and centers race and racial equity, focusing on historically marginalized communities within the United States. We understand diversity in relation to disparities in power, access, and opportunity, including an historical understanding of structural and systemic violence. We also recognize the significance of intersectional identities, and the varying experiences, positionalities, and knowledges of people within our system based especially on class, gender, gender identity, sexuality, and disability.
- E. Notwithstanding how institutions and systems report employee demographics, it is crucial to disaggregate diversity data and have critical conversations, so that we are being specific about the underrepresented, marginalized, and underserved racialized communities to which we are calling attention, including in data collection; assessment of needs; identifying gaps in DEI-KSAs among employees; etc. Therefore, DEHPD recognizes the distinction between underrepresented and marginalized (minoritized) populations (also designated as "Underrepresented Minorities" (URM) in some institutional contexts) vs. people of color (POC) in general.

believe that improving the status, compensation, and working conditions of adjunct faculty is mutually exclusive from the urgency of diversifying full-time faculty.

- H. *Doesn't an emphasis on DEI narrow the pool of qualified candidates? We don't have the time or financial resources required to undertake further ORA for diverse candidates.*

**Response:** DEHPD is asking for a systematic review of each institution's hiring processes in their entirety, as well as a re-examination of the requirements and competencies for our employees to meet the needs of our increasingly diverse students. Diversification of the workforce will not happen accidentally without sincere commitment and the allocation of resources to reach out to those with deeper DEI-KSAs, whether through more sophisticated trainings or through more strategic ORA.

- I. *Doesn't DEHPD's framework represents political correctness and liberal bias rather than an evidence-based method for improving student success?*

**Response:** There is substantial research that shows the positive impact of diverse faculty and staff on all students, especially underrepresented, marginalized, and underserved students when they can see their histories and identities reflected and validated. Moreover, we do not retreat from a commitment that dismantling institutional racism and counteracting implicit bias must be part of educational institutions' missions and strategic plans.

- J. *Does this framework imply that many white campus members are racist and that they are not sincerely seeking to hire the most qualified people, which would be unfounded and offensive assumptions?*

**Response:** There is a difference between individual racism and institutional racism; and there is a difference between conscious racism and implicit or unconscious bias. DEHPD asks institutions, search committees, and appointing authorities to recognize implicit biases related to assumptions about relevant knowledges, excellence, and collegiality, as well as to re-examine the KSAs that faculty and staff truly need to support equitable student success. Good intentions are not sufficient to counteract institutional racism and unconscious bias, which instead require continuous reflection, intentionality, and the transformation of institutional policies through the meaningful inclusion of diverse underrepresented campus stakeholders.

D. *Isn't focusing on DEI-KSAs illegitimate since these are not an essential part of most job duties?*

**Response:** Job duties are neither static nor isolated, and positions should evolve based on societal and institutional changes, as well as evolving best practices and innovations across higher education. Institutions must recognize the value and urgency of making space for the needs and subordinated knowledges of underrepresented, marginalized communities by making some threshold of DEI-KSAs an important part of the job duties of *all* employees.

E. *Doesn't the greater emphasis on DEI-KSAs disadvantage white candidates who should not be expected to be experts in DEI for the essential job duties of most positions?*

**Response:** Based on college missions around access and equitable success, the disparities in student success and in employee demographics point to needs and problems that must be urgently addressed. DEHPD does not ask candidates for all positions to be experts but to have more than superficial DEI commitments and competencies, which white-identified candidates should also have engaged meaningfully.

F. *Is DEHPD implying that the current faculty, staff, and administrators are not committed to serving the needs of ALL students?*

**Response:** Most current faculty, staff, and administrators are indeed committed to serving all students and have often distinguished themselves with brilliance, sincerity, hard work, and dedication over many years of service. However, acknowledging gaps in demographics, DEI-KSAs, and other competencies should not be seen as an indictment of the valuable KSAs that are already represented in any department or area as much as seeking complementary capacity growth on behalf of unmet needs both in the present and future.

