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About this toolkit

What is it?
The Equitable Faculty Recruitment and Selection Toolkit was created by the Equity Office to support faculty hiring committees utilize best-practice, equitable approaches to select the best candidate for a position.

In recent years, there has been a paradigm shift, away from diversity as a means to address inequities in higher education to a phenomenon that is core to the university’s mission and vision. Diversity is no longer simply a structural goal (i.e., hiring a critical mass of minority faculty), but has become a more systemic goal that includes achieving an inclusive climate (Urban Universities for Health, 2015).

Toolkit objectives
The practices suggested in this toolkit will assist individuals in:

- Mitigating unconscious/implicit bias
- Expanding the applicant pool to ensure diversity is represented in candidates
- Adhering to best practices for hiring strong candidates
- Documenting progress to monitor and improve the recruitment and selection process
Purpose and processes

Purpose
The purpose of this Toolkit is to help faculty hiring committees embed equity throughout the recruitment and selection process. For information on faculty hiring processes at the University of Waterloo, please review Policy 76.

Processes
1. Ensure all committee members have received training on equitable recruitment and selection
2. Consider the composition of your committee and try to ensure diversity in membership with attention to intersectionality
3. Devote time to the process. The amount of time you give to plan and set-up your recruitment process directly correlates to the quality of applicants who apply¹
4. Consider consulting with other departments to see what tools, processes, or best practices they suggest.
5. Make professional contacts with members of underrepresented groups at conferences or networking events and proactively reach out to those contacts/networks if there is a job that may be of interest to them.

The next two sections will cover foundational areas that are important first steps in the process of equitable recruitment and selection.

¹ University of Victoria, n.d.
Before you begin: foundational terms and concepts

**Equity**
The fair treatment, access, opportunity, and advancement for all people, while at the same time striving to identify and eliminate barriers that have prevented the full participation of some groups. Improving equity involves increasing justice and fairness within the procedures and processes of institutions or systems, as well as in their distribution of resources. Tackling equity issues requires an understanding of the root causes of outcome disparities within our society, and an understanding of intersectionality.

**Equitable**
Just or characterized by fairness or equity. Equitable treatment can at times differ from same treatment.

**Equity Deserving Groups**
Individuals or group(s) with identit(ies) that systemically lack power/privilege and experience structural and/or interpersonal barriers as a result of their identities. The use of ‘equity deserving’ as opposed to ‘equity seeking’ as a term is to emphasize a deserved right to equity – and to indicate that equity should not have to be sought.

**Discrimination**
Defined as any action or behaviour that results in adverse or preferential treatment related to those grounds prohibited under the Ontario Human Rights Code.

**Diversity**
Includes all the ways in which people differ, encompassing the different characteristics that make one individual or group different from another. Diversity includes race, gender identity, ancestry, age, national origin, religion, ability, sexuality, socioeconomic status, education, marital status, language, and physical appearance. Diversity can include differences in thought: ideas, perspectives, and values. It’s important to recognize that individuals have multiple intersecting identities, and that there is diversity within groups.

---

2 Definitions are directly quoted from the OHRC
3 Definition in Policy 33 – Ethical Behaviour
Intersectionality
A term coined by Dr. Kimberlé Crenshaw and is a framework that helps us to explore the inter-connected nature of identit(ies) such as race, class, and gender as they apply to a given individual or group; and the overlapping and interdependent experiences and systems of privilege, or discrimination/ disadvantage that are created. [1] Columbia Journalism Review

Duty to accommodate
Refers to laws related to equity and accessibility with which the University is obligated to comply. For example, legislation provides rights and responsibilities through the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA, 2005); the Ontario Human Rights Code (1990); Occupational Health and Safety Act (1990).

Implicit unconscious bias
Understanding implicit/unconscious bias is paramount for individuals who are involved in the recruitment and selection process. The Equity Office offers training on equitable recruitment and selection. Examples of implicit bias are in Appendix A.

An unconscious bias is an implicit attitude, stereotype, motivation, or assumption that can occur without one's knowledge, control, or intention. Unconscious bias is a result of our life experiences and affects all types of people. Examples of unconscious bias include gender bias, cultural bias, age bias, language, and institutional bias. Unconscious biases are important to recognize in instances when quality, relevance, and competence are being evaluated. Examples of these instances include peer review of grants, search committees, reference letters, and peer review of manuscripts" (CRC Unconscious Bias Training Module).

