

What do we do?

Hiring managers and selection committees must:

1. Overcome objections to setting diversity as a goal.
2. Employ processes to proactively address traditional biases that have historically limited opportunities for female and other minority candidates.
3. Utilize *Best Practices* in recruitment, evaluation, and selection.

Best Practices for Hiring a Diverse Workforce

1. Set improving diversity as a key priority in all hiring and selection.
2. Educate all hiring managers and selection committees on recruitment processes and the impact of unconscious bias.
3. Engage hiring managers/committees in conversations regarding diversity and unconscious bias. Identify strategies for addressing both.
4. Ensure that the composition of selection committees is diverse (experience, discipline, gender, ethnicity, etc.).
5. Know the internal and/or external workforce demographics for the position being sought.
6. Establish specifically job-related criteria at the outset of the selection process but ensure it is broadly worded enough to attract a diverse applicant pool.
7. Expand the recruitment effort beyond traditional sources to generate diverse applicant pools. Invite candidates from a variety of diverse partners. Encourage all participants in the recruitment process to proactively network for referrals of diverse candidates.
8. Control unconscious bias when evaluating candidates at all stages of selection by consistently applying the pre-established criteria.
9. Validate that short lists reflect the diversity of the applicant pool and/or the available workforce. Consider adding additional candidates to improve the diversity of the pool.
10. Manage the interview process for consistency to ensure an optimal climate for each candidate.
11. Gather evaluations from all hiring managers/committee members and review for appropriateness. If any apparent impacts of bias are identified then discuss and resolve.
12. Evaluate the recruitment process overall at the end and adjust future efforts accordingly.

AURA's Statement of Commitment

As a leader in the astronomical community, AURA is deeply committed to the human resources that support our mission to advance astronomy and related sciences and is deeply invested in continually developing and improving its policies and practices for the purpose of providing a welcoming and fruitful work environment for all employees.

AURA believes that a diverse workforce, particularly one that includes women and individuals from underrepresented minority, veteran and disabled groups, contributes best to the achievement of excellence in both our organization and the scientific community as a whole.

All AURA staff bear responsibility for developing and fostering a diverse and inclusive work place. AURA's recruiting and hiring practices are designed to attract a broadly diverse pool of candidates including underrepresented applicants. When a vacancy occurs, AURA will hire the most qualified person from among the fully qualified applicants meeting AURA goals and clearly defined program needs while endeavoring to develop and maintain a diverse work force where women, underrepresented minority, veteran and disabled staff are proportionately represented.

When we assume "that cultural, ethnic, and gender biases are simply nonexistent [in] screening and evaluation processes, there is a grave danger that minority and female candidates will be rejected."

--Caroline S.V. Turner



Overcoming Unconscious Bias

"To evaluate other people more accurately we need to challenge our implicit hypotheses...we need to become explicitly aware of them."

--Virginia Vallian



“Seeking diversity means maximizing the organization’s opportunity to hire the best.”

When we are put in the position of evaluating others, we like to think that we will handle that responsibility professionally and objectively—that we will judge people based solely on their credentials and achievements.

However, each of us brings a lifetime of experiences and cultural histories that create in us certain “schemas” or non-conscious hypotheses (expectations or stereotypes) that affect our judgments of others. Schemas allow efficient, yet sometimes inaccurate, processing of information. They are unintentional, automatic and outside of our awareness. Our schemas can even conflict with our conscious or “explicit” attitudes. We perceive and treat people based on the schemas we hold regarding their physical and social categories regardless of our own.

Unconscious bias results from the schemas that exist in our understanding. Unconscious bias affects us all, regardless of gender, age, race, sexual orientation, ability, etc. A significant limiting factor in our selection and advancement processes and our desire to achieve a more diverse workforce may well be our inability to acknowledge the existence and impact of unconscious biases.

The good news is that our schemas and the biases that result from them can change based on experience and/or exposure to new information.

Unconscious Bias and Diversity

Diversity goals help make difference acceptable and desirable, and reverse patterns of discrimination. We need diversity in such things as gender, age, race, discipline, outlook, life experience and

personality to offer the breadth of ideas that lead to an effective workforce capable of achieving excellence in astronomical science.