G. *Isn't the attempt to diversify full-time faculty at the expense of adjunct faculty who have often given years of their life under exploitative conditions that may not have allowed them to gain the DEI expertise that you are seeking?*

**Response:** There is no doubt that adjunct faculty need greater support and opportunities for more full-time positions and professional development, as well as better workplace conditions and contractual protections. However, the adjunct faculty ranks also need to be diversified and supported to build DEI competencies. DEHPD does not

F. DEHPD recognizes the differences (and overlap) between representing vs. serving students of color (and other marginalized populations). While both categories point to laudable motives, they both can also risk paternalism, the deficit model, and self-interested careerism.

G. Salaries constitute the major bulk of college operating expenses (80-85%). Therefore, disparities in employee demographics based on inequities in the hiring processes are central to reproducing white privilege and hierarchy on any campus and in dispossessing marginalized communities of color of meaningful employment and income in public higher education.

H. DEHPD rejects the notion that the disparities in employee demographics can be explained by a lack of qualified applicants or that implicit bias training for search committee members and improved advertising will solve the problem. Improved training and ORA (outreach, recruitment and advertising) are necessary but not sufficient steps in the hiring process.

I. DEHPD recognizes the multiple factors and processes of institutional structural racism that impact hiring practices and employee retention, including a lack of institutional commitment and resources regarding Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI); microaggressions as manifestations of unexamined white privilege, fragility, and resentment; nepotism and favoritism; confining notions of collegiality; insufficient numbers of supervisors and administrators with DEI expertise and commitments to ensure equitable hiring; among other aspects.

J. DEHPD does not automatically accept institutional statements and intentions around DEI in the hiring process at face value. Moreover, institutions may see themselves in a much more positive light than evidenced via campus feedback from marginalized students, employees, and community members. Established leadership and campus members in varying positions and at multiple levels of the institution must champion equity and inclusion, which means examining and dismantling the prerogatives of institutional power and control, such as nepotism, favoritism, and other exclusionary practices that create inequitable opportunities in the filling of positions.

K. Underrepresented and equity-minded staff in particular should make use of the "17 Steps" to empower themselves and to seek acknowledgment and support for their right to be involved in a

campus's or department's hiring process, even if they are not directly involved on a particular search committee.

- L. DEHPD acknowledges and honors the qualifications and experiences of candidates of color and rejects the implication that candidates of color are less qualified or need standards and qualifications lowered in order to be competitive. However, by foregrounding DEI-KSAs, DEHPD's framework does call for the re-examination of existing standards and qualifications, especially the sufficiency of the DEI-KSAs distributed within any given department or the college as a whole.
- M. Ensuring equity in the hiring process requires intentional institutional and cultural change, vision and leadership of the president, as well as the Chief Diversity & Equity Officer (CDEO) and other identifiable DEI leaders on campus if such positions exist. Moreover, multiple stakeholders must organize and assert their voices, rights, and "distributed leadership" to achieve situated collective authority and impact, whether at a departmental, committee, or campus-wide level, in order to shift the practices, policies, and culture that may have previously operated without adequate intentionality, scrutiny, or accountability.
- N. DEHPD's "17 Steps in the Hiring Process" should not be seen as a blueprint but rather as a tool and a framework and set of guidelines whose effectiveness will depend upon the parties making use of it. Moreover, because hiring outcomes are the result of multiple stakeholders, DEHPD recognizes the importance of relationships, respectful collaboration, and maturity in balancing the complexities of competing interests.

## Frequently Asked Questions

- A. *Does DEHPD's framework violate Initiative 200 and other laws relating to affirmative action? Is it a form of reverse racism that seeks to exclude white candidates?*

**Response:** DEHPD is not asking to give preferential treatment to specific groups. Rather we are calling attention to aspects of the hiring process that are not equitable, whether because of implicit bias or because of insufficient transparency and accountability for leadership. In addition, we must be strategic and intentional in bringing and fostering greater DEI competencies among faculty and staff if we are going to be responsive to the needs of our increasingly diverse students, as well as in compliance with Equal Employment Opportunity law.