Federal Designated Groups (FDGs)
In the Employment Equity Act, the four designated groups are defined as:

Women
In this toolkit, we use women to refer to all cis-women, trans women or anyone who identifies as a woman. Similarly, man/men refers to cis men, trans men, or anyone who identifies as a man. We recognize that gender identity is not binary, and that there are many folks who identify as non-binary, gender non-conforming, agender, two-spirit and otherwise outside of the binary of ‘men’ and ‘women’. This toolkit specifically addresses
women because of federally designated requirements – but acknowledges the gaps associated with that definition of gender. Additionally, please note that ‘female’ refers to sex assigned at birth, and ‘women’ is the appropriate term when referring to gender identity.

**Members of visible minorities**
Persons, other than Indigenous peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour. At Waterloo, the preferred language is “racialized person,” “member of a racialized group,” or “racialized groups/communities.”

**Aboriginal peoples**
Persons who are Indians, Inuit or Métis. Please note that while Aboriginal peoples is the term used in the Employment Equity Act – the appropriate terminology is Indigenous Peoples, or First Nations, Métis or Inuit, not Aboriginal peoples. Please note that at Waterloo, the preferred terminology is Indigenous, or First Nations, Métis or Inuit people.

**Persons with disabilities**
Persons who have a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric or learning impairment and who consider themselves to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment, or believe that an employer or potential employer is likely to consider them to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment. It includes persons whose functional limitations owing to their impairment have been accommodated in their current job or workplace.
Before you begin: important biases to consider

- **Using best fit** to describe a candidate, as we may focus on individuals who are similar to us and believe they are a better fit for the department than other candidates. This engages the affinity bias (where we prefer people who are like us) and the cloning bias (where we hire people like us).

- **Time to speak**: Allowing the interviewee to speak for 80% of the interactions should be applied to all candidates. Research on candidates who identified as 2SLGBTQ+ during the recruitment process often have shorter interviews and speak less than candidates who don’t identify as 2SLGBTQ+.⁴

- **Wishful thinking**: Believing racism, sexism and/or discrimination doesn’t occur in your department, university, or field. Engaging with wishful thinking often limits our ability to think critically during the recruitment and selection process. For example, individuals with names typically associated with equity deserving groups are less likely to be contacted for an interview than those with names typically associated with white candidates. This is even the case with identical skillsets and experience.⁵

- **Indigenous research** is not considered “academically rigorous” or “objective” enough. Examples of this include:
  - Accusations of conflict of interest or having a biased approach to research if conducted within their own community.
  - A long career with many conference attendances and service commitments, but “not enough” research or publication experience. Indigenous Traditional Knowledge is limited or primitive and framed as “non-traditional knowledge.”
  - Indigenous candidates “all” are/have …
  - There are too many gaps or interruptions in their career path, or they had a late start, and therefore they are not a “serious scholar.”

---

⁴ Hebl, Foster, Mannix, and Dovido, 2002.
⁵ Bertrand and Mullainathan, 2004
Forming a diverse search committee

- As Policy 76 outlines, it’s recommended where possible for the DACA/SACA to include committee members of more than one gender identity. Where this is not possible, a department, in consultation with the Dean, should consider inviting a faculty member from a related discipline to join the DACA/SACA. In addition to gender identity, consider the other aspects of diversity in the composition of the committee, including (but not limited to) racial diversity, prioritizing Indigenous committee members, committee members who identify as having a disability, as 2SLGBTQ+, as well as members of any other equity deserving group.

- Committee members should complete the Equitable Recruitment and Selection training either in LEARN or in person, with an annual refresher.

- The committee should have a conversation on how to value diversity and filling demographic needs in the department/school.

Members of underrepresented groups, especially women of colour, are often asked to do significantly more service than white men, so it is important to keep track of their service load, free them from less significant service tasks, and/or compensate them in other ways. Of priority, committees must create space for underrepresented groups to decide which service tasks to dedicate time to (University of Michigan, 2016, p. 6).

- Processes that check implicit biases throughout hiring help to mitigate the impact of bias on decisions and hiring processes.

- Ensure that search committee members represent a broad range of diversity being mindful or those taking a disproportionate service load.
  - Search committees should include members with different perspectives and expertise.

- There is a lack of current self-identified Indigenous faculty and staff to sit on these committees.

---

6 A tool to guide your conversation is located in Appendix B
7 DACA refers to the Department or School Advisory Committee on Appointments; SACA refers to Committee School Advisory Committee on Appointments
8 Light, 1994
9 EAB, 2017
10 University of Michigan, 2016, p. 6
- Course releases, secondment, or other forms of compensation should be considered for current faculty & staff being asked to take on additional workload.
- Be prepared to offer training and compensation.
- Ensure the committee is aware of Policy 69 – Conflict of Interest; Policy 65 – Equality in Employment; Policy 76 – Faculty Appointments and Waterloo’s requirements under the Employment Equity Act.

