Evaluation of the Search Process

Evaluation of the Search Process is an instrument designed to collect data that describe the nature of faculty searches. These data are collected as search committees complete their hiring process. Below is a compilation of four years of data.

Over the four years, the Evaluation of the Search Process was administered to 205 search committee members via Qualtrics. Sixty-seven search committee members completed the evaluation, yielding a response rate of 33 percent.

UNDERSTANDING THE COMMITTEE’S RESPONSIBILITIES

Participants were asked about their understanding of their responsibilities as a search committee member. A majority of respondents (88%) indicated that they had a good or very good understanding of their responsibilities at the onset of the search.

Q1

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMMITTEE’S RESPONSIBILITIES (N=67)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY POOR</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were asked which documents were discussed at the onset of the search. Multiple documents were discussed. Most search committee members indicated that LMU’s mission statement (n=55) and the college/school or department strategic plan (n=44) were discussed.

### Q2

**WHICH DOCUMENTS DID THE COMMITTEE DISCUSS AT THE ONSET OF THE SEARCH?** (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

*Count does not add to total (n=67) because respondents were asked to mark all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount University Mission Statement</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, School and/ or Department Strategic Plan</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing Applicants: Research on Bias and Assumptions</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interculturalism: Definition, Vision and Goals</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount University Strategic Plan (Sections 4 and 5)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Bar chart showing the number of respondents for each document discussed.](chart.png)
DEPARTMENT REVIEW REPORT

When asked about their responsibilities related to the development of the Department Review Report, participants’ responded that they were the primary author, a contributor, not involved in the development, or did not know what the department review report was. Forty respondents provided comments.

Q3

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT REVIEW REPORT.
N=40

10
I wrote the report.

21
I assisted in the collaborative process.

3
I was not involved in the development of the report.

6
I did not know about the Department Review Report.
Guidelines for Recruiting and Hiring Exceptional Teacher-Scholars for Mission recommend that search committees identify advocates for three areas: Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount Identity, Ethnic Diversity, and Gender Balance. Approximately, three-fourths of respondents indicated that advocates were identified for the search process.

Q4

DID THE COMMITTEE IDENTIFY FACULTY WHO ASSUMED THE ROLE OF ADVOCATING FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- 49 LMU as a Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount University
- 52 Ethnic Diversity
- 49 Gender Balance
REASON ADVOCATES WERE NOT IDENTIFIED

When applicable, participants were asked why an advocate was not identified. Four respondents indicated that advocating was a shared responsibility. A few respondents stated that they did not know why advocates were not identified.

Q4A

IF NO, WHY WAS AN ADVOCATE NOT IDENTIFIED?

4  We considered it a shared responsibility.

3  I don’t know.
Participants were asked about the search committee’s attitudes toward hiring for mission and identity, ethnic diversity, and gender balance. Most respondents indicated that the search committee had favorable or strongly favorable attitudes.

**Q5**

**PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COMMITTEE’S ATTITUDE TOWARD HIRING FACULTY:**

- **For Gender Diversity** (n=65)
  - Strongly Favorable: 44
  - Favorable: 12
  - Fair: 5
  - Unfavorable: 1
  - Strongly Unfavorable: 3

- **For Ethnic Diversity** (n=65)
  - Strongly Favorable: 45
  - Favorable: 11
  - Fair: 6
  - Unfavorable: 0
  - Strongly Unfavorable: 3

- **Supportive of LMU as a Catholic/Jesuit/Marymount University** (n=65)
  - Strongly Favorable: 34
  - Favorable: 18
  - Fair: 9
  - Unfavorable: 3
  - Strongly Unfavorable: 2
Please describe your responsibilities during the development of the committee’s Mission- and Culturally-Sensitive Position Announcement.

N=50

11 Sole or Primary Author
22 Contributor
15 None
2 I did not know
ADVERTISING THE POSITION

When asked about where the position announcement was advertised, participants stated the Chronicle of Higher Education, discipline specific publications or listservs, and affinity groups (i.e., Association for Asian Performance, Association for Women in Mathematics, Journal for Ethnic Minorities in the Profession, National Society of Black Engineers, The Hispanic Theological Initiative, etc.).

Q7

PLEASE LIST THE JOURNALS, LISTSERVS, DISCIPLINE-BASED NETWORKS, NEWSPAPERS, AND OTHER MEDIA OUTLETS WHERE THE POSITION WAS ADVERTISED.

