EDI in Psychology Department Faculty Hiring
Prepared by Sari van Anders and the EDI Committee, 11.04.21, Last Revised 03.09.22

Our department has a number of policies and practices surrounding hiring faculty members. These are important, useful, and clearly delineated. Some are formal and documented, and others are carried out but not recorded. Many have explicit or implicit intentions around EDI. At the same time, our department still overrepresents those who are not from equity-deserving groups. This has serious costs to our department, Psychology as a field, our students, and our larger community (e.g., Government of Canada, 2012; Milem, 2005; Stewart & Valian, 2018). Fortunately, research is clear that modifying policy is one of the most, if not the most, important and impactful ways to facilitate EDI (Stewart & Valian, 2018). This includes improving the EDI climate in a department and increasing faculty representation from equity-deserving groups.

In this document, we propose a set of policies to put our EDI principles into practice and maximize the likelihood of positive EDI change in our department's hiring processes and outcomes. Some of these policies formalize ongoing practices; others introduce new practices to our department. The goals of these policies in relation to EDI and hiring are threefold: (1) that our hiring increases representation of faculty members from equity-deserving groups, (2) that we hire people with lived experience related to those equity-deserving groups that will support positive EDI change in our department, and (3) that we hire people who are interested in, invested in, and committed to positive EDI change in our department. We have five proposals:

-
-
-
-
-

General Questions about EDI in Hiring:
1. *Why should we evaluate candidates on EDI?* EDI is already a departmental and QUFA criterion for hiring. This is likely because we, as a department, larger university community, and faculty, agree that our university and department need to change, and that the continued underrepresentation of equity-deserving groups needs to be addressed. Evaluating candidates on EDI is an impactful approach to doing this. This is also consistent with guidelines from the Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat (TIPS), which recommend that hiring committees evaluate candidates' records related to EDI as a step towards creating an equitable, diverse, and inclusive research environment through hiring practices.
2. *Is it fair to evaluate candidates on EDI?* As noted, EDI is a departmental criterion for hiring; additionally, we are required to consider it according to university and QUFA guidelines. Our hiring ad contains extensive language about EDI and directs candidates to submit EDI statements. Candidates know that EDI is a part of the hiring process and submit EDI statements, so it behooves us to evaluate candidates on all criteria we set for applications.
3. *How can we evaluate candidates on EDI in a way that considers career stage?* We can evaluate what each candidate has done and what their potential is for EDI, just like we do when we evaluate research and teaching. Fortunately, all candidates have the opportunity to get involved in EDI efforts at any stage (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral, professor). These include opportunities in universities, communities, academic societies,

research, teaching, labs, mentorship, volunteer work, knowledge translation, media involvements, and more; they may involve participation, leadership, developing activities, and more. In addition to evaluating past EDI involvements, we can also evaluate candidates' *plans* to incorporate EDI into their academic involvements.

4. *What if candidates haven't had a chance to be involved in EDI efforts? Is it fair to evaluate them in this case?* Everyone has had the chance to be involved in EDI efforts (see #3 above). Some people have chosen to do this and/or make it a priority, and some have not. By focusing on records as well as plans, we can be sure to take seriously what people have prioritized and spent time on. We do this when we evaluate candidates' potential based on factors like their record of publications and involvement in teaching/mentoring students (with the idea that this is a strong predictor of the likelihood of future success in these areas), as well as their plans and future ideas (because this helps us understand their independence, creativity, and so on). Therefore, evaluating people on their EDI involvement record and plans is consistent with our existing approach to hiring. Note: sometimes people who have not been extensively involved in EDI efforts – often not members of equity-deserving groups – can be surprised by the range of people's EDI activities, even early in schooling or their career, and wonder whether it's fair to evaluate candidates on past/current EDI involvement. But, excitingly, many candidates' EDI involvements are broad, deep, exciting, and truly transformative. Let's ensure we value what people have done, which is quite impressive, as well as their potential.

5. *Why should we use rubrics rather than our general judgement? Isn't quantifying EDI a problem?* While many people feel uncomfortable about rubrics for evaluation, Psychology as a discipline has shown repeatedly that the opportunity to evaluate in a systematic fashion decreases bias and prejudice, leading to more accurate and fair evaluations (Uhlmann & Cohen, 2005; Stephens et al., 2020). Our general judgement still matters with rubrics, but in a systematized form. We already quantify phenomena challenging to measure, including research record, research aptitude, teaching ability, and, outside of hiring, student performance (i.e., with grades). Quantifying is not perfect, but it carries more benefits and less biased outcomes than other approaches (Allen & Yen, 2021; Stewart & Valian, 2018).

References

Allen, C. & Yen, J. (2021). *Planning for Faculty Hiring: A Webinar on Search Committees, Assessment Rubrics & Job Ads.* University of Washington, Advance Center for Institutional Change. Retrieved July 5, 2021, from https://advance.washington.edu/sites/advance/files/2021-05/Committees%20Rubrics%20and%20Ads%20Workshop%20Slides%20Final_website.pdf

Government of Canada. (2012, November 29). *Creating an Equitable, Diverse and Inclusive Research Environment: A Best Practices Guide for Recruitment, Hiring and Retention.* Government of Canada, Industry Canada, Canada Research Chairs. Retrieved October 14, 2021, from https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/best_practices-pratiques_examplaires-eng.aspx.

Milem, J. F., Chang, M. J., & Antonio, A. L. (2005). Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective. Washington, DC: Association American Colleges and Universities.

Stephens, N.M., Rivera, L.A., & Townsend, S.S.M. (2020). The cycle of workplace bias and how to interrupt it. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 40*, 100137.

Stewart, A. J. & Valian, V. (2018). *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence.* MIT Press.

Uhlmann, E.L., & Cohen, G.L. (2005). Constructed criteria: Redefining merit to justify discrimination. *Psychological Science, 16*(6). 474-480.

Proposal 1: EDI Interview and Evaluation During Candidate Visits

One useful practice that our department introduced in the 2020-2021 hiring year was an EDI interview. The EDI Chair interviewed candidates and provided feedback via the general faculty evaluation form. Research shows that a specific focus on EDI can improve EDI outcomes (e.g., Government of Canada, 2012; Smith et al., 2015). However, this practice is not currently a formalized part of our department's hiring policy—and, there is no formalized mechanism for others in the department to comment specifically on candidates within an EDI context.