Some departments and faculties at Waterloo have designated an Equity Champion within the committee. An equity champion actively advocates for consistent, fair and respectful treatment of all candidates or faculty during the committee’s work. The role of an Equity Champion is to ensure the principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion are adhered to by members who have decision-making responsibilities. This includes being able to identify when equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) considerations are not being appropriately considered or incorporated in the committee’s processes and final decision-making. The equity champion should not be the only one advocating for equity.

This is the responsibility of the entire committee.
Developing the job ad

When developing the job ad, use the following discussion guides to have a conversation with your committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is the need for the position being identified?</td>
<td>Discuss how to invite applications from applicants from underrepresented groups, applicants with diverse research or teaching interests and ensure that the language in the job ad is inclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you considered how new policies or practices would impact the new hire?</td>
<td>Consider whether any new policies, processes, or requirements have been implemented by Waterloo and/or national/federal government that would impact the new hire. For example, if you are hiring for the Canada Research Chairs Program (CHCP), ensure you are aware of any new requirements.¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you identified the need for the position in broad terms?</td>
<td>Consider whether you need to hire someone who focuses on a specific subfield, or whether it would be appropriate to hire for a broad range of interests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outline the necessities (versus the nice to haves)

- Ensure the requirements outlined in the job description and ad are duties that are essential to the successful completion of the job.¹²

---

¹¹ [Canada Research Chairs Program Institutional Equity, Diversity And Inclusion Action Plan And EDI Stipend Report](PDF)  
¹² The Conference Board of Canada, 2015, p. 37
Throughout the job ad, be very clear about what is actually "required" and what is "preferred." This may increase the number of women applicants, as women (compared to men) are less likely to apply if they do not meet all of the criteria.

Review the forms and templates listed on the Provost’s Office website to ensure consistency with and adherence to institutional process.

Use inclusive language that takes into account the ways in which some words or phrases can be gendered or based in Western cultures.

Beyond a “traditional” job ad, what can we as a university offer to incoming Indigenous scholars?

- Accommodate oral traditions.
- Value experience with Indigenous research or methodologies outside of an academic context.
- Include a statement about Waterloo’s commitment to equity and diversity. For example:

> The University of Waterloo regards equity and diversity as an integral part of academic excellence and is committed to accessibility for all employees. As such, we encourage applications from women, persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples, racialized people, and others who may contribute to the further diversification of ideas. At Waterloo, you will have the opportunity to work across disciplines and collaborate with an international community of scholars and a diverse student body, situated in a rapidly growing community that has been termed a “hub of innovation.”

Include a statement to inform applicants that they can request accommodations for disability, or any other protected grounds under the Ontario Human Rights Code (OHRC), during the recruitment process. This is a requirement under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act. See information by the Faculty Association for further guidance.

Consider including information on the working conditions or if there are options for flexibility.

Consider offering multiple ways to submit applications.

---

13 University of Toronto, 2016
14 Mohr, 2014
15 University of Victoria
Some online forms may be inaccessible for candidates who use screen reader software. Many employers are not flexible on the application process, relying entirely on online submissions. Therefore, some individuals with disabilities get screened out before even being able to apply and employers are not reaching this untapped resource of potential employees (The Conference Board of Canada, 2015, p.27).
Developing assessment tools and interview questions

Interview questions should:

☐ Be matched to the position criteria outlined on the job posting. Be matched to assessment tools created before the interview so that the interviewee has an opportunity to demonstrate how they fulfill the criteria.

☐ Reflect the key concepts for merit review of Indigenous research

☐ Develop agreed upon probes or follow-ups to elicit sufficient information to make an evaluation. Avoid questions about the OHRC prohibited grounds. An example of this is provided in Appendix F.

Include questions that address diversity, which can include whether the candidates:

☐ Demonstrate an understanding of the value of equity, diversity, inclusion and anti-racism.

☐ Have experience working with diverse groups and can demonstrate the impact of that work.

☐ Bring lived experience that will benefit an increasingly diverse student, faculty and staff body.

☐ Demonstrate experience and a willingness to serve as a mentor and role model for students or other faculty from under-represented groups.

☐ Enhance the central mission and core values of Waterloo as they relate to equity, diversity, inclusion and anti-racism.

☐ Other examples of diversity questions are located in Appendix H.

Assessment tools

☐ Rubrics are strongly recommended as they help us mitigate unconscious bias.

  A rubric can be developed in a way that allows some flexibility but that would ensure consistency in evaluation across the committee.

