Department of Biology Faculty Search Handbook
May 2022

Table of Contents

Faculty Search Committee (FSC) Composition	pg 2
FSC Charge and Preparation	pg 2
Faculty Evaluation of Applicants	pg 4
Faculty Vote	pg 5

Appendices

Appendix A	Job Ads (Examples from 2019-2020)	pg 6
Appendix B	Application Components (Examples from 2020)	pg 9
Appendix C	Conflicts of Interest Table (Updated 2022)	pg 11
Appendix D	Description of Evaluation Phases of Tenure Track Professor Searches	pg 12
Appendix E	Description of Evaluation Phases of Teaching Track Professor Searches	pg 19

Faculty Search Committee Composition

Important resources for considering the composition of the Faculty Search Committee (FSC) are provided here by the UW Office of Faculty Advancement.

After the approval to hire is given by the College of Arts and Sciences Deans in Spring quarter, the Biology Department Chair consults former Chairs, former FSC Chairs, the Executive Committee, or other faculty members to appoint the FSC.

The FSC has one Chair or two co-Chairs and members with fair representation and field expertise, while avoiding conflicts of interest.

For all Tenure Track Professor and Teaching Track Professor searches, FSC members are all voting faculty members. One FSC member currently serves on the Diversity and Equity Committee (DEC). In some cases, it is desirable to add a faculty member from outside the Biology Department.

FSC meetings are limited to committee members and discussions are confidential.

Role of Graduate Students, Postdoctoral Trainees, and Staff Members.

Graduate students, postdocs, and staff members are not members of the FSC, but they are included in the search process and candidates' visits as part of their professional training. Their involvement provides valuable trainee experiences and ensures that many diverse voices are heard throughout the search process, so that we can identify new colleagues who will thrive in our highly interactive and scientifically broad department. The Department Chair appoints graduate student, postdoc, and staff representatives. The FSC Chair notifies the representatives of opportunities to organize and solicit feedback from their groups to participate in the search and provide input to the FSC.

On the application submission site, we explicitly inform applicants that the materials that they submit (CV and statements) may be reviewed by representatives of our graduate student, postdoctoral, and staff communities, under the same confidentiality guidelines that are followed by faculty members participating in the process.

FSC Charge and Preparation for Autumn Quarter Searches

In the Spring Quarter preceding the search, the FSC:

1. meets with the Department Chair to lay out the search process;
2. meets with the College of Arts and Sciences Divisional Dean for the Natural Sciences;
3. meets with the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement;
4. participates in ADVANCE workshop on best practices;
5. develops the job ad and shares it with the Biology Executive Committee and Voting Faculty;
6. determines the application format; and
7. defines rubrics for evaluating each component of the application.

See **Appendix A** for recent ads for Tenure Track Professor and Teaching Professor searches.

See **Appendix B** for components of the applications for Tenure Track Professor and Teaching Professor searches.

The ad, application format, and rubrics for scoring must be approved by the Department Chair and the College of Arts and Sciences Divisional Dean.

The ad must be approved by Academic Human Resources in the Provost's Office.

The FSC Chair develops the search timeline and informs the Voting Faculty in late Summer or early Autumn Quarter.

Dissemination of the Job Ad

As soon as the job ad is approved, the FSC Chair emails the ad to Biology Department faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, undergraduates, and staff and encourages them to advertise through their professional networks and share with potentially interested colleagues.

The FSC Chair emails the ad to the Chairs of relevant UW departments across all three campuses.

The Department Chair informs the FSC Chair of the funds available for advertising the search broadly.

The ad is published by journals, career centers, and professional societies, such as those on the list below, with the selection determined by the search area.

