

# Helpful Guidance for an Effective Search Process 2016

## [Introductory Remarks and Panelist Introductions]

JUDITH D. SINGER: Hello, everybody. I'm Judy Singer. I'm the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. And I want to welcome you to this session on helpful guidance for effective faculty searches. And I just want to make a few framing remarks and briefly introduce our panelists and then turn it over.

In thinking about this session, I was reminded of the first search committee that I was on. I was an untenured associate professor. And I was caught in the power politics of a group of people where I could see what was going on and I knew I dare not speak. It was a very complex situation. That's actually not the right response. And so part of what I'm hoping we will learn today is how to help faculty, whether they are a tenure track faculty, or tenured faculty, or non-ladder faculty, all feel like they have something to contribute to the process.

Because I think that as we think about a building stronger, and better, and more diverse faculty, we need a range of voices who do feel comfortable speaking, and thinking about how we can hear from different people who have perspectives that are important to share. And, obviously, consensus has to be reached, decisions need to be made. But listening to one another is actually one of the most important things that I think happens in a faculty search.

The number of searches at the University right now is not that high. Now some of that is tied to the endowment returns. But some of it's actually tied to the move to a tenure track. One of the handouts you have at your seat is the rise in the fraction of the Harvard faculty that is tenured. And that is a consequence of a move for a tenure track. But what it says is each search should be treated like your firstborn child. It's the most important thing we do in terms of who we hire and how we mentor them when they're here.

And as we think about building a faculty of the future, in a room where there are mostly dead white men on the wall-- that's the old Harvard faculty-- we want to think about having a faculty that is much more diverse, pulls talent from a variety of sources, and brings people to our

community who can push their research forward, bring intellectual diversity to our community, and also teach our students about new ideas and new ways of thinking.

So I thank you all for taking the time to come out. I thank our panelists, who I will briefly introduce by explaining why they were selected-- they actually don't know this. So you have their bios.

Sitting there, over on my far right, is Iris Bohnet, who is a professor at the Kennedy School, and is also a former academic dean of the Kennedy School, and has had a fantastic book come out on gender by design in the workplace. And she will be our moderator.

Next to Iris is Mahzarin Banaji, who is a professor of psychology in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and is also the senior advisor to the dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences on faculty development and diversity. Her book on implicit bias, called *Blind Spot*, with her longtime collaborator Tony Greenwald, is well worth reading.

Meredith Rosenthal is next. She is a professor of health economics at the School of Public Health and is also the Associate Dean for Diversity.

And then we have James Simpson, who is the tallest person on the panel and asked for the shortest introduction. James is a professor and the chair of the English department in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

We pulled together this panel because collectively they have a wealth of wisdom and different perspectives on the faculty search process, both from being a department chair, from being a dean who is thinking about diversity issues, from having been an academic dean and somebody who thinks about how organizations can make better decisions and open up opportunities to women and also, by extension, to minorities. So it's a group of people who've thought a lot about these topics. They represent a range of schools here. And I, for one, am looking very much forward to ideas that they have as we think about moving forward with our faculty searches this year and in the future. So I will turn it over to Iris.

**IRIS BOHNET:** Thank you very much, Judy. And thank you for the leadership of your office and your team on this very important topic.

So I thought I would start by making three remarks. And they all have something to do with the time that we're in. So first, I think if vice presidential candidates talk about unconscious bias in the debate, we do know that something is happening, of course because of the work of Mahzarin and others. And so you see I believe in small sample sizes. But so that was remarkable. I don't think they dealt with it perfectly. But it is remarkable how it has become part of a general discussion.

I'm also encouraged by a number of new technology development software startups which have taken the insights to heart and made it easier for all of us to improve our search processes, our hiring processes. And I thought I'll just give you a few examples.

I'm teaching a course right now on behavior economics for organizations where I have a number of them in my class. And they vary from-- one company's called Edge. They help organizations self-evaluate, just measure, how well they do in terms of diversity. Another one is called pymetrics, which has developed unbiased-- they claim, but unbiased tests to help employers to evaluate job candidates more objectively and also to source more broadly.