- B. *Why does DEHPD focus on race rather than other marginalized identities, including gender, sexuality, disability, religion, age, veteran's status, etc.?*

**Response:** DEHPD centers race because research has shown persistent and longstanding disparities for key racialized communities. Applying the concept of intersectional identities, each of these communities also includes internal diversity and marginalization, based on gender expression, sexuality, disability, class, veteran's status, etc. DEHPD also recognizes and supports the inclusion of these marginalized identities of those who may identify as white. However, we are also mindful of the ways in which a generalized framework of equity has been often used to dilute and shift focus away from racial equity.

- C. *Who gets to count as being part of "underrepresented, marginalized, and underserved populations"?*

**Response:** In many institutions, "underrepresented minority" (URM) refers to African American, Latinx, Native American, and Pacific Islander communities. However, institutions must also recognize the wide diversity of opportunity within the broad category of Asian and Asian American, as well as the exclusions of newer immigrant communities that may not be regarded as historically underrepresented, marginalized, and underserved based on the impact of Islamophobia, xenophobia, and the criminalization of the undocumented and refugees.

## Step 17: Assessing the Hiring Process

1. What happens if there is insufficient diversity in the candidate pool at any stage or if a search has to be re-opened for some other reason?
2. What data are collected for individual searches and for the overall hires in any given year?
3. How is feedback collected on the hiring process, both from applicants and from committee members?
4. Is there an annual review of hiring for the institution?
5. Does the institution develop an intentional plan for its hiring needs and goals for the following year?

### **Best Practices**

1. When a search has to be re-opened, NEW eyes should review the JD for artificial barriers, especially around qualifications but also around clarity and focus of the position.
2. When a search has to be re-opened, ORA should be re-examined and more resources should be allocated.
3. Searches should include self reflection and feedback by committee members at the close of the process—what worked, what didn't, and what can be improved in the future.
4. Demographics should be collected on applicant pools, semi-finalists, finalists, those hired, those promoted or appointed internally, and committee composition.
5. There should be an annual report of all new and replacement positions that went through a hiring process, as well as internal promotions and appointments. The report should be reviewed and analyzed by various stakeholders.
6. The institution should develop a hiring plan for the following academic year with attention to DEI needs and strategies.

## 17 STEPS IN THE HIRING PROCESS

### Step 1: Assessment of Needs for Positions

1. How are the needs for new and replacement positions assessed? Who has input on and decision-making authority for that assessment?
2. How are diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) factored into the assessment of needs for a position, including disparities with regard to student achievement, retention, completion, and demographics; faculty, staff, and administrator demographics; and the needs of underrepresented marginalized communities in the service area?
3. How are DEI gaps in the staffing of a particular department or employee class factored into the assessment of needs for a new or replacement position with regard to the existing DEI knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs); cultural and equity competencies; and capacity to serve marginalized student populations?
4. How are budgetary decisions made in relation to new and replacement positions?

### **Best Practices**

1. Seek out and act upon feedback from identified campus diversity organizations and underrepresented student representatives and leaders when possible.
2. Undertake a departmental dialogue and assessment with regard to DEI as part of assessing the need for new positions.
3. Consider ALL positions in relation to disparities in student opportunity and achievement.
4. Consider ALL positions in relation to existing diversity and DEI-KSAs within a department or employee class (complementarity) rather than seeing positions in isolation, which should inform the development or revision of the job description (see Step 4).
5. Use campus demographic and climate survey data when possible.
6. Identify and use resources to re-assess qualifications for a given position to clarify needs, as well as to eliminate favoritism and artificial barriers.

## **Step 2: Role of Appointing Authority / Hiring Manager**

1. How does the appointing authority factor in the assessment of needs (Step 1) in advocating or budgeting for various positions?
2. How will the appointing authority receive and genuinely factor in feedback from relevant stakeholders, departments, and constituencies, especially those with DEI expertise, in shaping the position?
3. What process and timeline is to be followed?
4. How does the appointing authority justify an open vs. an internal search or an internal interim or permanent appointment? How is equity factored into this decision?
5. How is the need for diversity and equity in hiring new or replacement positions balanced with the desire to reward faithful service? How are favoritism and nepotism demonstrably avoided?
6. How will the appointing authority make the decision in relation to the search committee's recommendations?
7. What criteria will the appointing authority use to cancel or re-open a search based on insufficient diversity or numbers at each stage of the hiring process: initial screening of applications, those who are offered an interview (semifinalists), and finalists (ranked or unranked)?