Chronicle of Higher Education (CHE)
Nature (https://www.nature.com/naturecareers)
Science (https://jobs.sciencecareers.org/)
SACNAS career center (https://careercenter.sacnas.org/)
Cell (https://careers.cell.com/)
ASCB career center (https://jobs.ascb.org)
Biophysical Society (https://biophysics-jobs.careerwebsite.com/)
American Physiological Society (https://www.physiology.org/Jobs?SSO=Y)
Ecological Society of America (https://www.esacareercenter.org/)
SABER (https://saberbio.wildapricot.org/)
CBE-LSE (https://www.lifescied.org/)

An alert for the position is posted through the UW Biology twitter account (@UWBiology):
https://twitter.com/UWBiology/status/1313131832104415241

To attract a diverse candidate pool, the alert is retweeted with tags for a variety of affinity groups such as those listed below, with selection depending on type of position and field:

@BlackandSTEM , @BlackGeoRocks , @CienciaPR , @DiversifyEEB , @DiversifyGrads , @ESWNtweets , @GreatMindsSTEM , @LatinasinSTEM , @LGBTscholars , @nagtgeo , @NABGSocial , @NationalMANRRS , @NativesInSTEM , @POCalsoknow , @UWSACNAS , @SHPE , @SREBDocSch , @VanguardSTEM , @WokeSTEM , @WomenAs1 , @GeoLatinas , @missingscifaces , @BlackWomenSTEM , @AccessibleGEO , @PridePolar , @MPOWIR , @AWG_org , @SEG_Women , @sednaepic , @OutdoorAfro , @LatinoOutdoors , @EmpowerGeo , @AAS_Women , @AISES , @GeoSpaceLatinx , @WOCinSTEMChat , @WOmeninTechChat , @womeningis , @PrideSTEM , @OutinSTEM, @FemmesofSTEM , @WomenSciAUST , @stemfemmes , @500queersci , @Lotus_STEMM , @STEMforEquality , @TigerInSTEMM , @PR_Planeteers , @ADVANCEGeo , @TheSistasinSTEM , @chron_ac , @pocintech , @SWISEofficial , @WomensAquaticDC , @BlackWomenPhDs , @TrynaGrad , @sisterphd , @firstgendocs , @pyrodiverse, @MinoritySTEM , @SWMStweets , @WeDoGeoScience , @womenSTEMglobal , @citeblackwomen , @StemTrans , @ABRCMS , @womenofgeology , @WOMEESA , @WomenInStat , @DiversityChem , @DisabledLatinx , @GreenLatinos , @RAS_Diversity , @ACSDiversity , @herstemstory , @DiversifyMicro , @DiversifyImmuno

For plant biology searches: @DiversifyPlantSci , @BlkBotanistsWk , @ASPB_ECPS , @nbinstem

Components of the Application

See **Appendix B** for components of the application for Tenure Track Professor and Teaching Track Professor searches.

Faculty Evaluation of Applicants

Before the evaluation phases begin, the FCS should be reminded and should remind the Voting Faculty of three critical needs to ensure a fair and ethical search.

1) The involvement of certain individuals as reviewers should be considered in cases of potential Conflicts of Interest (COIs). It is the responsibility of the FSC and all faculty members to ensure that COIs are identified and fair practices are implemented throughout the search process.

2) The FSC and entire faculty group should mitigate against the impact of personal and collective biases and maintain fairness and confidentiality at all times. Special attention is required when internal candidates or candidates with a history with the department are part of the applicant pool.

3) The FSC should organize search activities so that all candidates are subject to the same evaluation criteria, interview format, and visit schedules.

To address these needs, the FSC and Voting Faculty follows the **Appendix C** COI guidelines and The Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches Part 4: Assessment.

Typically, we use a process with 4 Phases:

Phase 1	FSC reviews candidates' brief statements
Phase 2	Voting Faculty reviews full applications of those who pass Phase 1
Phase 3	FSC interviews semifinalists using video
Phase 4	In-person (ideally) 2-day interviews with finalists

See **Appendix D** for detailed descriptions of each Phase.

Faculty Vote

After the in-person interviews, the FSC organizes the scoring and ranking of the finalists. In addition to numerical scores, the FSC collects anonymized, written feedback for all finalists.

To establish and consolidate finalist ranking, the FSC holds 'listening' sessions to discuss the merits and shortcomings of each candidate. These sessions are open to all members of the Biology Department.