And then we had Fidelity. It was actually very interesting to have Fidelity in the room as well who's using this software and shared with us that it increased the fraction of female candidates for Fidelity from 30% to about 50%. Because the tests now allow them to look much more broadly than they ever have just focusing on CVs.

And then finally, another service is called Applied. They help organizations do blind evaluations, so blind themselves to demographic characteristics of job applicants. And the UK government-- some of you might have been noticing the UK government just announced that they moved, for the whole civil service in the UK, moved to blind evaluations where they blind themselves to demographic characteristics and also the address of job applicants. So a lot is happening that makes me quite optimistic, actually.

I thought I'll end with a personal experience. So I recently applied these insights to my own search. So I hired a new assistant. And we changed our evaluation process. And we did three things.

So first of all, we blinded ourselves to people's demographic characteristics including to the schools that people went to. That was actually the most disconcerting part for me, because I really don't care about gender, race, ethnicity, anything else. But not knowing where somebody went to school was like, hmm, OK.

So we evaluated the CVs then put them aside. And then we had everyone take a work sample test. So I spent a lot of time thinking about what I really need in an assistant, what I look for. So for example, one of the work exercises was a scheduling task. And we evaluated those performances, not knowing, of course, how they compared to people's CVs. So we didn't know everyone had a number, so we didn't know the correlation between CV and work performance. And then I did a structured interview, again, not knowing people's CVs-- or not recalling people's CVs-- or knowing their scores for their work sample tests.

So we tried to get at three independent observations of the different candidates. And then in the end, we pooled it all. And we had different evaluators. And then we hired somebody.

And I think it was a super interesting exercise for my whole team and for myself. Because we all noticed that in this one-on-one interview, it's so hard not to be biased, even in a structured interview, which is much better than a non-structured interview. But even in a structured interview, people will share all kinds of things with you. And you're just, like, yeah, it's really me.

So we weighed the work sample test very, very highly. So again, this is a sample size of one. This is not my research. I normally have bigger samples. But I thought I'd share the experience with you, just to recommend that sometimes it's also just good to experiment with something for you, to try something out and see what impact it really has on your own evaluations. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to our panelists, who will tell us a bit more about their work-- both their research, but also their practical work in faculty searches and hiring. Mahzarin.

**MAHZARIN BANAJI:** Thank you, Iris. Thank you all for being here. I thought I was the only one who noticed that the presidential debate and the vice presidential debates mentioned work on implicit bias. But I'll just read you the tweet from one presidential candidate that went out yesterday. And you'll tell me which one of the two presidential candidates tweeted this. Implicit bias is real. It hurts Americans. Anybody who would outright deny its existence is unfit for the White House. Now the reason I bring this up is not to have a discussion about which political candidate said it or which one is the one we should all vote for, but rather that to me this is the moment in which I can be tough with you all.

And the reason I say that is because 25 years ago, when this work first began to be done, people would speak about it in hushed tones. People would say, do you realize this might be going on? The work is suggesting this. Letters of recommendation are not using the words in the same ways. And so on.

And I just think that when presidential candidates are being asked this as a question, about what is your position on this, I think the time for courage is past. It is no longer for us to say, hmm, we are not going to be ahead if we do it now. It is now going to be imperative that we simply listen to the data. And then the data are not telling us what to do, they're telling us the problem.

That's what it means to be in a place like Harvard where we need to sit down and decide what do we want to do about it. That's not anybody else's concern, and definitely not the scientists' concern. You do not want a bunch of scientists who discovered what implicit bias is to be the ones telling you all how it should be fixed. That would be too narrow a group of people to make that decision. That decision is for anybody in a community, however we want to specify what that community is. And I think the FAS at Harvard is a reasonable such unit to undertake this kind of conversation about what we want to do.

So I thought today's job was to focus in on just a small piece of all of this. And that's what we've been doing in little groups like this whenever we meet together. We go after one small piece of this. Because it's everywhere.