☐ Rubrics, interview questions, and job postings should be created at the same time (before the job is posted). The committee should discuss the types of qualifications that would result in the various scores provided on the rubric. Without a discussion about how the committee will score candidates, the distinction between an excellent and good candidate may be informed by unconscious bias.
There are some examples of rubrics located in Appendices C and D

Creating the rubrics before the job is posted:
  
  o Ensures that the rubrics and interview questions are based on the job description and limits the impact of our unconscious bias.
  o Provides for a fair organized structure in decision making.
  o Ensures consistency across the committee in terms of weighting.
  o Facilitates the demonstration of a fair and duly considered process.
  o Provides structure for documenting the process.
Posting the position

☐ Considerations to ensure Indigenous candidates are aware of and can express interest in your job posting:

  o Indigenous positions are often filled by word of mouth or community sharing.
  o Posting in “non-academic” places will still be effective.
  o Still consider posting to sites even if you hire a search firm – the net must be as wide as possible. Institutional accounts for Indigenous job posting & media sites (iCIMS).
  o Refer to the Job Advertising Sites – Indigenous Focused excel document
  o For further examples, refer to Western University’s Resources on Diversity from Professional and Academic Programs

☐ Review suggested posting locations, and web communities and portals that are targeted at equity deserving groups

☐ Advertise in journals appropriate to the discipline.

☐ Advertise in required sites, as outlined on the advertising checklist (WORD document).

☐ Advertise in publications/websites targeted to underrepresented groups.

☐ Utilize professional society mailing lists.

☐ Promote the advertisement at professional meetings.

☐ Make calls or send emails seeking potential applicants to a wide range of contacts.

☐ Contact potential applicants from equity deserving groups directly and encourage them to apply.

☐ Best practice is to post job descriptions for a minimum of 30 days to reach a broader applicant pool.
Evaluating candidates

When evaluating any material, an assessor should:

- Be aware and consider the diversity of Indigenous identities and life experiences, along with the variety of ways these identities and experiences are articulated during the application process:
  - The cover letters will often state the identity of an Indigenous candidate – considered part of protocol.
  - In regard to reference letters or statements, be aware of what the references are speaking to (lived experience, academic excellence, research, etc.).
  - An oral statement of support from an Elder may look very different than a ‘standard’ reference letter.

- Use the developed assessment tools as the main form of evaluation.

- Spend time talking to the committee about the candidates

- Spend an equal amount of time reviewing each candidate (15-30 mins) as this helps mitigate bias

- Actively challenge notions of rewarding or overvaluing the familiar, such as westernized approaches to research. For instance, an oral statement of support from an Elder may look very different than a ‘standard’ reference letter

- Consider whether the interview questions allow candidates to speak to different ways of knowing, approaches to research, and/or experiences (e.g. how will space be given to candidates to speak about and be evaluated on research based in Indigenous ways of knowing?)

- Evaluate the candidates’ demonstrated commitments to EDI which includes experience with mentoring students or other faculty from underrepresented groups, engagement on committees related to equity, involvement in broader community initiatives, etc. This said, be mindful that diverse candidates should not be considered as diversity workers, but rather valued for their teaching and research as well, just like all candidates.

- Consider the value of lived experience, expertise, and transferable skills, particularly among candidates with intersectional identities who are often underrepresented in academia.
CV scanning is often used to evaluate a candidate’s qualifications; however, when used without an equity lens it can often prevent good candidates from advancing in the recruitment process.

A person with a history of chronic illness may have long periods of time in which they are not working (The Conference Board of Canada, 2015, p. 28). Some newcomers take longer to obtain their advanced degrees due to the financial constraints of relocating and the challenges of adapting to a new country and language. Persons with disabilities are more likely to have had career pauses (University of Lethbridge, 2007).

Cover letters / applications

☐ Focus on the skills versus where or how candidates received them. More women than men have positions at “lower tiered” institutions, so it is better to focus on the quality of the work itself rather than the location where it was completed.16

☐ Focus on the quality of the content versus the style of the resume itself.17

Reference Letters

☐ When evaluating letters of references, be aware of stereotypical thinking and how words and phrases may be applied differently to people based on their identity.18 Consider that:

  o Applicants who are white are more likely to be described using “standout” keywords (e.g. exceptional or best) while candidates from equity deserving groups were more likely to be described as “competent”.19
  
  o The University of Arizona published a guide to avoid gender biases in reference writing (pdf). They noted that in women’s reference letters, individuals were more likely to mention personal life, trying hard (versus accomplishments), include a lesser number of references than men, and are less likely to mention research and publications.
  
  o Women with comparable qualifications to their men-identified counterparts were more likely to be portrayed as ‘good’ versus ‘excellent’ in reference letters. Based on this, comprehensive reviews of CVs in addition to

16 Valian, 2004
17 HRCouncil, n.d.
18 University of Lethbridge, 2007
19 Ross, 2017
reference letters are needed, as women may have gaps in their reference letters based on the writer’s gender biases.20

Short list

☐ Frame the conversation through inclusionary criteria.
  o This involves selecting who to move forward rather than who to eliminate, a strategy that has been shown to mitigate bias.21

☐ Declare conflicts of interest
  o Conflicts of interest between committee members and applicants should be declared and handled appropriately. See Policy 69 for guidance on Conflicts of Interest.