Proposal:
We propose that the department a) formalizes the EDI interview practice during candidate visits by adding it to our department hiring policies, and b) offers a formalized mechanism for all department members to comment on candidates within an EDI context. Specifically:
   a) The EDI Chair (or their delegate, identified by the EDI Chair or EDI Committee) meets with all candidates during their interview in one of the existing 30-minute slots.
      i) They ask each candidate a pre-set and consistent set of questions (see Appendix A).
      ii) They score each candidate on a pre-set rubric designed specifically for this interview to evaluate EDI activity and potential (see Appendix B).
      iii) They submit an evaluation for each candidate that focuses on EDI using the existing evaluation template all faculty use and identifying their submission as the EDI evaluation. They will indicate "yes" or "no" to supporting the appointment of each candidate based on their EDI evaluation, and provide extensive justification in the comments section. They can also choose to submit an evaluation from outside their EDI lens.
   b) Other faculty members may also have had the opportunity to evaluate candidates within an EDI context (e.g., based on their interactions or meetings with the candidate, the candidate's answers to Q&As, the candidate's diversity statement). To solicit faculty's evaluation of candidates in this framework, an additional section that specifically focuses on EDI could be added to the feedback forms (e.g., with wording such as "Please provide your evaluation of this candidate on the basis of EDI considerations."). The search committee attends to these EDI evaluations carefully and thoughtfully, as they do other evaluations, when making their recommendations about whom to hire.

Questions About this Proposal:
1. *Why is this needed?* The EDI interview approach is useful because one person is tasked specifically with focusing on EDI in the hiring process, and can do so consistently across candidates. In addition to this, the amended feedback form gives the explicit opportunity to all other faculty involved to evaluate the candidates based on EDI. This combination of approaches will yield both focused and consistent evaluations of EDI across candidates, as well as broad input from a variety of members about candidates' EDI activity and potential.
2. *How would the candidates be evaluated by the EDI Interviewer?* The interviewer will use the pre-set questions and rubric for scoring. Each candidate will be given a score on each rubric item as well as justifying comments and a final score. The interviewer will use this score to help complete the feedback form that all faculty submit. Specifically, the feedback form asks raters to indicate "Yes" or "No" to the question "I support the appointment of this candidate", and the reasons for this. This allows the EDI interviewer to use the same feedback form as

other faculty to ensure consistency of feedback and focuses the feedback on the interviewer's recommendation (yes/no) and its justification, rather than on numbers. This also ensures that the EDI Chair considers whether the candidate is *acceptable* on the basis of EDI or not.

3. *Does this confer lots of and potentially inappropriate power to the EDI Chair/Interviewer?* The EDI Chair conducts an interview with each candidate like all other faculty. They submit their evaluation on the same feedback form as others. Similarly, every department member submitting an evaluation will have the opportunity to comment on candidates specifically within an EDI context. The search committee takes the EDI Chair's feedback and that from all department members into account as they do anyone else's, but hopefully attending to the specific nature of the EDI input. The power still rests with those making the decisions to make their recommendations. The EDI Committee assumes that the input from the EDI interview and department members will *matter* to hiring decisions to some degree, but not instead of or minimizing the importance of other considerations.

4. *How would department members other than the EDI Interviewer evaluate the candidates on EDI?* In Proposal 4, we provide a comprehensive rubric for evaluating faculty job candidates, that contains EDI considerations; department members could use this to help guide their EDI evaluation.

5. *If everyone is evaluating candidates in EDI context, why do we need the EDI interview?* Although all other faculty members can provide comments on candidates within an EDI context, not all members may do so for all candidates. Having one person evaluate everyone with an EDI-focused interview ensures that all candidates are assessed consistently on the same criteria.

6. *Why have one set rubric for the EDI Interviewer?* The use of a singular rubric is important for consistent and fair evaluation (Stewart & Valian, 2018). The rubric is comprehensive enough to cover the broad range of EDI activities and potentials that candidates bring to evaluate past and planned activities.

7. *How does this role overlap with the existing role of the Equity Representative on the RTP Committee?* These roles are independent of each other. The EDI delegate is tasked with ensuring that the hiring process and treatment of candidates are sensitive to EDI. The EDI interview focuses specifically on the EDI activities and potential of the candidates.

8. *How will we know if this works?* Our department has already conducted EDI Interviews with an EDI Interviewer in the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 faculty searches, so we know that the questions and rubric work for diverse candidates with varied EDI records. We will consider this question again after the next search we use this in. In general, over the long-term, we will know that this "works" by positive EDI change we see in our department, including increased participation in EDI activities and change in representation from equity-deserving groups.

References

Government of Canada. (2012, November 29). *Creating an Equitable, Diverse and Inclusive Research Environment: A Best Practices Guide for Recruitment, Hiring and Retention*. Government of Canada, Industry Canada, Canada Research Chairs. Retrieved October 14, 2021, from https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/best_practices-pratiques_examplaires-eng.aspx.

Smith, J. L., Handley, I. M., Zale, A. V., Rushing, S., & Potvin, M. A. (2015). Now Hiring! Empirically Testing a Three-Step Intervention to Increase Faculty Gender Diversity in STEM. *BioScience*, *65*(11), 1084–1087. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biv138

Stewart, A. J. & Valian, V. (2018). *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence.* MIT Press.

Appendix A: EDI Questions for Job Candidates
Prepared by Sari van Anders 01.11.21
Last Updated by Sari van Anders 10.02.21

Process Note: These should be provided to the candidates in advance of the EDI Interview.

Introductory Note: Whether you use these questions as they are, adapt them, or develop your own, best practices are to ask each candidate the same questions so you can evaluate them on the same metrics.

As you meet with each candidate, explain that you are asking each of them the same set of questions and that you will be taking notes on their responses.

1. What do you think are some of the most pressing EDI issues facing your field/Psychology?
2. Where are places you need to grow and learn around EDI issues?
3. How would you contribute to EDI change and efforts in our department/university/city and/or in your field?
4. What is your connection to equity-deserving groups and/or other marginalized groups (e.g., scholarship, activism, professional development, lived experience, etc.)?
5. How have you contributed to EDI change and efforts? (Can consider field, department, university, city, community, societies, etc.)
6. How have experiences of privilege and/or oppression shaped your academic work and EDI efforts?

Note: Some ideas for questions are drawn from the [University of Washington](#) and the [University of Waterloo](#).