The candidates are further discussed in two personnel meetings attended by Voting Faculty only to consider the reports of the FSC, DEC, and the graduate student and postdoc and staff groups. All faculty members are advised to consider candidates' potential for excellence in research, scholarship, teaching, and contributions to DEI and service.

The FSC makes its final ranked list of acceptable finalists then presents the list to the Voting Faculty as a motion for a final discussion. If the committee decides not to rank-order finalists, then the meeting includes a discussion by the faculty on strengths and weaknesses of each unranked candidate.

The FSC Chair will solicit a motion leading to final ranking with yes/no/abstain options. Following the meeting, the faculty vote by anonymous electronic voting.

Appendix A - Examples of Past Ads

Job Ad for Tenure Track Position in Mechanobiology from Fall 2020
Assistant Professor in Molecular, Cellular or Developmental Mechanobiology Search

Apply via Interfolio (link) The University of Washington (UW) Department of Biology is seeking an Assistant Professor in Molecular, Cellular or Developmental Mechanobiology, broadly defined. Researchers in this area aim to understand how living organisms (including any animals, plants, fungi or microorganisms) generate, sense and respond to physical forces, ranging from the single-molecule to the organismal scale. Force generation and changes in the mechanical properties of molecules, cells, and tissues determine an organism's physical form, and can influence a wide variety of cellular processes including differentiation, organismal development, physiology, and disease. We are particularly interested in candidates who are exploring new frontiers in mechanobiology, including for example those investigating connections between mechanics and evolutionary mechanisms, those who probe mechanobiology using biophysical and quantitative imaging methods, and/or those who combine experimental approaches with mathematical modeling. Mechanobiology is an evolving discipline, and we welcome candidates from any background to explain to us how their research fits into this theme. We invite applications for a full-time (100% FTE, 9-month), tenure-track faculty position at the Assistant Professor level with an anticipated start date of September 16, 2021.

The UW Department of Biology is a large collaborative and integrative department, spanning research areas from molecules to evolution. The Department provides a supportive research environment, and we particularly aim to foster a sense of belonging among all of our members at all levels. We seek a new faculty colleague who will actively contribute to and enhance our eclectic community, and who will be committed to supporting the success of undergraduate and graduate students from a broad range of diverse backgrounds.

Our department hosts advanced imaging infrastructure and UW has a large number of excellent research services and shared facilities. We have a new Life Sciences Building (opened in 2018) centrally located on the Seattle UW campus nearby other departments in all areas of science, engineering, and medicine. The vibrant local research community also includes the UW Friday Harbor Laboratories, the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, the Allen Institutes (for Brain Science, Cell Science, Immunology and Artificial Intelligence), and a wide variety of other private and public research organizations.

Successful applicants are expected to develop an original, independent, extramurally-funded research program in mechanobiology, and promote diversity and equity in their research, teaching, and service activities. They will be expected to teach undergraduate and graduate courses as appropriate.

Applicants must have earned a doctorate, or foreign equivalent, in the biological sciences or a related field by the date of appointment. Applications will be submitted through Interfolio (link) and must be received by October 31, 2020 to receive full consideration. We welcome inquiries from prospective applicants, addressed to Drs. Clemens Cabernard and Julie Theriot, co-chairs for this search committee, at MechanobiologySearch@uw.edu (link sends e-mail).

The University of Washington is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer. The University is building a culturally diverse faculty and staff and strongly encourages applications from women, minorities, individuals with disabilities and covered veterans. The University is the 2006 recipient of the Alfred P. Sloan award for Faculty Career Flexibility and is committed to supporting the work-life balance of its faculty. Our NSF-supported ADVANCE program http://advance.washington.edu/ is dedicated to increasing the participation of women in STEM disciplines.

Job Ad for Tenure Track Position in DBER from Fall 2019

Assistant Professor in Discipline-based Education Research in Biology

The University of Washington (UW) Department of Biology is seeking an Assistant Professor in biology education research. We are searching for individuals who employ rigorous qualitative and quantitative approaches to address understudied questions of broad importance concerning college-level student learning, motivation, and retention in biology. We invite applications for a full-time (100% FTE, 9-month), tenure-track faculty position at the Assistant Professor level with an anticipated start date of September 16, 2020.