☐ When the longlist or shortlist is created, ask whether equity deserving groups are included.
  o Try to include more than one member of equity deserving groups on the short-list. Diversity can be invisible, so while it might be hard to determine if someone is a member of an underrepresented group, pay attention to information that is available including associations to which people may belong.
  o Evaluation bias is minimized when more than one member of an underrepresented group is interviewed.22

Ensuring a diverse slate of candidates

☐ In the case that this diversity is not apparent, applicant files should be revisited and checked to see whether any suitable candidates have been overlooked.

☐ If qualified candidates from underrepresented groups are not included, you should pause the process and re-advertise (ensuring you are reaching a wide audience). You may also want to review your processes before the next hire, including wording and language used, and where the job ad is posted.

☐ The Chair (through the Dean) should provide the University Appointments Review Committee (UARC) with a brief summary of the recruiting process including efforts to solicit candidates from the under-represented gender. Documentation (such as CVs, letters of reference) will be provided for the top candidates.

---

20 Dutt, Pfaff, Berstein Dillard and Block, 2016
21 Hugenberg, Bogenhausen, and McLain, 2006
22 McMaster Engineering, 2015
three candidates. If all three top candidates are of the same gender, documentation will also be provided for the top candidate of another gender.
Holding interviews

Interviews
Consider the ways that candidates with intersectional identities who are often underrepresented in academia can feel comfortable and safe to discuss their expertise and experience.

- How will space be given to candidates to speak about teaching and research based in Indigenous ways of knowing in the interview?
- When scheduling interviews, ensure you ask if any accommodations are needed or if there are considerations that would make the interview more accessible.
- Even if a candidate has not requested an accommodation, give them detailed information about the complete itinerary, general information on the University of Waterloo, and the Region prior to their arrival.
- Consider including information that might be useful to candidates from equity deserving groups (for e.g. accessible parking location, multi-faith rooms if one is available, private/quiet space).
- Ensure that candidates are given more than adequate space and time for rest, preparation, and reflection.
- Be sensitive to issues related to cross-cultural communication, like differences in accents and speech patterns, differences in greetings, or preferences around physical touch (e.g. handshakes) that may lead to direct or indirect discrimination.
- Ensure space is given to candidates to speak about teaching and research based in Indigenous ways of knowing.
- Understand that Indigenous and racialized people, particularly those identifying as women or Two Spirit, may have a harder time showcasing their accomplishments.

In some cultures, it is impolite to look a person in a position of authority directly in the eye. In others, contradicting another person openly is unacceptable, especially if that person is in a position of authority. Indigenous peoples and other cultures often look askance at self-promotion and are more likely to credit others for their successes (University of Lethbridge, 2007).

- Ensure you spend sufficient time evaluating the candidate:
Focus on how well candidates measured against the position-related criteria tested in each of the evaluation formats.23

Mitigate personal or committee bias or lack of understanding:

- Should an interview cause concern or a lack of clarity, consult with the committee as a whole. For example, strong accents or disabilities may impede full understanding.

- Some candidates may offer information (e.g. marital status) during an interview. Information irrelevant to the position should be dismissed. (See Appendix F for Addressing the OHRC Protected Grounds During an Interview).

- If another committee member makes a comment that indicates bias, ask for clarification.

Interview checklist

- Document discussions about a candidate’s suitability and store the documentation as a part of the hiring records.

- Any department member that meets with the candidates is a part of the interview and should be encouraged to read this guide or complete equity training.

- All interactions (including lunches/dinners) are part of the interview process and as such, committee members must avoid conversations related to the prohibited grounds.

Campus visit

- Provide candidates with information about:
  - The position.
  - The department.
  - The surrounding Kitchener-Waterloo area.
  - Any relevant health or financial information (e.g. insurance).
  - Check with the Office of the Dean as to whether there is already such information available.

- Provide information on the University’s accommodations and leave policies, opportunities for mentorship, etc.

---

23 University of Lethbridge, 2007
☐ Create an opportunity for the candidate to speak privately with a representative from the Faculty Association.

Ensure you make the candidate feel included. Introducing candidates to potential mentors or social support groups may be of interest. Allow the candidate to express what they would like to see, and give them some input on the schedule (University of Lethbridge, 2007).
Selection

☐ Openly and thoroughly review all the documented evaluation input and scores collected to determine the best match for person to position.

☐ Keep notes of the discussion, as this may be helpful if any questions arise about the selection and decision making of the committee.24

☐ Ensure that you are recording information that will help you prepare your submission to the University Appointments Review Committee (UARC).