Appendix B: Rubric for EDI Evaluation of Job Candidates
Prepared by Sari van Anders 01.11.21
Revised and Updated by Sari van Anders and Michele Morningstar, 01.26.22

Introductory Notes
- The following criteria can be used to evaluate candidates at the application stage (e.g., based on candidates' EDI statement, reference letters, and/or other application materials) and/or the interview stage (e.g., based on candidates' EDI interview, job talk, responses to questions, and/or other materials).
- Items should be evaluated <u>independently from one another</u> (e.g., a candidate may be uninvolved in EDI change efforts but show clear evidence of EDI teaching ability; they should receive a low score on EDI change efforts but a high score on EDI teaching ability) and <u>independently from one's overall opinion of the candidate</u> (e.g., a candidate may not seem like a good "fit" for the department but have an excellent EDI leadership track record; they should receive a high score on relevant EDI criteria).
- The rubric should evaluate concrete evidence rather than "gut feeling", with scores justified in the comments (e.g., examples of specific actions, materials, etc.).
- Some candidates have little involvement with EDI and will score low on the EDI evaluation. Avoid artificially inflating scores.

FOR EVALUATOR, PLEASE INDICATE, did you (the rater):
- Read the candidate's materials?   Y   N
- Attend their job talk (or listen to it)?   Y   N
- Attend their Q&A (if separate from talk)?   Y   N
- Interview the candidate directly?   Y   N

Item	Description	Comments, Examples, & Justification of Score	Score
Understanding of EDI issues	- Consideration of EDI issues facing their field and/or psychology as a discipline - Discussion of how experiences of social location, privilege, and/or oppression shape their own academic work and/or EDI efforts - Demonstration of an understanding of EDI concepts, including but also moving beyond gender/sex/race/ethnicity/SES (e.g., to intersections, to disability, to Indigeneity) - Use of inclusive language in discussing EDI issues		/5

	- Demonstration of awareness about the impact of their own culture/identity/biases on their academic work or other contributions		
Involvement with EDI change efforts	- Contribution to EDI change efforts in one or multiple spheres (e.g., in field, department, university, city, community, academic societies) - Description of specific strategies to infuse EDI into their academic work or other involvements - Demonstration of leadership in EDI change efforts (e.g., chairing committees, initiating programs, leading teams)		/5
Evidence of EDI considerations in **research**	- Ability to address EDI-related topics in research (e.g., consideration of EDI issues in research, implementation of EDI-sensitive research practices) - Scholarly contribution to research relevant to equity-deserving groups (e.g., involvement in research focusing primarily on underrepresented/equity-deserving groups with an EDI lens; participating in community-based participatory research; contribution to knowledge translation efforts with stakeholders in underserved communities)		/5
Evidence of ability to **teach** about EDI	- Experience in teaching content matter related to EDI issues - Experience in teaching students from equity-deserving groups - Articulation of the role of EDI in their teaching (past, current, plans) - Ability to teach content related to EDI		/5
Ability to **attract and mentor** students from equity-deserving and other marginalized groups	- Description of ways they have created/nurtured research and other opportunities for trainees (e.g., undergraduates, graduate students, post doctoral scholars, research associates/ assistants) from equity-deserving groups - Discussion of a specific plan for hiring/supervising a team of people from diverse social locations, especially including equity-deserving group members - Articulation of their plan to foster a culture of respect, equity, and inclusion in their team - Evidence of prior successful experiences working with equity-deserving group members		/5

Ability to contribute meaningfully to **department** EDI change efforts	- Discussion of plan for contributions to EDI change efforts in our department/university/city and/or in their field (e.g., training students, pedagogy/curriculum, outreach, research topics) - Demonstration of a willingness to challenge/change institutional practices that present barriers to equity-deserving groups or to EDI goals - Indication of experience, commitment, and/or willingness to promote/support EDI in the department - Independent verification of EDI involvement from others (e.g., from awards, in reference letters)		/5
Equity-Deserving group membership	- Lived experience of equity-deserving group membership as defined by Queen's[3]		0 or 5
Final Comments and Score:			**/35**

Choose A or B	A) For appointment of candidates	**Answer to "I support the appointment of this Candidate" on Feedback Form:** **Yes or No** *Note: Scores from 0-16 = "No"; 17-22 = discretionary and depends on comments and reasoning; 23-35 = "Yes".*
	B) For short-listing candidates	**Answer to "I support the short-listing of this Candidate for an interview":** **Yes or No** *Note: Scores from 0-12 = "No"; 13-18 = discretionary and depends on comments and reasoning; 19-35 = "Yes".*

Scoring guidelines: *5 = all or nearly all examples[1] are present and/or responses are relevant and strong (e.g., deep understanding of EDI, sustained track record of past efforts, clear and detailed plans to advance EDI)*

4 = most examples present/responses relevant

3 = many examples present/responses relevant (e.g., evidence of awareness falling short of deep knowledge or interest, evidence of past efforts, some ideas to advance EDI)

2 = some examples present/responses relevant

1 = a few examples present/responses relevant (e.g., limited awareness of EDI issues, describes few past efforts with minimal detail, few personal plans to advance EDI)

0 = no examples present OR criterion absent OR responses are irrelevant/concerning

Footnotes

1. The 'Description' column contains examples of the ways in which each criterion may manifest. These examples, inspired by similar rubrics implemented in other universities (e.g., University of Washington, University of Waterloo, Ryerson, Berkeley) and material from a previous search in the Department, are intended to be illustrative rather than prescriptive.
2. Members of equity-deserving groups face long-standing and ongoing challenges in academia. To contribute to our dual goals of advancing EDI change efforts and of increasing representation of equity-deserving groups in our department, candidates who identify as a member of such groups (as defined by Queen's) should be given a score of '5' in the 'Equity-Deserving group membership' criterion. This approach is consistent with recommendations in the Collective Agreement to "take special care not to eliminate at early stages potentially strong candidates from equity-seeking groups".
3. Queen's University defines equity-deserving groups as follows: (1) members of racialized groups/visible minorities, (2) women, (3) Indigenous/Métis/Inuit/First Nations peoples, (4) people with disabilities, and (5) LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) people.

Proposal 2: Timeframe of Decision-Making to Maximize EDI Considerations

Our department has energy and urgency towards hiring. This has a number of benefits, including taking advantage of time-limited opportunities and moving things forward quickly. However, this can also impact the amount of time available for all to have input.

Providing specific and sufficient timeframes for decision-making can help reduce disparities in time and opportunity for input. For example, women are disproportionately responsible for service in academia and (for those with children) childcare (Bianchi et al., 2021; Guarino & Borden, 2017). This can reduce the time and opportunity for one equity-deserving group (women) to respond immediately to emails; ensuring sufficient time to respond and/or review materials can help address this inequity.