And today it is to think about senior searches. And senior searches come in two forms. We promote people from within, we hire people from the outside. And so some of what I will say will apply more to one or the other. But I just want to focus on two very simple stages of errors.

And the first error, I think, is that we are not capable of thinking about the best people. Our minds simply don't go there. Junior searches give us a little bit of protection, because there is such a thing called an ad, and lots of people apply who we don't even know, and our job is to go through all of those applications and read them, and they believe it's their job to apply.

And even for junior searches, as I reported last year in such a meeting, we're finding that the best junior faculty are not applying for our positions. And when we call them up once with Judy's permission and said, why did you not apply for our position, given that you're in the top 5% of your field? They would say things like, well, I didn't think I was good enough for Harvard.

And I brought this up the last time to argue that just because it's a junior position don't assume that the best people are actually applying. One of them even said, your advertisement said seeking exceptional candidates and I don't think of myself as exceptional. So I want you to know that that's happening at the junior end.

So at the senior end, where most people think it's not even appropriate for them to come to us and say, how about me, how about me, it's much more our job to be able to think really hard. And that, I don't think, happens when we're taking a shower. That's not where the good ideas come when you have to think about who are these candidates, because of a simple bias that Danny Kahneman nailed for us 50 times or more in many different papers, and that is availability.

The availability bias is powerful. The frequency of things, our frequency of the expectation of things, is affected by the ease with which information comes into our mind. And the ease with which information comes into our mind is what we are surrounded by. This is why we vastly overestimate the presence of certain things over others and underestimate the existence of other things. So we need to decide on how we are going to even get what that-- what's the playing field, who are the people. And I don't think that can be done by just each of us coming up.

And I'll give you my own example of this bias, which I showed not too long ago. I was on a committee. This is a tiny elite little scientific society. There are about 400 people in it. And every year we give an award to the person who is most deserving, somebody quite senior.

And so three of us were on that committee. I was the chair of the committee. And we're all busy people, so I said to my two other committee members, you think about the best people, I'll think about the best people, we'll have a phone call. We did that, we got on the phone, and we each generated three names. And we had nine in total. Interesting. We didn't even think about the same people, which is great. Some diversity. There were nine candidates before us.

And as we were chatting about them, it struck me that I, who should know about this, I didn't think to say, here is the list of the 400 members. How hard is it to go from A through Z and just look at the entire set of people?

So you guess what the bias was, I'll tell you. I was from Harvard, the other person was from Rutgers, and the third person was from NYU. The three of us who were the selectors were those people. So what was the bias?

AUDIENCE: East coast.

MAHZARIN BANAJI: East coast. Nine names, all fantastic people, all between Boston and Washington.

[LAUGHTER]

Right. And so we picked the list up and we went from A through Z. And eventually, we gave the award to somebody in Columbus, Ohio.

So I just bring this up because it is definitely not-- it's not a bias in that I'm looking at somebody and saying, she ain't good enough for us. We're not even coming up with the name. So we need to do something. And maybe we'll talk about how we might figure out ways to put people before us in some way.

And I don't think any group of the kind that Iris mentioned can do that part of the work for us. They're just-- I don't know that they would have the relevant knowledge to be able to. But maybe they do, and maybe this is my elitism in thinking what can some group do for us, only we can do this for ourselves. But maybe they can. So I'd love to think about other ways in which we can be prodded.

The second bias-- and this is one of the two-- just the two things I want to say. So the first is not knowing who is out there and even bringing before us the most appropriate people. And then the second is that they come before us-- and this is where the research is really strong. There is not one, or five, or 50 studies, but 500 of them. If you open up the database, it can be 5,000 studies, that show that you can put two pieces of work in front of us that's identical with a name difference and we will not evaluate the work equally.

This is no longer a question does it happen, does it not. Happens on everything. It happens on what Iris mentioned-- the name of the university can be enough. This happens for publications. If you send your paper out for publication with your institutional affiliation or no institutional affiliation, you will get quite different outcomes of whether the paper is deemed worthy enough to be published. So everybody in this room should put their affiliation on there.