The UW Department of Biology is a large collaborative and integrative department, spanning research areas from molecules to ecosystems. The Department provides a supportive research environment, actively engages with faculty and students on topics of diversity and equity, has a long-term strategic hiring plan and a new Life Sciences Building. Within UW Biology, the Biology Education Research Group has established an international reputation for excellence in discipline-based education research. In addition to contributing to this group, we seek a colleague with a demonstrated interest in interdisciplinary research collaborations with scholars in the social sciences, education, biology or other STEM fields.

Successful applicants are expected to develop an original, independent, extramurally-funded research program in biology education research, and promote diversity and equity in their research, teaching, and service activities. They will be expected to teach Introductory Biology and advanced undergraduate or graduate courses as appropriate.

Applicants must have earned a doctorate, or foreign equivalent, in the biological sciences or biology- related field by the date of appointment. To view the full advertisement and submit an application, please visit Interfolio (apply.interfolio.com/64869).

The deadline for applications is October 1, 2019. Questions should be sent to Drs. Alison Crowe and Martha Bosma, Co-Chairs for this search committee at uwbiologydbersearch@uw.edu.

The University of Washington is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer. The University is building a culturally diverse faculty and staff and strongly encourages applications from women, minorities, individuals with disabilities and covered veterans. The University is the 2006 recipient of the Alfred P. Sloan award for Faculty Career Flexibility and is committed to supporting the work-life balance of its faculty. Our NSF-supported ADVANCE program http://advance.washington.edu/ is dedicated to increasing the participation of women in STEM disciplines.

Job Ad for Teaching Track Professor

To be developed and discussed

Appendix B Application Components

The application for Tenure Track Professor positions includes:

1) Three brief statements (< 200 words) summarizing (a) your past research accomplishments, (b) your future research goals, and (c) your perspective on mentorship, diversity, equity, and inclusion. You will have the opportunity to expand on your ideas in these short statements more fully in the full application (see below).
2) A list of keywords representing your major areas of expertise, methods, and organisms.
3) The names and email addresses of three references who will provide letters of recommendation upon request.
4) Web links to your three most significant publications. Manuscripts that are publicly available on preprint servers (such as bioRxiv or arXiv) are acceptable.
5) A merged PDF with each of the following elements in this order:
   a) Cover letter describing why you are interested in joining the UW Department of Biology
   b) Curriculum Vitae, including your full publication list
   c) Research statement, covering both past research accomplishments and future research goals (PDF, up to 3 pages)
   d) Teaching statement, describing your teaching philosophy and specific plans for contributing to the educational mission of the UW Biology Department (PDF, 1 page)
   e) Diversity statement, discussing your perspective on barriers you have observed or overcome in your career and how those experiences have shaped your approaches to research, teaching, and mentoring. This is also an opportunity to briefly highlight important diversity, equity, and inclusion work you have done in the past, and how you will promote inclusion in your research and classroom environments at UW (PDF, 1 page)

The application for Teaching Track Professor positions includes:

1) Three brief statements (<200 words each) summarizing (a) your past teaching accomplishments; (b) your future teaching goals, and (c) your perspective on mentorship, diversity, equity, and inclusion. You will have the opportunity to expand on your ideas in these short statements more fully in the full application (see below).
2) A list of keywords representing your major areas of teaching expertise or interest
3) The names and email addresses of three references who will provide letters of recommendation upon request
4) Web links to your teaching video and 3 most significant education-related publications, if applicable. Manuscripts that are publicly available on preprint servers are acceptable.
5) A merged PDF with the following elements in this order
   a) Cover letter describing why you are interested in joining the UW Department of Biology
   b) Curriculum Vitae, including your full publication list
   c) Teaching scholarship[1] statement, covering both past scholarly work in teaching and future scholarly work in teaching, including discipline-based education research, if applicable (PDF, up to 3 pages)

d) Teaching statement describing your teaching philosophy and specific plans for contributing to the educational mission of the UW Biology Department (PDF, 1 page)
e) Diversity statement, discussing your perspective on barriers you have observed or overcome in your career and how those experiences have shaped your approaches to research, teaching, and mentoring. This is also an opportunity to briefly highlight important diversity, equity, and inclusion work that you have done in the past, and how you will promote inclusion in your research and classroom environments at UW (PDF, 1 page).