Sufficient time for decision-making is beneficial for enhancing EDI considerations and outcomes, including in hiring (Kessler & Low, 2021). It helps to ensure that EDI considerations are central and present, and not rushed or lost in a race to attend to a host of other urgent issues. This is valuable when reviewing candidate materials and/or making decisions about hiring. This approach is similar to that outlined in Article 30 of the Collective Agreement (Renewal, Tenure and Promotion for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty), which provides guidelines about response times to ensure integrity of process.

Moreover, consulting with EDI experts can be a valuable way to maximize the potential of EDI success in hiring. This is especially the case when we want to hire in areas we do not currently have expertise in (which applies to almost all equity-deserving groups) or representation of (which applies to the majority of equity-deserving groups). In addition, EDI consultation can be helpful in other situations, to explore whether EDI considerations are being met. Ensuring that consultants are given sufficient time is thus important to the hiring process. It also signals and reflects that the department values and prioritizes EDI, and that it recognizes and appreciates the complexity and expertise involved in EDI consulting. This is especially helpful because many EDI experts are themselves members of equity-deserving groups, so allowing sufficient time for consultation can indicate respect for the person's identity and expertise (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017).

Proposal:
We propose that the process for making decisions about hiring be given adequate time to ensure best outcomes, including related to EDI. Specifically, that:
  A) Faculty are given at least 3 business days to review the first 20 applicants and at least 2 business days for each additional 20 applicants (e.g., there are 60 applicants = faculty are given at least seven business days to review applications).
  B) Any decisions made over email occur after there have been at least 2 full business days for email discussions with an additional 2 business days at minimum once a decision has been called for (e.g., there are email discussions about topic X; these discussions are not closed until at least 2 days have passed since the discussion's beginning. If a decision is called for over email, at least 2 business days are provided after discussions have closed for people to vote/comment over email).
  C) Materials for meetings are disseminated at least two full business days before the meeting starts (e.g., the meeting starts at noon Friday = materials disseminated by at least noon Wednesday; the meeting starts at noon Tuesday = materials disseminated by at least noon Friday).

D) EDI consultants, whether from our departmental EDI Committee or an external consultant, are given at least one full week to review materials or answer queries (e.g., people are asked on Monday and agree on Wednesday = deadline of the following Wednesday for feedback).

E) No decisions are made outside of business hours (e.g., weekends, nights) unless there has been sufficient time for response as per above.

F) In either extreme, rare, and highly infrequent cases of emergencies or deadlines that could truly not have been anticipated, the above be shortened by 1 business day, but with notification to all involved.

G) This proposal is superseded by those timing rules that already exist (e.g., about renewal, tenure, and promotion, in Article 30 of the Collective Agreement).

Questions About This Proposal:

1) *Isn't EDI urgent? Don't we want to move quickly?* EDI is urgent, and we need to attend to it. But we also need to do so in ways that will matter and have the most impact in our hiring and elsewhere. Ensuring sufficient time is a realistic approach to thinking through what are sometimes complex EDI issues and/or processes, and for the helpful input and consultation from experts that can improve EDI outcomes. The urgency of EDI means we need to take it seriously, recognize the time it takes, and plan for it.

2) *Won't this slow things down too much?* The faculty search process is already a long process, and no one wants to see it take longer. But there are many "hurry-up-and-wait" points in the process that can be better utilized as "set-aside-time-for-that" points. It might take some planning, but ensuring sufficient time for EDI in our hiring shouldn't slow anything down.

3) *Why do we need rules about timing?* Rules can seem prescriptive and restrictive, but their benefit is that they lay out common understandings. For example, it might seem fair to send an email Friday afternoon and ask for a response ASAP. But, for someone with family or other responsibilities, this could mean setting aside those responsibilities when possible or missing out on important discussions (and others missing out on their valuable input). Ensuring we're all on the same page (e.g., with rules!) helps to clarify expectations and pushes us to ensure those expectations are fair for everyone. We already have rules about timing for other important processes (e.g., renewal, tenure, and promotion) to help ensure the process provides everyone with adequate time for making complex and impactful decisions; these timeframes are actually longer than what this proposal includes.

4) *EDI consultants are there to consult; why do we need to give them so much time?* Very few EDI consultants are actually "EDI consultants" as a full-time paid occupation. Most are academics like any other, even when they study EDI: their days are taken up with their own research, service, and teaching. They are making room in their schedules to share their expertise when that is not their job; honouring that by giving sufficient time to consult is respectful. People who are professional EDI consultants are often even busier in the short-term; they have their days already scheduled with the EDI consultations and involvements that pay their salaries. It would be nice if there were "drop-in" EDI consultants, but there aren't! We are asking people to make time for us, when they don't have to. The more respectful we are with our requests, the more likely we are to get the expertise we need because consultants had adequate time for reflection.

References

Bianchi, S. M., Sayer, L. C., Milkie, M. A., & Robinson, J. P. (2012). Housework: Who did, does or will do it, and how much does it matter? *Social Forces*, *91*(1), 55–63. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sos120

Government of Canada. (2012, November 29). *Creating an Equitable, Diverse and Inclusive Research Environment: A Best Practices Guide for Recruitment, Hiring and Retention*. Government of Canada, Industry Canada, Canada Research Chairs. Retrieved October 14, 2021, from https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/best_practices-pratiques_examplaires-eng.aspx.

Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family? *Research in Higher Education*, *58*(6), 672–694. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2

Kessler, J. & Low, C. (2021). Research: How companies committed to diverse hiring still fail. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved October 14, 2021, from https://hbr.org/2021/02/research-how-companies-committed-to-diverse-hiring-still-fail

Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). Reproduce Whiteness and Practical Change. *Harvard Educational Review*, *87*(4), 557–581.

Smith, J. L., Handley, I. M., Zale, A. V., Rushing, S., & Potvin, M. A. (2015). Now Hiring! Empirically Testing a Three-Step Intervention to Increase Faculty Gender Diversity in STEM. *BioScience*, *65*(11), 1084–1087.

Proposal 3: Emphasizing EDI in the Selection of Short-Listed Candidates

The Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat (TIPS) published guidelines for creating an equitable, diverse, and inclusive research environment (Government of Canada, 2012). As it pertains to recruitment, hiring, and retention of candidates for its member programs, the TIPS' "best practices" include the use of clear and flexible criteria that assess various forms of scholarship (e.g., teaching, service, research, etc.)—including "demonstrated commitments to EDI". The guidelines recommend that hiring committees request and evaluate evidence of candidates' record related to EDI (e.g., "strengths and experiences in increasing EDI in their previous institutional environment, in curriculum, and in supporting diverse students").