The other part of-- so there are many studies now. And they involve fairly shocking data. And we can set that aside by saying, but that's jobs in New York City where people are-- it's for who to hire for this yogurt manufacturing place. And so what does it say about me?

And that's the interesting thing. The studies have been done on people like ourselves. So the study that Jo Handelsman at Yale did was on people very much like myself, people in the life sciences who run labs and who need a lab manager. And it's for the position of lab manager.

And I should just tell those of you who are not in the life sciences that the job of lab manager is actually quite crucial. If you finish college and you get the job of a lab manager, you're much more likely to get to a really good graduate program. That two years of experience running somebody's lab is worth a lot more than other things on your resume. So that's an important position.



And she discovered that people like me are much more likely to hire men rather than women who are equally qualified for the job of lab manager. But not only that, we actually look at that resume and we see in it-- we see, we look at the same words, the same publications, the same everything, and we say, that's so competent.

And what to do about that is a very deep question. Because if I took somebody schlocky and said, oh, they're great, that's one thing. But here are-- I'm looking at two people who are equal, and one of them just looks to me so much more deserving. And we know it's deserving because we apparently give \$4,000 more in salary, starting salary, two one over the other candidate. Even if they don't want it, we say, please take my money, you deserve \$4,000 more. I will mentor you x hours more every month. These are things coming out. It's just welling up inside us. And men and women do this equally.

So no place for finger pointing in this business. Because we are absolutely all doing it. I just saw something on solo status women. If you have a search on which there is one woman, the likelihood of hiring a woman goes down. So solo status women have a very difficult time agreeing to hire another woman. And as the number of women in the group grows, the number of other women who are higher. And this is paradoxical and even ironical, because it's when there are fewer women that you need more, not when there already are enough.

So those are the kinds of things I want to bring up. Because now it's about the reflection on the work itself.

So I've been very impressed, as Iris has, by corporations. So in the last 20 years, universities have not budged much, because I think we think we're not the biased ones. But Goldman Sachs and people who are in the business of just making money, they're changing very much faster than we are.

So there's one company that I particularly admire. It's a very large company, it's a Fortune 20. It says that its products are used by four billion people in the world. And its CEO had heard me talk about blind auditioning and decided that he would use it in some way.

Because you can't-- most of us can't use blind auditioning. We just cannot do that for our searches. Even from the get-go it's much, much harder for us, unlike symphony orchestras.

And so what he did was something very intriguing. He created blind biographies of the top 100 leaders in his corporation for succession planning purposes. And he gave those to those who were to be the decision-makers. And he had them read those blind biographies and rate them and came up from that set with the top 10 people.

And then he did the usual thing, what we all do. You sit and talk about who are the best people to lead us, where are we going to find them, and what does the world need right now, and what are we doing, and how should we change. You go off on a retreat, and you eat high-fat food, and you think some more, and you talk again, and then you say, who. And he did that and he came up with the top 10.

And the reason he called me up was to tell me that those two lists are mutually exclusive, that the people his own leaders selected when they knew who the candidates were were quite different than the ones they selected when. So I think that-- now I'm not going to argue that the people that came up with on the blind list are clearly superior to the ones that they came up with in any other way.

But what it does is that group of people now I would consider aware. They, I think, are now less likely to make a mistake. Because when they now deliberate, they have to confront the fact that they did not choose the same people when they knew who they were. And that, I think, might be something that we can force ourselves to do a little bit.

So in closing, I think we should do seminars on senior-- on the work of senior people long before we even invite them out. That is, our departments should have meetings where we just read the work with no intention of hiring that person but about just reading the work. You can have four papers of each person circulated. You can discuss two people at a time. Yes, this is investment.

Some of our departments do this kind of thing all the time. Mathematics is a good place to look at. They do this. They review people all the time all year round. They just keep doing that. They don't wait for a search. And I think that's actually very, very good practice.