19 Chronicle of Higher Education

28 Discipline specific media and publications

19 Affinity Groups
ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES TO BUILD A MISSION-ORIENTED DIVERSE POOL OF APPLICANTS

Respondents were asked about additional strategies they used to build a mission-oriented diverse pool of applicants. The most cited strategy was utilizing a personal touch.

PLEASE IDENTIFY ANY ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES THE COMMITTEE IMPLEMENTED TO BUILD A MISSION-ORIENTED DIVERSE POOL OF APPLICANTS? (Please check all that apply) *

- Used a personal approach to recruit scholars who work in the Catholic intellectual tradition, and with women and historically underrepresented minorities (e.g., a letter, email or telephone call to inform individuals about the position) - 27
- Mailed the Mission- and Culturally-Sensitive Position Announcement(s) to professional and academic organizations that serve women and/or historically underrepresented minorities - 23
- Asked colleagues to refer women and historically underrepresented applicants - 21
- Asked Department Chairs at leading Catholic universities to recommend prospective applicants - 15
- Distributed the position announcement at conferences and/or academic meetings primarily attended by women and/or historically underrepresented minorities - 13
- Consulted the Lilly-Network and Collegium lists for prospective applicants - 3
- Used other strategies - 6

*COUNT DOES NOT ADD TO TOTAL (N=67) BECAUSE RESPONDENTS WERE ASKED TO MARK ALL THAT APPLY.
SELECTION OF APPLICANTS FOR PRELIMINARY INTERVIEWS

When asked about the factors that influenced the selection of applicants for preliminary interviews, responses varied.

WHAT FACTORS IDENTIFIED IN THE DEPARTMENT REVIEW REPORT AND POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT INFLUENCED THE SELECTION OF APPLICANTS FOR PRELIMINARY INTERVIEWS?

- Mission: 15
- Experience in the field: 10
- Teaching: 10
- Diversity: 10
- Research: 8
- Fit: 8
- Leadership: 2

Q9
CAMPUS INTERVIEWS
Respondents indicated they invited between 2-5 candidates to campus for interviews.

Q10
PLEASE INDICATE THE NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INVITED TO CAMPUS FOR INTERVIEWS?

CANDIDATES
1. 33%
2. 27%
3. 20%
4. 13%
5. 7%
CAMPUS VISIT
Questions 11, 12, and 13 asked about specific offices, representatives, and groups that candidates could choose to visit.

Q11
WERE CANDIDATES OFFERED THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Participate in conversations with faculty (e.g. question and answer session, teaching/research presentations, etc) 59
- Engage in conversations about the Catholic Identity of the University 46
- Meet with faculty outside of the department who share similar backgrounds and/or interests 40
- Meet with staff who share similar backgrounds and/or interests 27
Questions 11, 12, and 13 asked about specific offices, representatives, and groups that candidates could choose to visit.

Q12

During campus visits, did candidates have the opportunity to meet with representatives from one or more of the following offices (please check all that apply):

- Human Resources: 41
- LMU’s Children’s Center: 14
- Intercultural Affairs: 11
- Campus Ministry: 6
- Mission and Ministry: 6
- Center for Ignatian Spirituality: 2
- Committee on the Status of Women: 1
- Other opportunities provided to candidates during campus visits (See page 16): 22
Q13

During campus visits, did candidates have the opportunity to meet with representatives from one or more of the following affinity groups (please check all that apply):

- African American Faculty and Staff Association: 6
- Asian Pacific Islander Faculty and Staff Association: 4
- Committee on the Status of Women: 5
- Faculty and Staff Gay/Straight Network: 6
- Latina/o Faculty Association: 6
- Latina/o Staff Association: 2

Campus Visit: Other Opportunities Provided to Candidates:

- Housing (8)
- Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (6)
- Campus Tour (3)
- Dean (2)
- Department Chair, Campus Tour during which colleagues in other areas of the University were introduced
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ALIGNMENT WITH POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

Respondents were asked how the interview questions aligned with position announcement. All respondents stated that mission and identity were part of the announcement and interview. Many followed up by asking how mission and identity is translated into their teaching, research, and service. Respondents also asked about diversity and interculturalism.

Q14

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ALIGNED WITH THE COMMITTEE’S MISSION- AND CULTURALLY-SENSITIVE POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT.

Mission and Identity (35)

“Interview questions aligned very closely with the position announcement. We asked, e.g., why the candidate was interested in teaching at a Catholic university, how they addressed issues of interfaith dialogue, and how they would respond to teaching across a broad field? How do you understand yourself to contribute to LMU’s Catholic and Marymount Identity? What theoretical approaches do you employ in your research and teaching that reflect race, class, gender, sexuality and religious diversity and sensitivity? What resonates with you in regard to LMU’s Mission statement?”