Hiring committees exercise discretion in how they wish to evaluate candidates' EDI record alongside other application materials. For instance, they decide the order in which to review candidates' materials and establish the internal criteria for candidates to be forwarded to the next level of the evaluation process. Hiring committees have an opportunity to leverage their decision-making power to promote EDI in their process (O'Meara, 2021). For example, for a cluster hire, the College of Arts and Sciences at Emory University only reviewed the entirety of candidates' dossier if their EDI statements were deemed strong enough. This approach yielded a "pool of candidates that was both diverse and academically exceptional" (Freeman, 2019). The practice of evaluating diversity statements when deciding which candidates to short-list has also been adopted at other institutions, and has yielded similar outcomes (Bhalla, 2019; Flaherty, 2017). In addition, this is a practice adopted by the New Frontiers Research Fund, where reviewers only review applications that pass the EDI threshold set by the Tri-Council (Government of Canada, 2022). By similarly prioritizing excellent candidates who exhibit a commitment to, and experience with, EDI-related endeavours, our department may similarly increase the diversity of applicants and hires.

Proposal:
The EDI committee proposes that each candidate for faculty positions be evaluated on an EDI-related evaluation rubric. We recommend that this evaluation be used as a **first-pass "threshold" in the selection of candidates for further review**. Candidates for faculty positions would first be screened for EDI considerations by the search committee, using the EDI Scoring rubric (Appendix B). Only those who meet a specified EDI threshold (see Appendix B for recommendations) would continue to the next stage of evaluation. The EDI committee proposes that this approach be implemented for a one-year trial period, after which it would be reviewed.

Questions About This Proposal:
1) *Why is this needed?* This approach would ensure that candidates seriously considered for the position would also be likely to contribute meaningfully to EDI-related efforts within the department. In addition, this approach provides an opportunity to restructure processes and systems to center EDI considerations in our hiring practices—thereby demonstrating the Department's commitment to EDI through concrete actions. On a practical level, this would also reduce the number of candidatures to review, allowing hiring committees to subsequently center research or other valued aspects of the application.
2) *Wouldn't this prevent us from hiring the best candidates, just because they aren't involved in EDI work?* We would argue that the best candidates for the department would be those who demonstrate excellence on all the fronts we value and evaluate, including their commitment

to EDI. Moreover, the rubric for evaluation contains many different ways in which someone might reasonably contribute to EDI-related goals—including a consideration of EDI matters in their research, a connection to equity-deserving groups, and/or plans to contribute to EDI-related change in their field. The 'bar' for this threshold is set at "34%" (see recommendations in Appendix B), meaning that this approach would primarily affect candidates who have little to no interest in, acknowledgement of, or understanding of EDI in their materials (which includes their diversity statement). Focusing our attention on candidates who do give thought to EDI-related matters in their application is arguably in the department's best interest.

3) *Why does the rubric explicitly reward candidates who are members of equity-deserving groups?* Department goals include positive EDI change, which includes improving the EDI climate as well as increasing representation of equity-deserving groups. This proposal addresses both goals in our hiring processes: prioritizing candidates who will contribute to departmental EDI change efforts *and* increasing representation of equity-deserving groups in the department. Moreover, equity-deserving groups are recognized as such because of large-scale past and/or ongoing oppression that has material, academic, and opportunity costs. These costs (including informal and unrecognized "EDI work", like dealing with microaggressions, supporting other marginalized group members, and educating majorities about oppression) can sap the time/energy needed for the kind of EDI work that is documentable (i.e., you can't document the experience of dealing with racism or racist systems). Ignoring equity-deserving group membership can lead to biased judgements (Stewart & Valian, 2018). To recognize relevant lived experiences in addition to EDI change efforts—and therefore advance both our hiring goals—the rubric allots points for membership in equity-deserving group(s). The rubric therefore allows anyone who shows EDI excellence to score very highly, but also recognizes that majority group members might actually have more time for the more documentable forms of EDI work, thus rectifying inequities that can impact our recognition of EDI work itself.

4) *Why is the threshold for this proposal lower than in proposal 1 (EDI Interviews During Candidate Visits)?* Our department would benefit from being less exclusive at the initial review stage, as candidates might have more EDI involvement than could be fully expressed in their package. Using a lower threshold for the initial review will allow our department to also interview those who report at least some evidence of EDI knowledge/involvement, and gather more information at the interview stage. The stakes are lower for the initial review than for the hire recommendations. However, once the candidate has visited, the EDI Chair can base their evaluation on all the candidate has to offer, including the talk and EDI interview.

5) *Isn't this threshold too high a bar for candidates to pass?* A candidate who received 35% on the EDI evaluation rubric (i.e., passed the suggested threshold to be shortlisted) would have received, on average, between 1.33 and 2.17 points out of 5 for each criterion. This corresponds to having included 'a few' or 'some' relevant examples of EDI knowledge, efforts, and/or plans in their diversity statement or other application materials. Having this threshold ensures that short-listed candidates have at least some level of knowledge about, interest in, record of, or plans to contribute to, EDI in the department.

References

Bhalla, N. (2019). Strategies to improve equity in faculty hiring. *Molecular Biology of the Cell, 30*, 2744-2749.

Flaherty, C. (2017, September 28). Making diversity happen. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved February 2, 2022 from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/09/28/how-two-institutions-diversified-their-faculties-without-spending-big-or-setting

Freeman, C. (2019, October 9). The case for cluster hiring to diversity your faculty. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved July 5, 2021 from https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-case-for-cluster-hiring-to-diversify-your-faculty/

Government of Canada. (2012, November 29). *Creating an Equitable, Diverse and Inclusive Research Environment: A Best Practices Guide for Recruitment, Hiring and Retention*. Government of Canada, Industry Canada, Canada Research Chairs. Retrieved October 14, 2021, from https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/best_practices-pratiques_examplaires-eng.aspx.

Government of Canada. (2022, January 7). *New Frontiers in Research Fund 2022 Transformation Competition*. Government of Canada, Canada Research Coordinating Committee. Retrieved February 11, 2022 from https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/nfrf-fnfr/transformation/2022/competition-concours-eng.aspx#7

O'Meara, K. (2021, February 24). Seizing discretion to advance full participation. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved July 5, 2021 from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2021/02/24/faculty-should-use-their-discretion-more-effectively-advance-equity-opinion

Stewart, A. J. & Valian, V. (2018). An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence. MIT Press.