I think we have to be careful about how we read letters of recommendation. That's a whole other topic. And we can speak about that.

And then don't assume, when you think about a senior person, that this person is not going to come. I have one wonderful example of a person at Harvard who we tried to hire-- not in my department, but in another department-- maybe five years ago, then three years ago. And she said no, absolutely no, and no again each time we asked.

She's now here. And that's because about two years ago I said, why don't we ask her. And they said, but remember, she has said no to us. And I said, who knows, maybe she's divorced.

And she came. So when I saw her after she'd arrived, I said, you know, I made this little joke about you and said maybe you were divorced and we should ask you again. And she said, that's exactly why I came. I'm now divorced.

So I think that we should know this, that we can take no for an answer, and that Harvard is no longer the place where people drop everything-- family, location-- and just come to us because this is Harvard. That is not going to happen.

We're interested in two people in my own department. One will not leave France. The other is a woman who has a husband who we would not want to hire and she will not move unless the university makes offers to both of them. So they're not going to be hireable.

So we've got to become super creative in our thinking. Because we don't think we're hiring boxers or athletes. There are many amazing people out there. And so we actually have to become far more creative than we've had to be in our past. So with that. Thank you.

Thank you very much, Mahzarin. Meredith.

**MEREDITH ROSENTHAL:** Thank you. And it's clear why Mahzarin was invited here.

And I was thinking that Judy might introduce me as the person who has chaired more failed searches than anyone else at the Harvard Chan School of Public Health. I'm afraid I might have that honor. But in fairness to myself, I've been put as the chair of difficult searches.

My own experience at the school begins with my participation in our Committee for the Advancement of Women Faculty over many years trying to understand patterns of hiring and promotion among women faculty and also faculty of color at the school. And we have some fabulous biostatisticians and epidemiologists on the committee. And so of course it was a very data-rich exercise.

And I want to pick up on some of the manifestations of what Mahzarin was talking about to say, first, that when we look at our data and we ask the question of why we haven't increased gender equity over the last decade among the faculty at the School of Public Health-- despite the fact that 75% of our students, 70% of our post-docs are women-- it looks like women are just not applying for our jobs. That is our most critical problem is between post-doctoral studies and applying for our assistant professor jobs.

And so I've become very interested in these questions around framing the job description and also finding more effective ways to reach out to candidates who might not think that Harvard is a place for them, who might not see themselves here for a whole variety of reasons. And I'm sure it's obvious to everyone that just putting your posting on lists that appeal to different kinds of groups is not actually going to increase the rate of applications from those groups. We do that to a large extent. But we really need more networks and to find ways to be more connected to sources of talent that don't look like us and haven't trained in exactly the same places where we have trained.

In terms of the search process itself, my experience has been that search committees really depend very heavily on an active chair. And I think to the extent that we could-- and I think we are moving forward with some consciousness-raising in search committees. We're piloting some implicit bias training for search committees as they gather for a particular search, to try to get people to start thinking about this.

But then I think you need an active chair to continue to push the discussion, make sure that everyone gets discussed and everyone gets heard. And there are certainly cases when there may be one very senior faculty member on the search that takes the discussion in a particular way that

closes off discussion of certain candidates. And I think some active monitoring of those conversations could really help there.

I'm very intrigued. I have been pulling out my hair thinking about how one can do blind reviews. But I am very intrigued about a multi-stage notion where there is at least some blind review of something-- it could be a paper, for example. And many of our fields are quite narrow, which can make that challenging, particularly for senior searches. But at the junior level, it ought to be possible to get some objective measure of the science for these individuals, maybe corresponding a little bit, Iris, to what you were talking about in terms of what you might do with employees.

So overall, I think we have made incremental steps in trying to make sure that we're not defining our searches too narrowly, which is another way in which we end up getting the self-reinforcing distribution of talent at the school. I think that's another place where taking a broad look is really important.