### ***Best Practices***

1. Appointing authorities, hiring managers, and supervisors should have more than basic training, expertise, and mindfulness regarding DEI for EACH stage of the hiring process.
2. Be mindful of nepotism, favoritism, and rewarding obedience over innovation.
3. Provide some oversight and direction in the crafting of job descriptions based on DEI needs assessment (Steps 1 & 4).
4. Provide some oversight and direction with regard to the composition of search /interview / selection committees (Step 3).
5. In conjunction with HR and an analysis of "workforce availability," support minimum diversity in a pool at each stage of the hiring process.
6. Be intentional about how many finalists are required and whether they are to be ranked or unranked.
7. Take a "second look" at candidate applications from interview (semi-finalist) stage to finalist stage.
8. Track demographics of who gets opportunities for internal advancement.

## **Step 16: Promotion and Career Advancement**

1. In which departments or areas are promotional opportunities concentrated?
2. What are the building blocks of promotion and advancement at the institution or in a department?
3. What opportunities for leadership development are provided? To whom?
4. How does the institution bring awareness of and work to counter the ways in which privilege and power are maintained and dominant culture reproduced through promotions?

### ***Best Practices***

1. Ensure professional development and leadership opportunities and resources for all staff, specifically including underrepresented staff and faculty (especially adjunct faculty) to increase the pool of competitive candidates for positions as they become available at the institution or within the system.
2. Support employees to develop and fulfill professional development plans, including finding suitable mentors.
3. Create space and opportunities for employees to share their DEI-KSAs and experiences and to expand their application and effectiveness.
4. Be open to allowing for the expansion of job duties with suitable compensation based on the DEI-KSAs an employee may bring.
5. Track demographics of promotions and career advancement.



4. Faculty tenure committees should be formed with representation in mind in relation to the claimed marginalized identit(ies) of the new faculty member, including attention to race, gender, sexuality, disability, etc.
5. Acknowledge, value, and make space for the knowledge and authority that diverse employees may bring based on their expertise, lived experience, and community relations.
6. Recognize and compensate the additional work that underrepresented faculty or staff may be doing with regard to DEI, including informal mentorship of students of color.
7. Train and hold supervisors accountable on equitable evaluation, support, and the identification of and response to microaggressions in their areas. Don't deny, downplay, or seek to equalize the stated experiences of staff of color around microaggressions.
8. Provide regular in-depth training and continuing education on various urgent DEI topics, including microaggressions; white privilege, supremacy, and fragility; inclusive pedagogy; cisgender privilege; cultural competencies; community engagement; etc.
9. Integrate DEI elements into all employee evaluations. Support employee growth in DEI, but don't overinvest in retaining someone who persists in inappropriate behavior or an unacceptable level of DEI competency and commitment.
10. Underrepresented employees should understand the various mechanisms in addressing workplace DEI concerns with their colleagues and supervisors, ranging from a formal HR complaint process to more informal methods of conflict resolution. They should feel protected and supported in such processes.
11. Campus employees should understand the circumstances and processes, perhaps via case studies, whereby administrators, staff, and faculty may be disciplined, remediated, lose their job, or not be renewed for inappropriate behavior and speech or inadequate cultural competency.
12. Address concerns raised by regular campus climate surveys and other feedback mechanisms.
13. Conduct meaningful exit interviews with staff who leave with mechanisms and protections to get honest feedback about campus climate, workplace experience, and the potential limits or problems the exiting staff may have had with supervisors and administrators.