Proposal 4: Flex and General Rubrics for Faculty Evaluations of Candidates

Hiring rubrics are key to fair evaluations of candidates and to ensuring that EDI matters in hiring (Stephens et al., 2020; Stewart & Valian, 2018). Rubrics help us pause and think about our evaluations – interrupting any internalized processes of bias we may not be aware of, and hopefully minimizing whatever explicit bias we may have (Axt & Lai, 2019; Quinn, 2020) – because we have to justify our choices. Rubrics help all of us, including those most committed to EDI: they ensure the focus is on the continued need to mitigate bias rather than adjudicating one's commitment, and they minimize "moral licensing", whereby commitments to EDI can actually be used as license to reduce EDI in judgements (Stewart & Valian, 2018). When criteria are established prior to decision-making about candidates, rubrics provide structure for evaluations and more consistent decision-making (Uhlmann & Cohen, 2005; O'Meara et al., 2020). They help us know what criteria we are using and support assessment of that criteria. Many of us already use rubrics in our grading, and recognize their utility in evaluating more fairly and consistently.

However, rubrics are no panacea. If they are developed with problematic assumptions, rubrics will provide problematic outcomes. Moreover, faculty can legitimately value different criteria in hiring, including in ways that can strengthen the hiring process and avoid groupthink. But, because rubrics are often imposed from above, they do not always reflect the diversity of faculty hiring values. As such, there can sometimes be little buy-in to hiring rubrics.

In sum, rubrics can help us do better at hiring in general and in relation to EDI outcomes, but only if we develop them thoughtfully and in ways that build off the strengths of our diverse values, and if they reflect our values and are useful for each of us.

Proposal:
We recommend the following rubric for faculty to use consistently across all candidates they evaluate. Specifically, we offer this rubric based on input from all faculty in the department (see Appendix C), to be used as (a) a General Rubric, which any faculty member may use as is to evaluate candidates, or as (b) a Flex Rubric, which any faculty member can *adapt to use* to best reflect their own values and considerations in hiring (e.g., by adding/omitting items, by reorganizing, by changing mechanisms, and by changing scoring). The rubrics are kept by each faculty member and not submitted to anyone or shared. Instead, faculty use their rubric evaluations to inform their decision-making for the general feedback form, which they submit as usual.

Questions About This Proposal:
1) *Do these rubrics replace the general evaluation form? Why do we need a rubric if we have the general evaluation form?* The rubric does not replace the general evaluation form; the rubric helps us delineate our rationales for what we recommend on the general evaluation form. At present, there is no structured way to assess candidates provided by and for the department, but rubrics are recommended best practices for evaluating candidates (Stewart & Valian, 2012).
2) *Do we need to submit these rubrics to someone?* No. They are only for each faculty member to use for their own evaluations.
3) *Can we add criteria to the rubrics during the evaluation process?* We recommend using the same rubric in the same way across candidates, because that maximizes the consistency of

evaluation. If something comes up midway through the candidates that makes you rethink your evaluation process, you can always change accordingly – and then go back and change the evaluation process for all others, to be consistent and fair. (Evaluations can be amended, with revised ones submitted after all candidates have visited if need be.)

4) *But doesn't using different rubrics across faculty lead to inconsistency, unfairness, or bias?* We know that faculty already use individual evaluation processes and there is nothing inherently unfair, inconsistent, or biased about this. In the same way that we all succeed in different ways, we can have different criteria for success. So long as we each use our rubric *across candidates* in the same way, we will be consistent in our own evaluations. And, we need to be attentive to bias whether we all use the same evaluation criteria or not, since discriminatory bias can be present regardless.

5) *But, didn't you justify the use of the rubrics by saying they will reduce bias? How can bias be present with a rubric then?* If we build and use our rubrics in biased ways, they also will have biased outcomes. For example, if we use "publication count" as one of our criterion, but look at total count for majority group candidates and then only first-authored count for minoritized candidates, we would be introducing bias into our rubric use. Accordingly, we recommend that you be as specific as possible for each item and consistent in that across candidates. For example, if you say "teaching excellence", what specifically are you counting towards that? If it's teaching ratings, don't ignore poor ratings for a candidate you otherwise prefer.

6) *Why are these rubrics different than other rubrics in this collection of proposals?* Each rubric in this collection of proposals has a different purpose. This one is for a general evaluation of candidates by all, whereas the others were designed to help the EDI Chair focus on evaluating EDI specifically or the committee evaluate whether candidates meet an EDI cut-off. The rubrics in this proposal are more broad but still incorporate EDI.

References

Axt, J.R., & Lai, C.K. (2019). Reducing discrimination: A bias versus noise perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 117*(1), 26-49.

O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D., Templeton, L.L. (2020). Nudging toward diversity: Applying behavioral design to faculty hiring. *Review of Educational Research, 90*(3), 311-348.

Quinn, D.M. (2020). Experimental evidence on teachers' racial bias in student evaluation: The role of grading scales. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 42*(3), 375-392.

Stephens, N.M., Rivera, L.A., & Townsend, S.S.M. (2020). The cycle of workplace bias and how to interrupt it. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 40*, 100137.

Stewart, A. J. & Valian, V. (2018). *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence.* MIT Press.Uhlmann, E.L., & Cohen, G.L. (2005). Constructed criteria: Redefining merit to justify discrimination. *Psychological Science, 16*(6). 474-480.

Appendix C: Rubric for Evaluating Candidates During Faculty Searches
Prepared by Sari van Anders, EDI Chair, 10.07.07
Revised by Sari van Anders & Michele Morningstar, 01.31.22

Scoring Considerations
Rubrics are only as effective as the ways we use them, and can only enhance EDI outcomes when we take EDI into account while using them. Accordingly:
1. Make sure that items are evaluated as independently of each other as possible (e.g., they may have a lot of publications but have no teaching experience, so they get a low score on one and high score on the other).
2. Make sure that items are evaluated independently of your opinion of them as a candidate (e.g., they may not seem like a good "fit" but, if they have excellent funding, rate them highly on that).
3. Focus on concrete evidence over "gut feeling" (e.g., evaluating that a candidate would teach EDI well should be backed up by examples and actual reasons that can be pointed to).
4. Make sure ratings are justified in the comments (e.g., by pointing to specific actions, materials, comments, etc.). Refer to their application materials, their responses to questions, reference letters, their talk, their Q&A, and/or your interactions.
5. Consider your own values around growing existing areas of strength and thus avoiding isolated areas of expertise (e.g., hiring someone who adds to an existing strength in our department) versus expanding beyond existing areas of expertise and avoiding hiring more of the same (e.g., hiring someone who adds something new to our department).