I think the other thing that's important on the senior searches-- since you were focusing there as well-- is I have noticed that it's very hard for people to focus on trying to gauge what this person will do at the school in the university for the next 20 years versus exactly where people have been. And I think when we bring senior faculty here, we're really trying to project as much as did that person work in this esteemed person's lab during their training, have they accomplished x in a certain number of years. And sometimes, I think, trying to do more to think about what that person in the Harvard context with a new set of colleagues brings to the total environment would be a useful way of, again, diversifying. Because otherwise I think we judge people on our own science and what we're already doing as opposed to what they bring to growth for our units and our schools.

IRIS BOHNET: Thank you very much. James?

**JAMES SIMPSON:** Thank you. It's surely the commonest introduction to an academic talk to say, I'm here to learn. But very often, it's not really meant. But I say it and I mean it. I'm here to learn. I've already learned things.

In general, I think we have a really terrific set of practices for searches, so much superior to my experience in the United Kingdom. But one aspect of their strength is precisely that our readiness to scrutinize those practices in the way that we're doing right now. They're always improvable.

Now I'll say it right out at risk of being branded as a heretic. I personally do not conduct searches in order to produce-- in order to produce-- a more diverse faculty. That for me is not an end in itself. I conduct searches so as to produce the best faculty. But before you excommunicate me, let me say that our gender statistics about ratios coming out of Ph D programs and minority statistics just points to the fact that we should be ending up with a much greater diversity in our faculty. So in order to produce the best faculty, we have to produce a more diverse faculty.

I'll be talking about tenure track searches. I did check the invitation just now and after Mahzarin said we were talking about senior searches.

MAHZARIN BANAJI: It's not?

JAMES SIMPSON: It does not say that.

MAHZARIN BANAJI: Sorry about that.

JAMES SIMPSON: But I think everything we're saying about tenure track searches does apply, or just about. So we're putting a huge effort into our tenure track searches right now. Judy said that it should be like your first child. I hope that tenure track searches don't keep us awake as much as our first child. But apart from that, yes, the same level of care and joy in the search and welcome to a tenure track colleague.

We're putting a huge effort into those searches now, given the new ethos in the college of tenuring from within. When I arrived at Harvard in 2003, it was assumed that tenure was not really going to happen. But now, it can happen, it does happen. And so we really take seriously this criterion of tenurable within seven years as we hire tenure track faculty. And that means much, much higher standards of search as we hire.

Our gender and minority ratios are relatively weak. They're getting a bit stronger for gender, but got some way to go for diversity. So we're really, really listening very hard to people of the we're

hearing today-- and particularly Mahzarin, if I may say so. We are explicitly citing Mahzarin Banaji in many of our discussions about searches. I think the information you're feeding into the system is just tremendous.

We don't have a standard search process, precisely because thanks to Mahzarin it's being updated all the time. But that said, I'm going to take you through our current search process for tenure track and ask if you agree with them.

But there is one principle that guides everything we do. And that is avoid groupthink by putting arithmetic before rhetoric. Avoid groupthink by putting arithmetic before rhetoric. Particularly important in an English department.

[LAUGHTER]

MAHZARIN BANAJI: I'm going to citing you, mister.

JAMES SIMPSON: So what are the initial steps? We make a representative search committee. We have a broad definition of the field. We write to colleagues in the field all over the country, other countries. I can talk about why we do that, but we do.

Establishment of a long short list. Now this is where I want to ask for the legal advice. We separate-- we got this idea from philosophy-- we separate the applications-- we've agreed to do this-- on gender lines. We read the women applicants first. We select the 10 or 12 best women. And thereby we get our eye for the standards that we're going to apply, the kinds of things we're looking for in this search. We establish the benchmarks of the search on the basis of those 10 or 12 best women applications. And then we read the men. And only then do we establish a short list.

Once we've established those gendered readings, once we've established our short list, we split the applications into as many people as are on the search committee, and then we split it again so that we each read-- every application is read twice. If minority applications can be identified securely, then we each read every minority application. That's a big if-- I don't know personally,

is another big hole in my knowledge, if minority applications can be identified securely. And I will not guess.