☐ Summarize results on one page to facilitate the final selection decision.25

☐ Notify unsuccessful candidates in a timely manner.

☐ Consider providing feedback on why a candidate was unsuccessful to help strengthen their future applications and widen the pool of equity deserving candidates.
  ☐ Provide feedback on what they did well and what they could improve.
  ☐ Provide information on other opportunities forthcoming or elsewhere.

Be prepared to explain why you made the decisions you did. To do this you need to ensure you have a reason for advancing certain candidates while not advancing others (ensure this reasoning is on an individual basis). Consider using a template to categorize why someone was not hired. An example of this is attached in Appendix G.

---

24 University of Lethbridge, 2007
25 University of Lethbridge, 2007
Wrapping up

Document storage

☐ The committee chair is responsible for the retention and storage of all evaluative materials related to the search (including notes from the committee meetings).

☐ These materials must be kept in accordance with the university requirements as outlined in Policy 46 – Information Management. Specific guidance on who is responsible for keeping categories of administrative information and how long we keep it is found in the University records retention schedules. The Human Resources section includes several retention schedules for different types of searches and appointments.

☐ When you are destroying records in accordance with the appropriate procedures, you will need to fill out a form on the University of Waterloo website to meet data storage requirements.

Faculty retention

While an equity approach to recruitment and selection may allow for more diverse faculty, retaining these faculty members is important. For example:

Mentorship
Providing opportunities for faculty to develop mentorship relationships (which can involve peer mentorship) improves job satisfaction and positively impacts their promotion.26 Further, Vaccaro and Camba-Kelsay (2018) noted that ensuring mentors had cultural competency training was important for diverse populations.

Time commitments
Faculty from underrepresented groups, particularly women, are more likely to engage in service commitments such as mentoring students.27 They are also more likely to teach undergraduate classes.28 This demand is especially prominent for Black women and Indigenous people. Find ways to encourage balance in service commitments between faculty members.

26 Malmgren, Ottino, and Nunes Amaral, 2010
27 Fitzgerald, 2006
28 Allen et al., 2000
Research interests
Supporting faculty who engage in community-based work is important but may lead to less research publications and a greater time commitment for the faculty member.

Supporting individuals with their research and community involvement should be a priority. For example, Indigenous faculty may engage in activities that do not produce research results but allows them to advocate for their communities.  

Frameworks and emerging definitions of Indigenous research and research methods should be referred to. For example, according to SSHRC, Indigenous Research is:

- Research in any field or discipline that is conducted by, grounded in or engaged with First Nations, Inuit, Métis or other Indigenous nations, communities, societies or individuals, and their wisdom, cultures, experiences or knowledge systems, as expressed in their dynamic forms, past and present. Indigenous research can embrace the intellectual, physical, emotional and/or spiritual dimensions of knowledge in creative and interconnected relationships with people, places and the natural environment.

- Whatever the methodologies or perspectives that apply in a given context, researchers who conduct Indigenous research, whether they are Indigenous or non-Indigenous themselves, commit to respectful relationships with all Indigenous peoples and communities.

- This understanding of Indigenous research reaffirms SSHRC's support of research by and with Indigenous peoples. Research by and with Indigenous peoples and communities emphasizes and values their existing strengths, assets and knowledge systems.

- All research involving Indigenous peoples must be undertaken in accordance with the second edition of the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans, and, in particular, Chapter 9: Research Involving the First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada.

Examples of emerging Indigenous research definitions:

29 Griffin and Reddick, 2011; Fitzgerald, 2006
Research means talking about relational accountability. As a researcher you are answering to all your relations when you are doing research (Wilson, 2008).

[We are] not so much concerned with the actual technique of selecting a method but much more with the context in which research problems are conceptualized and designed, and with the implications of research for its participants and their communities.” (Smith, 2012, p. ix)

“We use re-search purposefully to indicate our shared commitment to the production of knowledge that is both Indigenous and decolonizing. We hyphenate the word to re-search and in doing so promote an act of looking again at how we search and as we ‘re-search, we re-write and we re-story ourselves’ by centering our epistemologies, principles, and methodologies in our search and gathering journey” (Absolon & Dion, 2018, p.2).

“There is a distinction between Indigenous research methodology that may be selected as a methodology by all researchers and Indigenous research conducted by Indigenous scholars” (Weber-Pillwax, 1999).
Appendix A: Examples of Implicit Bias in Recruitments

Common Shortcuts
Shortcuts can lead to biased assessments in evaluation if we are not motivated to avoid them and skilled in doing so. These shortcuts can lead to erroneous conclusions that underrepresented candidates are unqualified or a bad fit.