Candidate Considerations
It is reasonable and appropriate for expectations of candidates to reflect their career stage, field, and any career breaks. For example, it may seem like equal treatment to count publication number and compare that across candidates, but this would underrate the contributions of (a) a prolific early-career candidate versus a solid mid-career candidate, (b) a successful candidate in a field where each research project takes years vs. weeks, and (c) a candidate with prodigious output given medical, parental, or other leaves versus a solid candidate who has not needed any breaks. Accordingly:
6. Take career stage seriously: weigh *evidence* more heavily for people who have been faculty at least 2 yrs, and *potential* for others.
7. Consider the impact of breaks on the candidate's contributions and adjust ratings accordingly.
8. Consider the candidate's field and disciplinary norms for research output, and adjust ratings accordingly.

General Rubric
(To adapt for a Flex Rubric: delete items, add items, reorganize, and/or restructure scoring)

Name of Candidate:
Career Stage of Candidate (circle one): PhD Candidate   Post Doc   Asst Prof   Tenured Prof
Breaks in Candidate's Career:

Did you (the rater):
- Read the candidate's materials?   Y   N
- Attend their job talk (or listen to it)?   Y   N
- Attend their Q&A (if separate from talk)?   Y   N
- Interview the candidate directly (individually or in a group, separate from Q&A)?   Y   N

Total Score: /80
Overall Comments:

Criterion	Areas	Mechanisms	Comments, Justifications, and Examples	Score (see footer)
Fit and Potential /20	Education & Experience	-degree/field -field/topic of labs -years of training		/4
	Relevance to hire and/or other dept needs	-fit with ad -fit with dept priorities -fit with EDI goals -adds to representation of equity-deserving group (especially underrepresented in dept)		/4
	Interest in scientific/dept community	-shows interest in dept/area -involved in field-relevant activities		/4

Scoring: 4 = excellent; meets or exceeds all criteria with no major areas of concern; **3 = good;** meets majority of criteria with no major areas of concern; **2 = fair;** meets some criteria and there may be some areas of concern; **1 = poor;** does not meet minimal criteria or has major areas of concern. *Scoring based on best practices from the University of Washington's Center for Institutional Change.*

	Ability to strengthen existing areas or add new ones	-collaboration possibilities within existing strengths -collaboration possibilities to develop new lines of research		/4
	Potential to contribute to profession	-leadership -initiative -EDI involvement -renown/expertise (e.g., invitations to participate in/contribute to special issues, books, conferences, etc.)		/4
Teaching /12	Potential to contribute to dept curriculum	-existing courses -new courses -ability to teach EDI-relevant topics -ability to teach any topic in EDI-informed ways -ability to teach and attract students from equity-deserving groups		/4
	Quality	-teaching ratings (keeping in mind the biases they are known to reflect) -awards -comments from students -communication during job talk		/4
	Experience & Approach	-experience (# courses taught and/or TAd) -training (certificates, courses, etc.) -teaching philosophy -use of evidence-based pedagogical practices -previous syllabi -use of EDI-related examples/activities in the past		/4
Service /16	Potential to contribute to dept/university in general	-interest in/fit for various committees -relevance of experience for service		/4

Scoring: 4 = excellent; meets or exceeds all criteria with no major areas of concern; **3 = good;** meets majority of criteria with no major areas of concern; **2 = fair;** meets some criteria and there may be some areas of concern; **1 = poor;** does not meet minimal criteria or has major areas of concern. *Scoring based on best practices from the University of Washington's Center for Institutional Change.*

	Potential to contribute to dept/university for EDI	-can specifically add to EDI change efforts in the dept/university (e.g., via specific initiatives, community involvements, committees)		/4
	Experience & record in general	-awards -activities -leadership		/4
	Experience & record for EDI	-experience -awards -leadership -community involvements		/4
Research /24	Creativity & Innovation	-development of new methods/pubs in methods journals -open science involvements -research statement novelty or innovation -knowledge translation involvements (e.g., blog posts, infographics, open-source resources, community partnerships, etc.)		/4
	Quality	-awards -rigor -thorough read of representative publications -quality of journals/publication venues (e.g., impact factor, status in the field, etc.) -significance for EDI principles -invited opportunities (e.g., talks or papers)		/4
	Productivity	-Publication metrics (count, citations, Altmetrics, downloads, views) -presentation numbers		/4
	Independence	-topic expands from that of training supervisors -supervisor letter -ability to answer questions in interviews and talk Q&A -plans for future research		/4

Scoring: 4 = excellent; meets or exceeds all criteria with no major areas of concern; **3 = good;** meets majority of criteria with no major areas of concern; **2 = fair;** meets some criteria and there may be some areas of concern; **1 = poor;** does not meet minimal criteria or has major areas of concern. *Scoring based on best practices from the University of Washington's Center for Institutional Change.*

		-able to envision lab needs -# first-authored pubs (and/or last/senior for more senior people)		
	Funding	-history of successful funding -likelihood of program receiving Tri-Council or other external funding -Ability to succeed on EDI aspect of proposals		/4
	Potential for a successful research career	-awards -scholarships, fellowships -ability to communicate research		/4
Mentorship /8	Experience supervising students	-demonstrated supervision skills, including of equity-deserving group members -number of undergraduates supervised (volunteers, RAs) -number of undergraduate student projects supervised (e.g., honours, directed studies) -support of graduate students in research (e.g., # primary supervisees) -ability to attract and supervise students from equity-deserving groups		/4
	Quality of supervision	-student awards and fellowships -students on publications -mentoring awards -# students from equity-deserving groups -description of approach to mentoring in job application (could be teaching statement, research, cover letter, etc.)		/4

Scoring: 4 = excellent; meets or exceeds all criteria with no major areas of concern; **3 = good;** meets majority of criteria with no major areas of concern; **2 = fair;** meets some criteria and there may be some areas of concern; **1 = poor;** does not meet minimal criteria or has major areas of concern. *Scoring based on best practices from the University of Washington's Center for Institutional Change.*

Proposal 5: Connecting Candidates with Equity-Deserving Groups

This series of proposals aims to increase EDI in our department, including during the hiring process and via its outcome. There is a common conception that members of some equity-deserving groups (especially racialized/visible minorities) are not interested in coming to our department, Kingston, and/or Queen's; however, the EDI committee does not know of any job offers to members of these equity-deserving groups, including those that have been turned down on this or other bases. In fact, most psychology departments in Canada continue to underrepresent equity-deserving groups, especially racialized/visible minorities, even in locations that are considerably more diverse (e.g., Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Vancouver). In addition, specific units at Queen's have an unfortunate history of attributing the lack of racialized minorities to "their lack of interest" in coming, when this has instead represented written or implicit policy[1]. A more positive and progressive approach to EDI is to focus on what we *can* do to make our department more attractive to recruit (and retain) candidates from these minoritized social locations, which the preceding proposals aim to do in various ways. One additional way is to ensure that all short-listed candidates are given the opportunity to connect with members of equity-deserving groups on campus and/or in Kingston, either during the interview or after the offer is made (Stewart & Valian, 2018). This will help demonstrate our understanding and commitment to EDI issues and change, and help potential candidates from equity-deserving groups feel more connected to existing communities.