[1]See definition of teaching scholarship in footnote in **Appendix D** Processes for Teaching Track Professorship Searches on page 17.

Appendix C Department of Biology Conflicts of Interest for Faculty Searches

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">If you are a faculty member, staff member, postdoc, or graduate student:</td><td colspan="5">You can:</td></tr>
<tr><td>View the candidate's application</td><td>View the candidate's seminar online</td><td>Comment or rank the candidate's application</td><td>Be present during search committee or faculty meeting discussion of candidate</td><td>Vote on the candidate, including as part of a slate</td></tr>
<tr><td>Substantial collaborator with the candidate (major grants, ongoing projects for publication</td><td rowspan="5">Yes</td><td rowspan="5">Yes</td><td rowspan="4">No</td><td rowspan="4">No
But you may disclose your conflict and share your thoughts before you leave</td><td rowspan="4">No</td></tr>
<tr><td>"Family" member of candidate</td></tr>
<tr><td>Current or past grad/postdoc advisor of candidate</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ineligible to vote, but have a conflict of interest with the candidate</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ph.D. committee member, teaching mentor (instructor of record, mentored teaching postdoc, TA, past or minor collaborator</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes
But you must disclose relationship before speaking</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Internal candidate</td><td colspan="5">No, and you cannot view or comment on own application</td></tr>
</table>

Appendix D Detailed Descriptions of Evaluation Phases 1 – 4
Tenure Track Professor Search

Example from the 2020 Mechanobiology Tenure Track Professor Search

Phase 1. After the Interfolio application site closes, evaluation of applications begins.

For the initial evaluation, applicants' names and degree institutions are not visible to reviewers. Instead, each name is replaced with a unique identification number. This step is taken to minimize any possible unconscious reviewer bias based on gender or national origin.

The three brief (200-word) statements on 1) past research accomplishments, 2) future research goals and 3) perspective on mentorship, diversity, equity, and inclusion) for each candidate are read by three randomly assigned FSC members and scored ("Yes", "Maybe", or "No") according to the following rubric (written collaboratively by the FSC):

(1) Fit to search theme Interested in how living organisms (animals, plants, fungi, microorganisms) generate, sense and respond to physical forces.
Specific Mechanobiology examples are:
• Mechanics and evolution
• Biophysical and quantitative imaging methods
• Mathematical modeling
• Mechanotransduction
• Tissue engineering
• Community interactions
• Single-molecule biophysics

(2) Contribution to the Department of Biology (Yes for at least one criterion)
• Enhances or broadens expertise and range within the department
• Potential to collaborate with or integrate into existing areas
• Potential to contribute to undergraduate and graduate teaching mission of the department (competence in Biology)

(3) Exciting science, addressing big ideas (Yes for at least one criterion)
• Potential for or demonstrated achievement of creative and exciting research
• Potential for or demonstrated achievement in addressing big ideas
• Making connections with other research areas, potential bridging to other departments or schools

(4) Productivity (Yes for both criteria)
• At least one first-author paper that reports a major finding
• Cogent and compelling description of past accomplishments

(5) Mentorship (Yes for at least one criterion)
• Potential for, or demonstrated excellence, in mentorship based on brief diversity statement
• Demonstrated past commitment to DEI work

• Evidence of leadership

In addition, DEC members separately read each candidate's short statement on perspective on mentorship, diversity, equity, and inclusion. These are ranked as: concerning, average or excellent.

Statement from the DEC Chair describing a recent DEC review procedure:

1. Before reviewing diversity statements, reviewers revisit the following resources. "Reimagining the Faculty Search: Redefining Excellence and Merit" in "Strategies to Improve Equity in Faculty Hiring" by Needhi Bhalla (Molecular Biology of the Cell 2019) and "Rubric to Assess Candidate Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" (University of California 2019)

Here we highlight points from "Strategies to Improve Equity in Faculty Hiring."