Cloning
Replicating oneself by hiring someone with similar attributes or background. Also refers to the undervaluing of a candidate's research or research methods because they are not familiar, as well as expecting candidates to resemble someone whom the search committee is replacing. Cloning limits the scope and breadth of approaches and perspectives in research, teaching and service.

Snap judgements
Making judgements about the candidate with insufficient evidence. Dismissing the candidate for minor reasons or labelling a candidate “the best” and ignoring positive attributes of the other candidates. Having a covert agenda furthered by stressing something trivial or focusing on a few negatives rather than the overall qualifications. Often occurs when the hiring process feels rushed.

Fit/Bad Fit
While it may be about whether the person can meet the programmatic needs for the position, it often is about how comfortable and culturally at ease hiring committee members feel.

Negative Stereotypes
Characterized by assumptions of incompetence. The work of members of equity deserving groups is scrutinized much more than majority faculty, at all stages of academic career.

Positive Stereotypes
Dominant group members are automatically presumed to be competent. Candidates from dominant groups often receive the benefit of the doubt, negative attributes are glossed over, and success is assumed. Also called the “original affirmative action”

---
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because dominant group members are automatically presumed qualified and thereby
given an unearned advantage.

**Elitist Behavior (also called “Raising-the-bar”)**
Increasing qualifications of people from marginalized groups because their competency
does not strike committee members as trustworthy. Downgrading the qualifications of
people from marginalized groups, based on accent, dress, and demeanor. In short,
uneven expectations based on a candidate’s social identity.

**Wishful Thinking**
Insisting racism, sexism and other forms of prejudice no longer exist.

**Euphemized bias**

**Visionary**
Term used to describe members of dominant groups who are often evaluated based on
their potential whereas underrepresented groups are judged on their accomplishments
and track record only. For example: “he has vision” or “she lacks vision”.

**Star**
Used when the speaker is an infatuated fan of the candidate under consideration. When
you hear it, ask the speaker to explain their use of the term and support it with evidence.
For example: “she’s not a star” or “it’s clear he’s a rock star”.

**Committed, single-minded focus or hard-worker**
These terms could be cloaking a bias against caregivers, those faculty members who
cannot depend on what Williams (2000) calls a “flow of family work” which allows ideal
workers to log long hours in the office while still having their material needs met.

Adapted from Joann Moody’s *Rising Above Cognitive Errors: Guidelines to Improve
Faculty Searches, Evaluations and Decision-Making* (2010).

**Source:** [Interrupting Bias in the Faculty Search Process](#) (PDF)
Appendix B: Diversity checklist for committees

A diverse search committee is important in recruiting and hiring the best qualified candidates for positions. With a diverse search committee, it is more likely that alternate perspectives will be considered, and that candidates will be evaluated with a strengths-based approach. Diverse faculty members assist us in many things including “[preparing] all students for a diverse society, [promoting the] success of a diverse student body [and increasing] the engagement of new scholarship” (Wood, 2018, p. 139).

This checklist is a useful tool to be intentional about the ways the committee embedded equity in the hiring process. It was designed for Waterloo’s CRC hiring process, but could be adapted for other hires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No (Please provide a reason)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have had a discussion on demographic gaps in our department and opportunities to fill those gaps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have completed equitable recruitment and selection training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have diversity on the committee in terms of gender, race, ability, indigeneity, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have designated an equity champion on the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are aware of relevant equity legislation and CRC guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are aware of <a href="#">CRC equity targets</a> and considered this in our committee processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (Please provide a reason)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committee members are representative of the Faculty at the University of Waterloo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We consulted stakeholders where appropriate (such as the Equity Office, Office of Research, etc.) to ensure we were meeting best-practices for our search.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Example 1, faculty recruitment rubric

Name of candidate: _____________________________________________________

Candidate pronouns: ____________________________________________________

Position: ______________________________________________________________

Name of Evaluator: ___________________________ Date: ______________________

☐ Faculty
☐ Staff
☐ Student
☐ Other

Department: _____________________________

Please indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):

☐ Reviewed candidate’s CV
☐ Met with candidate one-on-one
☐ Attended candidate’s research seminar
☐ Met with candidate in group
☐ Attended candidate’s teaching seminar

How effective do you believe the candidate will be in meeting the responsibilities of this position? ______________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
Rubrics should be based on the necessary skills to complete the job and are specific to the job and faculty. Based on the categories below, job criteria, and faculty, the committee is encouraged to develop their own custom rubric. Questions asked should be written objectively, rooted in the requirements of the job, and not focus on personality or culture of the department or faculty.