### **Step 3: Interview / Search / Selection Committees**

1. At what stage are interview committees formed (i.e., before or after the writing and posting of the job announcement)?
2. What is the composition of the interview committees? Who has the right to be represented? Who should be represented? Who has the relevant expertise to be represented?
3. What implicit bias and/or DEI training do interview committees receive? Do committee chairs receive a higher degree of training?
4. Are there members with specific DEI expertise and training (e.g., diversity and equity reps)? Are these employees acknowledged and supported by their supervisors and colleagues?
5. How are committee members prepared to assess the relevant DEI-KSAs, subject matter expertise (SME), and cultural competencies of applicants?

#### ***Best Practices***

1. Search committees should be diverse, including underrepresented members.
2. Substantive trainings on the hiring process should be offered regularly throughout the year, including implicit bias, DEI-KSAs, collegiality, alternative excellence, nontraditional qualifications, as well as assessing applications, demeanor, and answers to DEI questions.
3. Committee chairs should have additional training in order to lead a successful and equitable search process.
4. Committee chairs should develop a viable timeline with a sufficient number of preparatory meetings to develop or revise job descriptions (JDs), application rating criteria, interview questions, presentation prompts, and/or teaching demonstrations that reflect a DEI lens; interview timeslots; and assessment of candidates for the finalist stage.
5. Committee members should have a realistic understanding of the amount of time required of them during the entire search process (20+ hours).
6. Interview committees should be formed before job descriptions are finalized, so that multiple committee members, including those outside the immediate department, may review the JD, as well as contribute to the Outreach, Recruitment, and Advertising (ORA) process as they can.
7. Each committee should include at least one non-departmental member with recognized expertise in diversity and equity (e.g., a diversity and equity representative), whether voting or not. The diversity-equity reps should be involved early enough in the process and be respected to review and contribute to the JD; ORA strategies; interview questions and presentation prompts; screening applications and selecting semi-finalists; the interview process and committee culture; selecting and

describing the strengths and weaknesses of finalists; planning for reference checks; and strategizing for orientation/onboarding.

8. Committees may choose to include an underrepresented student member (based on achievement gap statistics), chosen through a campus diversity office rather than through student government.
9. Track the demographics of hiring committees.

## **Step 4: Job Announcements/Descriptions (JDs) Overlap with Steps 1 and 8**

1. Who writes, revises, reviews, and approves job announcements? How many sets of eyes?
2. At what stage of the hiring process are job announcements reviewed and revised?
3. Which minimum and preferred qualifications ask for substantial cultural and professional competencies around diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI-KSAs)? How are these woven throughout other sections of the job announcement?
4. Do the minimum and preferred qualifications avoid artificial barriers?
5. Which supplemental questions (if any) address DEI experience and competencies?
6. Are part-time faculty and staff position announcements also carefully reviewed with a DEI lens before being posted?

### ***Best Practices***

1. Search committee should be formed early enough to participate in the development and revision of the job announcement/description.
2. If a job announcement is to be posted BEFORE a search committee forms, it should be reviewed by more than one or two department members and the supervisor in consultation with the appointing authority. Ideally, there should be review by other stakeholders and college members with some diversity/equity training, e.g., an established and trained group of diversity/equity representatives from which search committee members may also subsequently be drawn.
3. ALL job descriptions should be reviewed carefully and revised as necessary rather than simply using a previous version on file.
4. One or more DEI-KSAs should be discipline or function specific, based on reflective dialogue and research by the committee or department, e.g., in Financial Aid vs. Advising or in Business vs. Photography. What current DEI innovations are developing within any given field or department?

## **Step 14: Onboarding / Orientation**

1. How is the new staff member oriented?
2. What other forms of support will the new staff have?
3. What is communicated about how the new staff member will be evaluated, what professional development opportunities there may be, and any other relevant resources?

### ***Best Practices***

1. Provide support and resources for new staff members to have mentors, not necessarily from their own departments.
2. Provide training and resources for the new staff member's transitional period.
3. Address real campus climate issues and other potential problems with the new employee with intentionality, honesty, and support.
4. Involve campus diversity organizations in orienting and welcoming new underrepresented employees.