"Diversity statements allow for a more holistic evaluation of applicants (Harris et al., 2018). For scientists from well-represented groups, they provide an opportunity to consider and discuss how one will educate, train, and/or mentor students, particularly those from historically marginalized groups, who may have very different life experiences. Considering the increasing diversity of the undergraduate and trainee populations, this will provide an opportunity to identify candidates who take diversity seriously."

"For scientists from historically marginalized groups, diversity statements can play an even more important role: They highlight the important diversity, equity, and inclusivity work candidates may have done, information that may be difficult to glean or that may even be completely absent from a candidate's CV. Because this essential work is not typically recognized with prizes, awards, titles, or promotions, it can often be 'invisible'; diversity statements can help to make this crucial work visible."

"Further, diversity statements also provide an opportunity for scientists who are underrepresented to talk about the barriers they have overcome in their careers and how these accomplishments may have shaped their approaches to research, teaching, and mentoring."

2. Each diversity statement is reviewed by two DEC faculty members, with an emphasis on identifying excellent or concerning outliers, with regard to (1) knowledge, (2) past engagement, (3) life experience, and (4) plans. Next, the reviewers meet for discussions of consensus recommendations.

3. A committee member enters the consensus recommendations into the Phase 1: Diversity Review site, converting consensus recommendations of "excellent" (in one or more of the four areas), "average," and "concerning" (in one or more of the four areas) into "yes," "maybe," and "no," respectively.

For the FSC meeting, scores are converted into numeric equivalents (yes = 2, maybe = 1, no = 0). For each candidate, scores from the three FSC reviewers are averaged and summed across all five criteria. After examining the distributions of scores, and discussing the relative importance of the rubric criteria, the FSC divides the candidates into three groups based on their overall or specific criteria scores: "Yes" (to advance to Phase 2): "Maybe" or "No":

From the “Maybe” group, individuals who received a score of “Excellent” from the DEC are promoted to the “Yes” group and individuals who had received a score of “Concerning” from the DEC were demoted into the “No” group. For the remaining candidates in the “Maybe” group, FSC members review their short statements rapidly and nominate individuals to promote to the “Yes” group. After this review, some candidates may be promoted to the “Yes” group to advance to Phase 2.

If there are applicants applying for an Assistant Professor position who already hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, the FSC Chair discusses these cases with the Department Chair who determines the next steps for considering the candidates.

Phase 2

All members of the faculty, including adjunct and affiliate faculty with the appropriate expertise in the search area, are invited to participate in online review of the applications. Some faculty members may opt out of the process because of sabbatical status or other constraints.

Each application is read and scored by four to six randomly assigned reviewers, including two or more FSC members and 2 or more non-FSC faculty members. The FSC monitors assignments to ensure that 2 or more field experts review each application. Scores assigned are: “Exceptional”, “Above average”, “Average” or “Below average” across four criteria according to the following rubric (written collaboratively by the FSC):

(1) Impact and innovation
• Evidence of or potential for significant scientific impact
• Evidence of or potential for innovation in scientific approach, methodology, analysis

(2) Teaching, mentoring, and diversity
• Evidence of or potential for teaching ability
• Dedication to and interest in mentoring
• Evidence of potential for strengthening or expanding the department’s teaching areas
• Evidence of or potential for promoting diversity

(3) Productivity (relative to applicants of similar rank)
• Evidence of consistent publication record, ideally at all career stages.
• Evidence of funding (fellowships, awards, transition grants (*e.g.*, K99)).

(4) Interdisciplinarity
• Evidence of or potential for incorporating interdisciplinary approaches and methodology
• Evidence of or potential for interacting with colleagues of different disciplines (at the department level, across departments, across UW).
• Potential for bridging or strengthening or extending disciplines within the department

Separately, the full diversity statements for Phase 2 candidates are read by DEC members and ranked by consensus as “Excellent”, “Average” or “Concerning”, as described above in Phase 1.