Hiring committees, after they have completed this toolkit together, are encouraged to create language to explain each of these categories for evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge and Score</th>
<th>Demonstrated 5-4 points</th>
<th>Somewhat Demonstrated 3-2 points</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated 1-0 points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Skills in Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skills in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Score</td>
<td>Demonstrated 5-4 points</td>
<td>Somewhat Demonstrated 3-2 points</td>
<td>Not Demonstrated 1-0 points</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and anti-Racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, I find this candidate to be:

- [ ] Highly acceptable
- [ ] Acceptable
- [ ] Not acceptable
- [ ] No opinion

Additional comments on the candidate’s strengths or any concerns you might have:

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
Have I ensured that my assessment is based on an unbiased evaluation of the candidate’s ability to fulfil the requirements of the position?

Signed: ___________________________________________________________ Date: ________________
Appendix D: Example 2, faculty recruitment rubric

Recognized teaching ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas of specialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision (e.g. masters and doctoral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of additional work with graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with distributed learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content, knowledge, skill in field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive material / non-discriminatory language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulated, valid &amp; fair means of assessing achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative, creative development of course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technologies to improve teaching &amp; learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research, Scholarship or Creative Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has presented and disseminated work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals from recognized teaching ability (above):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals from research, scholarship or creative work:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E: Addressing the OHRC Protected Grounds during an interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Grounds</th>
<th>Prohibited Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Family status     | • number of children or dependents  
|                   | • child-care arrangements        |
| Gender identity   | • specific titles such as Mr., Mrs., Miss or Ms. on an application or anything that asks the candidate to identify their gender (i.e., leave it up to the candidate to offer a prefix and avoid boxes which force a candidate to choose a gendered prefix) |
| Disability        | • whether a candidate has received workers' compensation  
|                   | • whether applicant has ever received psychiatric care or been hospitalized for emotional problems  
|                   | • whether candidate drinks or uses drugs  
|                   | • a list of all disabilities, limitations, and health problems |
| Creed             | • if candidate will work on a specific religious holiday  
|                   | • about religious affiliation  
<p>|                   | • references from a clergy or religious leader |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Grounds</th>
<th>Prohibited Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Accommodations    | • It is illegal to ask questions or discriminate a candidate/employee based on these grounds unless it is a bona fide occupational requirement.  
• Employers are expected to accommodate the employee and candidate to the point of undue hardship. |
Appendix F: Equity Questions

The following interview questions have been collected from UHS staff and departments, the Division of Equity & Inclusion, informational interviews with recruiters, and internet research.

Equity-related interview questions
☐ The University is committed to equity, diversity, inclusion and anti-racism. Can you tell us about your experience working with marginalized groups and the impact of those experiences?

☐ Can you tell us about your experience with creating inclusive research teams/training environments?

☐ Can you tell us about your experience with mentoring students or other faculty from underrepresented groups?

☐ What do you see as the fundamental characteristics of organizations that create an inclusive environment?

☐ How might your research or professional experience contribute to equity and anti-racism?
Appendix G: Reasons applicant is not hired or selected

Once you have decided an applicant is not a top candidate, a not hired/selected reason must be identified. The list of system not hired or selected reasons for both Faculty are listed below.

- Application errors/incomplete
- Failed to provide or requested application documents/materials
- Does not meet minimum/required qualifications
- Lacks preferred qualifications
- Lacks sufficient education/training/certification
- Experience insufficient or not as strong as finalist(s)
- Education or experience incompatible
- Job-related knowledge/skills/abilities insufficient or not as strong as finalist(s)
- Failed to respond/unable to contact
- Declined interview/unavailable for interview
- Failed to demonstrate effective communication skills
- Failed to adequately answer interview questions
- Unavailable for employment at designated start date
- Unable to work required shift
- Requires a higher salary than able to offer
- Inadequate references
- Unsuccessful background check
- Did not meet pre-employment requirements
- Would be considered if the first choice declined
- Accepted another job
- Withdrew from consideration
- Declined offer of employment
- Considered internal/promotional candidates only
- Position claimed by layoff candidate
- Position cancelled
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Appendix H: Websites, publications and organizations supporting designated groups

- Association for Women in Mathematics
- Canadian Indigenous Peoples Job Seekers Portal
- Senior Women Academic Administrators of Canada
- Elsevier Advancing Postdoc Women Clearinghouse
- Association for Women in Science
- American Association for University Women
- National Organization of Gay and Lesbian Scientists and Technical Professionals
- American Association for the Advancement of Science
- American Educational Research Association
- Canadian Association of Postdoctoral Scholars
- Conference Board of Canada
- Resources for Indigenous Postdoctoral Fellows
- Indigenous Waterloo website (Send job ads to Sami Iskandar (s6iskandar@uwaterloo.ca) at St. Paul’s)
- Mi’kmaq Maliseet Nations News
- UArctic
- Aboriginal Professional Association of Canada
- NAISA Native American and Indigenous Studies Association
- American Indigenous Research Association
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