Diversity and Interculturalism (12)

“The questions at the beginning of the interview included: You were asked to read the Mission and Goals of LMU. What aspects of the Mission and Goals resonate with you most? LMU is a Catholic university in the Jesuit and Marymount traditions. How would you see yourself contributing to the Mission and Goals of this university and the School or College? Please tell us about your experience working with diverse student populations and how this experience shapes your work?”

“What do you see as the major challenges for students in the major at this time in our culture? If you could change the world in three ways, what might they be? What do you do to get to know your students - their backgrounds and experiences which they bring to class that influences how they learn from you.”
EVALUATING CANDIDATES

Respondents used a variety of methods to evaluate candidates, including the initial screening worksheet and student evaluations.

Q15

PLEASE IDENTIFY THE TYPES OF STANDARDIZED FORM(S) YOUR COMMITTEE USED TO EVALUATE CANDIDATES (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

- Initial screening worksheet to determine whether candidates meet minimum qualifications (37)
- Student evaluations of candidates (34)
- Evaluation of candidate's campus visit (30)
- Checklist for references (25)
- My committee did not use standardized forms to evaluate candidates (16)
- Other (please describe):* (11)
**EVALUATING CANDIDATES (OTHER-PLEASE DESCRIBE):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A checklist that they submitted all the materials requested for the application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Faculty/staff rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Search Committee Interview Questionnaire and Faculty/Staff Rubric and CVs posted on Blackboard for committee and administration review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>We used our forms based on the standardized forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Reading of papers, interviews at meetings with an agreed-upon list of necessary questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Open forum during the general meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>We developed a form for screening the candidates according to our search criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Skype interview as a first screening method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Candidates were screened according to verbal inputs from the faculty. No screening worksheet was used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Standardized Interview forms (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINALIST DID NOT ACCEPT AN OFFER

Respondents were asked why a finalist did not accept LMU’s offer for a position. Most respondents stated that finalists had other (better) offers or opportunities.

Q16
IF A FINALIST WAS OFFERED THE POSITION AND DID NOT ACCEPT, WHAT REASONS DID HE/SHE PROVIDE?

Other offers or opportunities (9)
“Better salary elsewhere.”
“Female candidate refused an offer because she had other opportunities.”
“Our first choice candidate did not accept our offer. She had offers from two other universities. While LMU was her top choice in terms of what she was looking for in a place to work, in discussion with her spouse, they decided that they were unable to relocate to Los Angeles because they did not want to live in this urban environment.”

Not applicable (10)
Q17

IF THE POSITION WAS NOT FILLED, **DESCRIBE THE REASONS FOR THE FAILED SEARCH.**

*EVALUATING CANDIDATES (OTHER—PLEASE DESCRIBE):*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The finalist withdrew her name several weeks after the search was considered closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>This is a complex answer. Essentially our finalists who were schooled in cultural studies and were female candidates of color did not possess the skills to teach the level and style and safety of technique essential for our program. These finalists strongly stated they wanted to teach technique as part of their assignments. This posed an irreconcilable dilemma. One of the candidates who was a top researcher with a record of notable publication wanted to do creative work as a central part of scholarship, and her creative work was simply not of the standard creative work should meet. One of the candidates was a superb technique teacher but was not strong in cultural or media studies. We will need to re-shape our job search, and we have several clear ideas how to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>African American females in engineering have many more opportunities than those at LMU. They are in high demand, and they command higher salaries than LMU offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not applicable (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEARCH COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

As shown in question 18, search committees comprised 3-6 or more faculty members.

Q18

Please indicate the number of faculty on the search committee. Shown in question 18, search committees comprised 3-6 or more faculty members.

(N=58)
As shown in questions 19 and 20, few students served on search committees. Student input was gathered in other ways including the candidate’s job talk or through special meetings.

Q19

Using the drop-down menu, please indicate the number of students who served on the search committee.