The FSC meets to discuss the candidates. For guiding the discussion, numerical scores are generated (Exceptional = 3, Above average = 2, Average = 1, Below Average = 0) and averaged across reviewers. Depending on the score distribution, candidates are sorted into "competitive" and "not competitive" categories. Further discussion includes or eliminates a small number of candidates based on DEC scoring. Remaining individuals are discussed. The FSC aims to reach unanimous consensus on recommending ~15 candidates to progress to Phase 3 (semifinalists). At a personnel meeting of the voting faculty, the FSC chair moves to advance this group of candidates to Phase 3. All voting faculty members have access to all of the candidates' application through the department's internal search site prior to the meeting, and at the meeting the FSC summarizes semifinalists' names, current institutions, and research topics.

After substantial discussion at the personnel meeting, and a faculty vote, the Department Chair presents the list to the Divisional Dean, along with a written description prepared by the FSC Chair of the search procedure. This allows the Divisional Dean to monitor efforts to maintain diversity in the candidate pool.

Phase 3

Letters of support are requested for the remaining candidates. Each semifinalist is scheduled for a short (20-25 minute) confidential Zoom interview with members of the FSC. This interview should include the majority of FSC members and one guest (a Biology graduate student or postdoc) and is recorded (with the candidate's permission) for later review by FSC or DEC faculty members only. For consistency and fairness, all candidates are asked the same questions (written collaboratively by the FSC), and the list of questions is sent one hour in advance of the interview time to give the candidate an opportunity to think about their answers, but not fully script and rehearse responses. The questions are asked by one of the two FSC co-chairs, and another FSC member keeps time.

Sample interview questions and allotted times are:

Research Vision [10 min]
• Why is your research topic important, and how is your contribution to the field distinct from and/or complementary to the work of others? (3 mins).
• What would be a major scientific accomplishment you would be most proud of in 5 years? (3 mins)
• Where do you see your field in 20 years and how will you help it get there? (3 mins).

Community Vision [10 min]
• What attracted you to the University of Washington and the Department of Biology? (2 mins)
• What teaching contributions do you hope to make? (2 mins)
• What do you think will make you a good mentor? (2 mibs)
• How will you increase equity and inclusivity as a faculty member of UW? (2 mins)

Do you have any questions for us? [2 min]

All FSC members score semifinalists on five criteria ("Excellent", "Good" or "Not competitive") according to the following rubric:

Vision: Insight, originality, and clarity of research plans. For example, did the candidate express new ideas and approaches or just 'more of the same'?

Citizenship: Will this person be a good departmental citizen? Do they speak respectfully of their co-workers, lab mates, 'competitors', or collaborators?

Communication: Will this person be a good teacher and mentor? Do they communicate their vision and research in a compelling manner? Did the candidate express their thoughts in terms understandable to non-experts, or was jargon excessive? Did the person answer the questions asked?

Scholarship: Did this person demonstrate good command of knowledge in the field and well-reasoned perspective on the most important questions?

All members of the FSC also write comments for each candidate.

The FSC discusses each semifinalist individually and weighs impressions from Zoom interviews, written applications and the letters of support which are only available to FSC members. The FSC considers scores and comments from earlier evaluation phases and aim to reach a consensus on recommending candidates to invite for full (two-day) finalist (virtual or in-person) interviews. The goal is to complete these tasks by mid-January.

All Biology Department voting faculty are provided with the list of finalists, access to the written applications through the departmental internal search site, and a summary of anonymized written comments on each candidate from the FSC members. At the department personnel meeting (goal: mid-January), the FSC Chair make a motion to invite the finalists for interviews.

Phase 4 - finalist interviews

Before invitations are extended, the Department Chair submits the list of finalists approved by the voting faculty and a detailed written description of the search process to the Divisional Dean. Usually, the Dean's approval is received within 1-3 days and finalists are informed that they are being invited.

By this time, the FSC must set the format for the visit, whether it is in-person or remote. The events include: entry (45-60 min) and exit (30-45 min) meetings with the Department Chair; research seminar; chalk talk; meeting with the DEC; meeting with graduate students and postdocs; meetings with faculty members, likely in small groups. If the interview is in person, we use meals as well to maximize interactions with the candidate. In some cases, or upon request by the candidate, meetings include faculty colleagues from outside the department.