Unconscious bias is an impediment to achieving diversity goals. Unconscious bias affects the evaluation of CVs and resumes, job credentials, applications and letters of recommendation. If the use of and impact of bias is not acknowledged and addressed, the processes for selection and advancement can become flawed, resulting in some candidates being underestimated and/or unfairly disadvantaged while others are inadvertently advantaged. This self-reinforcing cycle can make historical outcomes of who applies for positions, gets positions and progresses in positions seem “natural” or expected.

Examples of Unconscious Bias

» A study of over 300 recommendation letters for medical faculty hired at a large U.S. medical school in the 1990s found that letters for female applicants differed systematically from those for males. Letters written for women were shorter, seemed to provide “minimal assurance” rather than solid recommendation, raised more doubts, and portrayed women as students and teachers while portraying men as researchers and professionals. While such differences were readily apparent, it is important to note that all letters studied were for successful candidates only (Trix and Psenka 2002).D

» A study of the nonverbal responses of white interviewers to African American and white interviewees showed that white interviewers maintained (1) higher levels of visual contact, reflecting greater attraction, intimacy, and respect when talking with whites, and (2) higher rates of blinking, indicating greater negative arousal and tension, when talking with African Americans (Dovidio et al. 1997).

» In a double-blind study, when evaluating identical application packages of an undergraduate randomly assigned a male or female name, 127 male and female physics, biology and chemistry faculty were significantly less likely to hire the female applicant, rating her as significantly less competent and hireable than the (identical) male applicant. Participants also offered a lower starting salary and less career mentoring to the female applicant. (Moss-Racusin et al. 2012). Controlling for male-female cognitive ability, education, and experience differences across 486 work groups, a study finds that women received lower performance ratings when the proportion of women in the group was small, as is typical in many academic fields (Sackett et al. 1991).

» In an investigation of the association between an applicant’s self-identified race or ethnicity and the probability of receiving an U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH) R01 award, researchers found that after controlling for the applicant’s educational background, country of origin, training, previous research awards, publication record, and employer characteristics, black applicants were 10 percentage points less likely than whites to be awarded NIH research funding (Ginther et al., 2011).

» In a study of scientists in R&D labs, White, U.S.-born men received more favorable task assignments and evaluations whereas most others fell into an average zone on these aspects of their work. Only U.S.-born Black women were actually less favorably evaluated and had less access to the work experiences that are related to performance. “...Findings suggest that in science and engineering, the relative structural position of U.S.-born White men provides them with greater access to favorable work experiences...as well as giving them the benefit of the doubt in the evaluation of their work (DiTomaso et. al, 2007).

» Chapter 7 “Evaluating Men and Women,” *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*, provides an overview of research that repeatedly demonstrates that men and women who do the same things are evaluated differently, with both men and women rating women’s performances lower than men’s, even when they are objectively identical. (Valian, V., 1998).

References

1. Trix, F and Psenka, C. 2003. Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. *Discourse & Society* 14:191–220.
2. Dovidio, J.F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B. and Howard, A. 1997. On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 33:510-540.
3. Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J.F, Brescolle, V.L., Graham, M.J. and Handelsman, J. (2012) Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students. *PNAS* 121:1286109 .
4. Sackett, Paul R., DuBois, Cathy L. Z., and Ann Wiggins Noe (1991). Tokenism in Performance Evaluation: The Effects of Work Group Representation on Male-Female and White-Black Differences in Performance Ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76, 2, 263-267.
5. Ginther, Donna K., Schaffer, Walter T., Schnell, Joshua, Masimore, Beth, Liu, Faye, Haak, Laurel L., Kington, Raynard 2011. Race, Ethnicity, and NIH Research Awards’, *Science* 333.
6. DiTomaso, N., Post, C., Smith, D.R., Farris, G.F., and Cordero, R. (2007). Effects of structural position on allocation and evaluation decisions for scientists and engineers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52: 175-207.
7. Valian, V. (1998). *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.