## **Step 15: Employee Retention and Inclusion**

1. What specific resources and strategies are in place to anticipate the needs and support the success and aspirations of underrepresented staff (classified and exempt) and faculty (full-time and adjunct)?
2. How has the department or institution thought through the social integration of new underrepresented staff and faculty?
3. How are staff and faculty to be evaluated?
4. What mechanisms and support systems are in place for remediation and for addressing complaints?
5. How qualified are supervisors to address the needs and experiences of underrepresented faculty and staff of color, including how they may experience microaggressions on campus from colleagues and students?

### ***Best Practices***

1. Support the establishment of and meaningful roles for campus DEI entities (committees and councils) with leadership from underrepresented staff and faculty.
2. Facilitate and support the establishment and sustenance of affinity groups.
3. Provide ongoing mentoring, with opportunities for employees to choose mentors.

## Step 12: Reference Checks

1. At what stage are reference checks conducted?
2. Who conducts the reference checks, an individual, more than one person, HR, etc.?
3. How do reference checks assess the candidate's DEI-KSAs and experiences?
4. Will those on the list of references allow for an accurate and multifaceted picture of the candidates and their experiences, or is the list too narrow?

### **Best Practices**

1. Reference checks should be respectful, professional, and generous.
2. Those checking references (or the entire search committee) should have deliberated about how to assess candidates' DEI-KSAs and experiences rigorously rather than superficially.
3. Taking into account time, availability, and consistency in the process, more than one committee member should listen to or correspond with referees.
4. Be equitable in seeking additional background information on candidates.

## Step 13: Job Offer

1. Who makes the job offer?
2. Are salary and benefits negotiable?
3. What resources and flexibility are available to make competitive offers?
4. What professional development opportunities are part of the job offer?
5. What is communicated about onboarding, orientation, and next steps?

### **Best Practices**

1. Be intentional about how much flexibility there is in an offer, whether with regard to salary, relocation, anticipated professional development and training, timeline, etc.
2. Job offers should be made in a welcoming and inclusive way.
3. Relocation support and resources should be culturally responsive.
4. Give contact info for relevant people to whom the new employee may pose questions, including recognized DEI representatives.
5. Provide info and answer questions about the onboarding process, professional development opportunities, and retention initiatives.

5. Job announcements should clarify the importance of direct and meaningful experience, community engagement, and/or leadership directly serving marginalized populations.
6. Some qualifications can include a range of possible desired experiences and expertise by using "or"; e.g., "Substantial knowledge in Native American Studies OR Latino/a/x Studies"
7. Each college should develop thoughtful standard language for all JDs regarding how the institution sees the value of DEI. When appropriate, add contact information for a designated diversity-equity leader to the JD so that applicants may pose questions regarding campus climate if they so wish.
8. Colleges and departments should deliberate and develop criteria for determining the number of years of experience truly needed for positions rather than listing an arbitrary number or privileging candidates with the most years of experience.
9. Minimum and preferred qualifications, when possible and appropriate, should not be so specific or high that they automatically exclude people with non-traditional backgrounds, including education and professional experiences.
10. The process for hiring and developing JDs for adjunct faculty and part-time staff should also include DEI elements and a DEI lens.
11. Recognize that unconscious implicit bias can be present in the crafting of a JD as the department or committee attempts to envision ideal candidates.
12. Early thinking about ORA (Step 5) may inform the framing of the JD.

## Step 5: Outreach, Recruitment, and Advertising (ORA)

1. Who is responsible for ORA? Which additional stakeholders can be brought in for ORA?
2. How much money is allocated for ORA?
3. To what extent is ORA passive (e.g., advertising) vs. active (relationship building)?
4. To what extent is ORA discipline specific as opposed to generic?
5. How much time is allowed before a job search is closed? How does the presence of internal candidates impact the timeline?

### **Best Practices**

1. Advertise in and/or subscribe to publications, networks, and other venues with diverse readership and membership as well as

demonstrated success in recruiting and promoting underrepresented candidates.