Arithmetic. For all readings, we establish a numerical tally in the first instance. We give a certain proportion to quality of letters, to the cover letter-- a certain proportion of the cover letter, the teaching research statements, a certain proportion to the quantity and outlets of publications. We give the largest numerical category to the research sample. And then we just give a certain number of points for potential for growth in research and/or teaching contribution, where might this person go.

Now we come to the first meeting with a tally of each of our readings and we share the tally-- we do the arithmetic-- before we treat the applications discursively. We do not let one English professor say, this was so dazzling. We just don't allow any of that stuff, any of the rhetoric, to capture spirits, to cow spirits, perhaps. We just do numbers.

So at this point, we've introduced another novelty when we get to our short short list. We bring graduates in-- two graduates in. We strip out the letters, so the graduates are not reading individual letters, personal letters. And the graduates will read the theses that we receive and help us with the construction of the long list.

MLA interviews. Our practice has been completely changed by Mahzarin. And I think Iris as well gave a paper at the faculty club. Many problems with interviews. Apparently, if they're to be more than one-on-one, research shows that four interviewers are the optimum number. Have I got that right?

MAHZARIN BANAJI: Mhm.

JAMES SIMPSON: So interview should be structured, as we've heard. We're structuring them. The committee ask the same x number of questions. And each committee member will score arithmetically each candidate on each question. Avoid all chat. Chat is prohibited after rhetoric, after every interview. After just anything outside formal mechanisms, chat is disallowed.



When we come to a formal meeting, we collect the numbers prior to discussion. I call in the numbers, and I do the arithmetic, and I present the arithmetic on the spot. No one can change their numbers-- like, ooh, someone's given more, I should perhaps fiddle with that. No. No arithmetical fiddle. So once again, arithmetic before rhetoric.

Campus visits. Something we've introduced recently is a lunchtime teaching event. In the past, we would take the candidate to the faculty club with a group of senior faculty. My stomach is still in a knot when I think of the tone of these horrible lunches. Just learn nothing. You're very often a long way from the candidate. Just total waste of time and money.

What we do now is we get each candidate to give a teaching demonstration. They talk for 20 minutes and then we open a conversation. We have all the graduates there, very big audience, all the faculty. That's videoed. And then we take them to dinner, obviously.

And then the committee meets to recommend-- make its recommendations. And the department has a vote.

I suddenly realized as I was preparing these comments that we don't put arithmetic before rhetoric when it comes to the departmental vote. And maybe it would be a good idea if we did do that before we had the department meeting. Everyone just sends in a number. So I think I've taught myself something. I'm done, thank you.

IRIS BOHNET: And please join me in thanking our panelists and for being here today. Thank you, Mahzarin. Thank you, Meredith. Thank you, James.

[APPLAUSE]

And again, thank you to Judy and her office for her leadership on this topic and for putting this together. Judy, back to you.

MAHZARIN BANAJI: Can I say before Judy gets on that I just think we've been improving. And I would have made an ideal-- I would have made a list of how you ideally run a search. And James basically said that's what they're doing. That's astonishing to me. And for that I'm really pleased. So thank you.

JUDITH D. SINGER: And any English chair that says arithmetic before rhetoric. I think that line will get repeated.

I want to thank Iris, and Mahzarin, and Meredith, and James for their leadership in these efforts. This is a lot of work, the amount of energy that we put in to faculty searches. And a lot of this spills off into graduate admissions, to [INAUDIBLE] question about the pipeline. If you can take some of these ideas and put them in our admissions committees, I think we might have a somewhat more diverse pipeline-- admittedly, 10 years from now. But that's the way we have to make change.

I would also issue an open invitation. I am happy-- and Elizabeth Ancarana-- who is meant to go and raise her hand-- is Assistant Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity-- we are happy to meet with any search committee. We're happy to meet with any faculty member who is interested in thinking about creative ways of doing this work. It is hard and we want to be supporting you in these efforts. And if you have some good ideas or some questions, please come see us. And thank you all very much for taking the time.

[APPLAUSE]