N=52

- 0 students: 88%
- 1 student: 10%
- 2 students: 2%
### Q20

**IF STUDENTS DID NOT SERVE ON THE SEARCH COMMITTEE, DESCRIBE THE ACTION(S) TAKEN TO OBTAIN STUDENT INPUT (I.E., PARTICIPATING IN A MEAL WITH A CANDIDATE, PROVIDING FEEDBACK DURING THE CANDIDATE’S JOB TALK):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STUDENTS INVITED TO TEACHING PRESENTATION/JOB TALK (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“We had each candidate make a classroom presentation and solicited student input. We also invited them to the job talk given primarily to faculty.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STUDENT MEETINGS (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Students active in the department met with each candidate and submitted feedback/report to the committee.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FORMED A SEPARATE STUDENT SEARCH COMMITTEE. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“We formed a separate student search committee. It was composed of 7 members (2 men, 6 women; 2 seniors, 3 juniors, 1 sophomore, and 1 freshman; one of these students was a transfer student; 2 students of color; 2 students who self-identify as Gay; 3 with double majors; 2 seeking work in community based arts education and cultural presentation; 4 deans list type students and 3 good but not stellar academic students. The students were trained in Search Committee Protocol and instructed on mission and diversity issues. Students developed a set of questions for candidates and met with candidates over lunch. Students attended a class taught by the candidate. Students met and discussed responses and used a matrix for discussion. Co-chairs of the Student Search Committee met with the faculty and presented the written and oral report of findings and recommendations. Students who took the class filled out assessment forms. Overall assessment and response forms were posted on the Bulletin Board for any student who wished to add additional commentary. We did not include a student on the Faculty Search Committee because we have two internal candidates and this would have been very awkward. Also, we learned from last year’s failed search, that the work of a separate student search committee was invaluable. Students thought deeply and learned a great deal about leadership as well.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The final questions asked participants to provide suggestions on how the search process could be improved. These responses varied.

### Q21

1. **PLEASE IDENTIFY WAYS THE SEARCH PROCESS CAN BE IMPROVED. PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE. GREATER FACULTY INPUT BEFORE THE AD IS WRITTEN. (POSITION DESCRIPTION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greater faculty input before the ad is written. (Position Description)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Better training on how to prioritize department goals and still make sure the search is consistent with university goals. (Aligning university and department goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Money interviews at the meetings - this is crucial to convince people that LMU is an interesting place, in particular, minorities. More flexibility in the hiring process when additional positions open up in the department and good/interesting candidates applied for the position out there (why lose the opportunity to hire someone if the position can/will be reassigned to a department? why can that not be determined in a fairly fast manner?) give everybody on the search committee access to the same material ask also seasoned faculty members that serve on a search committee to take something like Harvard’s implicit bias test, so they are aware of the pitfalls. (Hiring more than one person from a pool of applicants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My personal feeling is that our search committee was not able to do any of the activities that I learned about during the Identity &amp; Mission training day. I am very disappointed with the search process in my Dept. I am also very disappointed with the current guidelines in my department which follow the mantra of “if it isn’t broken, don’t fix it.” In short, I think the process has to be rebuilt. (Failure to follow LMU’s Guidelines for Search Committees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It was easy for the committee to dismiss my overtures to identify and highlight those who had characteristics and backgrounds that fit the gender/mission/catholicity standards of the university. I said what I wanted to say and they moved on as if I had said nothing. Somehow, we need to find ways to ensure that committee members take these issues seriously. (Silencing Search Committee Member)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT (CONTINUED)

The final questions asked participants to provide suggestions on how the search process could be improved. These responses varied.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I believe the search was sensitive to these issues. It would be helpful if the University would be clear about qualifications - there was some debate about whether ethnicity/gender should be more important that other qualifications (whether a less qualified candidate that was from an underrepresented group should be selected before above more qualified candidates that weren’t from underrepresented groups), or whether ethnicity should direct selection from among the most qualified candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students need even greater orientation about their role in the Search Process and more detailed information about all the aspects that go into choosing a final candidate. Our students, in the end, felt decidedly let down that the “choice” of most of the students was not selected. To some extent, this was probably inevitable, but in hindsight, we could have created an even more informed context. We shortened the interview process from last year – only one class and shorter faculty interview session. This was more effective. (Orientation for Students who Participate in Faculty Searches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Include students on the search committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If anything I feel that the entire process was too cautious, too weighted down with protocols and was consequently immensely time-consuming, took way too long, consumed too many resources and ultimately was designed to be so completely fair that it various ways it ultimately strung some candidates along when, in reality, it was generally known (if not confessed) that they wouldn’t ultimately get offered the job. (Ignore LMU’s Guidelines to shorten the search process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There needs to be better communication about how to write an acceptable announcement. Also, there needs to be more information about dates and deadlines. The job announcement posted in the Chronicle of Higher Education runs for too short of a period. I was shocked to learn that our ad was not running up until our deadline. There was poor communication about the length of time the announcement would run. I attended a workshop related to hiring, and I felt the entire time that this was useful information that was made accessible too late in the game to be helpful. (Guidelines on writing a Mission and Culturally-Sensitive Position Announcement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>