2. Identify and cultivate potential “pipelines” for candidates for various positions and employee groups, e.g., university graduate programs.
3. Support additional stakeholders to be involved in ORA for specific positions, including campus diversity organizations, members of search committees, etc.
4. Build relationships with diverse, culturally responsive organizations, institutions, and individuals who can promote your job opportunities.
5. Allocate budget to send campus representatives to recruit at venues with a high concentration of underrepresented candidates, including discipline-specific and general employment venues.
6. Allocate additional budget for ORA for those positions for which a diverse pool of underrepresented candidates may be less likely.

## **Step 6: Application Process**

### **Point of view of applicant**

1. How clear and streamlined is the application process? Does it avoid redundancy?
2. Does the application process avoid artificial barriers, e.g., asking for too many elements up front?
3. How do applicants get clarification during the application process?
4. Is there a policy or process to follow up with applicants in case of any missing information?
5. How is DEI woven into the application process, e.g., in the form of supplemental questions?

#### ***Best Practices***

1. Application process should be streamlined without unnecessary redundancy.
2. Committees/supervisors should reflect on at what stage letters of reference and transcripts will be required to reduce barriers.
3. Each college should have clear and consistent follow-up protocol for contacting applicants if applications are incomplete.
4. DEI questions should be substantive and thoughtful rather than generic, including the education, training, application or outcome of skills, and leadership.
5. Applicants should be informed about whom to contact for questions about campus climate.

8. Recognize the differences (and overlap) between representing vs. serving students—note that both categories can risk paternalism, the deficit model, and self-interested careerism.
9. Expect DEI-KSAs and community engagement to be substantial, but recognize that DEI-KSAs and experience are not all or nothing—they can include varying levels of awareness, participation, support, and leadership. Committees and appointing authorities should consider seriously the minimum level of DEI-KSAs to meet the needs of the position and institution (see MCIR: Multicultural Competency Interviewing Rubric).

## **Step 11: Campus Forums (if applicable)**

1. Which positions include open campus forums, and why?
2. How is the forum, talk, or workshop advertised and contextualized for which segments of the campus?
3. Is the forum, talk, or workshop taped and made available to those who cannot attend?
4. How is the candidate hosted and supported during the campus visit?
5. What are the potential DEI elements of the campus forum to be assessed?
6. How is feedback solicited, and how is it considered within the final decision?

#### ***Best Practices***

1. Encourage attendance from campus DEI organizations/committees, as well as underrepresented and underserved student groups.
2. Forum topic/prompt should include elements of DEI and/or community engagement.
3. Search committee should review written feedback from those who attended the campus forums.
4. Forums should be videotaped with a link provided to the campus community so that those who cannot attend can still review them and provide feedback.
5. Minimally, all administrator positions should include open campus forums with opportunities for campus feedback.

## Step 10: Assessment / Ranking of Candidates Strengths and Weaknesses

1. How significant are the candidates' DEI experiences, knowledge, skills, approaches, and competencies in the assessment of their interview performance?
2. What critical awareness do hiring committees have around the criteria for and potential biases around "collegiality" and professionalism and their implications for excluding candidates?
3. How much weight is placed upon each section of the interview process? For example, how much importance is placed on question responses vs. a presentation or teaching demonstration?
4. How much time is allotted to discuss differing assessments by the committee members and the attempt to reach consensus?
5. How many viable finalists are to be put forward by a committee, and what happens if that number cannot be reached?
6. Are the finalists to be ranked or unranked before reference checks and before being sent to the appointing authority?

### **Best Practices**

1. Committee members should be aware of and resist the impulse to reproduce themselves through the hiring for this new position.
2. Be aware that not all candidates may be equally comfortable in all of the modes that may be part of the interview: Q&A, presentation, demonstration, banter, etc. Be mindful of placing undue importance on any one modality or minor errors in interpreting prompts.
3. Teaching demonstrations, presentations, or mock scenarios should be assessed with a DEI lens even if DEI is not an explicit part of the prompt.
4. Committee members should not automatically discount candidates who are more nervous or less polished; nor should they automatically privilege the most experienced and polished interviewees.
5. Do not allow the focus on collegiality, which is culturally coded and loaded, to dominate assessment; recognize that outstanding colleagues may not be your future best friends, while posing useful challenges to "business-as-usual" and entrenched ways of thinking.
6. Be willing to invest resources in training a new hire rather than automatically privileging those who can "hit the ground running" and those with the most experience.
7. Give priority to those candidates who have the DEI-KSAs to represent and/or serve (in a variety of ways) one or more marginalized and underserved student populations with achievement/opportunity gaps.