Proposal:
To maximize our chances of recruiting faculty from equity-deserving groups, we propose the following:
   A) We propose that all candidates invited to interview are offered connections to/a chance to meet members of equity-deserving groups as part of their <u>invitation to interview</u>.
      a. This would be added onto the invitation to interview, which already involves appropriate welcomes and details. As such, we offer the following wording to use as is or adapt to fit what already exists: "You may know Kingston well, have some familiarity with it, or be new to our city; we would like to ensure that you have the opportunity to learn what might be helpful, including about equity, diversity, and inclusion. Accordingly, please let us know if it would be helpful for us to connect you with members of equity-deserving groups on campus and/or in Kingston, and if so, which. These might be the equity-deserving groups recognized by Queen's (members of racialized groups/visible minorities, Indigenous/Métis/Inuit/First Nations peoples, people with disabilities, LGBTQ people, and/or women) or other minoritized/marginalized groups. We will do our best to liaise with groups and provide an opportunity for you to meet face-to-face, remotely, and/or over email/phone. Please note: if this seems helpful eventually but not something you want to do at this stage, we will again provide this opportunity to successful candidates during our job offer. And, if you would like to do this

---

[1] For example, after Queen's and its administrators banned Black students from medical school, "…they told student activists that Black students simply didn't want to come to Kingston, preferring 'more cosmopolitan cities'" (Glauser, 2020).

now (or later), but via an independent staff member at Queen's who is not a part of our search process, you can directly contact [insert appropriate name; likely Monica Stewart], who will facilitate this without our department's involvement."

    b. If a candidate asks for this, we will connect them with 1-2 community members and/or representatives that are known to us, or that we find via support from the Queen's faculty support services or other contacts on campus. This may include during the campus visit (e.g., a 30 min slot) or via another mechanism (remote visit, email, phone) that might work well.

B) We propose that all candidates offered positions are provided with connections to/a chance to meet members of equity-deserving groups as part of our <u>recruitment process</u>.

    a. This would be added onto the job offer email, which already involves appropriate welcomes and details. As such, we offer the following wording to use as is or adapted to fit what already exists: "During the interview process, we offered the opportunity to connect you with members of equity-deserving or other groups on campus and/or in Kingston. You may have questions about what it's like to live in Kingston as a member of one of these groups, and who better to help delineate this than community members! Accordingly, please let us know if it would be helpful for us to connect you with members of equity-deserving groups on campus and/or in Kingston and, if so, which. These might be the equity-deserving groups recognized by Queen's (members of racialized groups/visible minorities, Indigenous/Métis/Inuit/First Nations peoples, people with disabilities, LGBTQ people, and/or women) or other minoritized/marginalized groups. We will do our best to liaise with groups and provide an opportunity to meet face-to-face, remotely, and/or over email/phone, or as appropriate. Please feel free to request this, whether or not you did this during the interview stage. Again, if you would like to do this, but via an independent staff member at Queen's who is not a part of our search process, you can directly contact [insert appropriate name; likely Monica Stewart], who will facilitate this without our involvement."

    b. If a candidate asks for this, we will connect them with 1-2 community members and/or representatives that are known to us, or that we find via support from the Queen's faculty support services or other contacts on campus. This may include during another campus visit or via another mechanism (remote visit, email, phone) that might work well.

C) We propose that the department develops a list of connections and community members to contact from each equity-deserving group, plus specific within-group social locations (e.g., for racialized/visible minorities, but also for Black people and/or Middle Eastern/North African people; for LGBTQ people, but also for trans people and/or queer people). This list should be reviewed at the beginning of the hiring process during the first hire of any year of hiring to ensure it is up to date.

Questions About This Proposal:

1) *Won't this single people out from equity-deserving groups?* Our proposal offers this option to all short-listed candidates, and is thus "social location-neutral" in its offering. However, we

anticipate uptake mostly from equity-deserving groups. Moreover, it will demonstrate that we recognize what is often said, including by some of our department members – that Kingston and Queen's (and perhaps our department) are not always seen as the most welcoming place for members of some equity-deserving groups, like racialized/visible minorities – but also that we aim to improve this and connect people, not that we aim to hide it and live with it as a status quo.

2) *Won't this "out" people who might not be comfortable identifying their marginalization during the hiring process?* Offering the opportunity prior to the interview with the notice that it will again be offered upon a job offer will allow people to make the choices that best serve them, without us presuming to know what's right for them. And, for many people (e.g., visible minorities, people with visible disabilities, women), their equity-deserving group status is always visible. Ignoring social location can be experienced as ignoring oppression. However, we also will make clear that candidates can access this opportunity outside of our involvement, via Queen's' faculty support services.

3) *Why should the department do this; can't candidates do it on their own?* Candidates can do this on their own. However, our involvement will signal our investment in and commitment to EDI issues front and center. Moreover, we have more access to and knowledge of our university and local communities, and can gather this information with less challenge; this reduces the extra time equity-deserving group candidates would have to put in to access this knowledge.

4) *Does anyone even want this information?* Yes. We know of hires who did want or would have wanted this information to help them make their choices more informed.

References

Glauser, W. (2020). When Black medical students weren't welcome at Queen's. *University Affairs/Affaires Universitaires.* Retrieved 03.10.20 from https://www.universityaffairs.ca/features/feature-article/when-black-medical-students-werent-welcome-at-queens/

Stewart, A. J. & Valian, V. (2018). *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence.* MIT Press.

Uhlmann, E.L., & Cohen, G.L. (2005). Constructed criteria: Redefining merit to justify discrimination. *Psychological Science, 16*(6). 474-480.