## Step 7: Screening Applications

1. Who does the initial screening of applications for minimum qualifications, HR or the search committee?
2. How is the gray area interpreted with regard to an applicant who may not appear to meet all of the minimum qualifications?
3. How is diversity of a pool assessed at each stage, with attention to applicant demographics? (data not to be shared with the search committee during the hiring process)
4. What are the criteria and protocol to cancel or re-open a search because of insufficient diversity?
5. How and when is the number of applicants to be interviewed determined?
6. How does DEI factor into the ratings guide for the review of applications to select candidates for interview (semi-finalist stage)?
7. How are candidates informed that they were or weren't selected for an interview?
8. Is a travel reimbursement ever offered for semi-finalists and/or finalists?

### **Best Practices**

1. Track demographics at each stage: applicant pool, interviewees (semi-finalists), finalists, and those offered the job (data not to be shared with the search committee).
2. A DEI lens should inform ratings of candidates (rubrics and scoring sheets) to review applications, cover letters, and resumes/CVs.
3. Substantive, authentic, and thoughtful DEI responses should be expected in a cover letter and/or responses to any DEI supplemental questions.
4. Travel reimbursements should be considered for those positions where a broader search expanding beyond the state has been deemed necessary.

## Step 8: Interview Questions (IQs)

### Also: Presentations & Demonstrations

1. Who is involved in writing or revising the interview questions and other presentation prompts?
2. What specific experiences, knowledges, skills, philosophy, and qualities is each question trying to solicit and assess?
3. Which interview questions seek to measure DEI-KSAs, subject matter expertise (SME), education, experience, cultural competencies, and leadership?

#### **Best Practices**

1. Interview questions, presentation prompts, and demonstrations should assess a range of relevant past experiences, approach and personality, knowledge and understanding, and what candidates expect to bring to the position or campus.
2. In finalizing the IQs and other prompts, committees should clarify what they are seeking from each one, as well as possible average, good, and excellent answers.
3. Interview questions around DEI, cultural competencies, and community engagement should be substantial and get at specific DEI-KSAs and experiences rather than being limited to asking for statements of commitment and value. Avoid recycling generic or token diversity question.
4. DEI questions should not be so overly specific or detailed that candidates attempt to give the committee what they think it wants rather than sharing their authentic experiences and answers.
5. More than one IQ or prompt should allow the committee to assess candidates DEI-KSAs and experience.
6. Interview prompts should include more than one modality for responding or sharing experience and KSAs, including questions, presentations, demonstrations, role play, hypothetical scenarios, etc.

## Step 9: Interview Process

1. How are interviewees supported to prepare for the interview (e.g., information about committee composition, presentation prompts, maps, parking, etc.)
2. How are applicants welcomed to or escorted on campus? Are they offered a campus tour?
3. Are there any aspects of the interview process that may create artificial barriers or that may not be inclusive, accessible, or equitable?
4. Are committee members prepared to respond to DEI questions from candidates?

#### **Best Practices**

1. Be hospitable and warm. Have water, notepad, and pen available if needed.
2. Be sympathetic to legitimate glitches that may occur relating to parking, lateness, location, technology, etc.
3. Selection committee members should reflect on their own implicit biases during the interview itself (not just during any earlier training), especially with regard to notions of collegiality and excellence.
4. A designated committee member with DEI expertise (diversity-equity rep) should be empowered to play a productive and recognized role.
5. Discuss whether to give candidates a printed version of (some) interview questions, whether right at the outset or for a fixed amount of time beforehand (e.g., 15 minutes).