Internal candidate(s) should be invited to interview first, in accordance with [The Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches Part 4: Assessment].

Seminar introductions should be somewhat standardized across candidates and brief to allow full time for the seminar.

Chair entry meeting: congratulations on getting to this stage; the main goal is to determine if the fit is right for the candidate; discuss department philosophy, major role in teaching undergraduates, and overall values on research/teaching/service; emphasize strengths of UW culture; review schedule; discuss space needs, tour facilities to show what is available; ask if they have any questions.

Chair exit meeting: ask how things went; provide feedback; clearly explain the timeline for the decision process; state directly how and when to expect to hear from the Chair. Explain that typically the decision will be one of: (A) "you are our top candidate; we want you to return for a second visit"; (B) "we are working towards an offer to another candidate but you are still in the running; I'll be in touch roughly every week or two until the situation clarifies; if you get any formal offers, please let us know"; or (C) "we won't be able to move forward."

Interview structure:

Duration and organization of visits and interviews are similar for all candidates

Candidates give a 1-hour research seminar at 12 noon on the first day of the visit (Monday or Wednesday), and a "chalk talk" on their future research plans on the morning of the second day. "Chalk talks" are open to all faculty members, members of FSC, and a small number of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. Candidates have one-on-one meetings with the Chair of the Department and if available, also the Divisional Dean.

In separate meetings, candidates meet with representatives of stakeholder groups:
1) the DEC, 2) Departmental Staff, and 3) Graduate Students and Postdocs. Candidates also have as many as 6 meetings with small groups of faculty (2-4 attending), mostly from our department, but also including a few colleagues from other departments whose work is closely related to the candidate's interests.

Evaluation rubrics and process for finalists:
Voting Faculty members score the finalists on the research talk and chalk talk performance, using the following rubrics:

Research talk:
● Impact and innovation: evidence of or potential for significant scientific impact; evidence of or potential for innovation in scientific approach, methodology, analysis.
● Scholarship: good command of knowledge in the field of the candidate; well-reasoned perspective on most important questions.
● Communication: skill in communicating their vision and research; ability to clearly and concisely answer questions; ability to use language aimed at an audience that is not specialized in the specific field of the candidate.

Chalk talk:

● Vision: Insight, originality, and clarity of research plans.
● Impact and innovation: evidence of or potential for significant scientific impact; evidence of or potential for innovation in scientific approach, methodology, analysis.
● Feasibility: feasibility of aims from a technical perspective; suitability of proposed methods to address the outlined aims.
● Communication: skill in communicating their vision and research; ability to clearly and concisely answer questions; ability to use language aimed at an audience that is not specialized in the specific field of the candidate.

A simple method is to use the scores ‘outstanding’, ‘good’ and ‘not competitive’, which are later converted into numerical scores: Outstanding = 2, Good = 1, Not competitive = 0.

Candidates are also evaluated based on their small group meeting interactions.

The FSC summarizes the scores for Voting Faculty discussion and voting.

Appendix E Detailed Descriptions of Evaluation Phases 1 – 4
Teaching Track Professor Search

Phase 1. After the Interfolio application site closes, evaluation of applications begins.

For initial evaluation, applicants' names and degree institutions are not visible to the reviewers; instead, each name is replaced with a unique identification number. This step is taken to minimize any possible unconscious reviewer bias based on gender or national origin.

The three brief (200-word) statements that focus on the scholarship of teaching[1] accomplishments (1) past accomplishments, 2) future goals, and 3) perspective on mentorship, diversity, equity, and inclusion) for each candidate are all read by three randomly assigned FSC members and scored ("Yes", "Maybe" or "No") according to the rubrics below:

(1) Fit to search theme
- Candidate's views of how students learn the area of biology for which they are being recruited
- Expertise and teaching innovations in their disciplinary area, including biology-related research in their content area.

(2) Contribution to the Department of Biology (Yes for at least one criterion)
- Enhances or broadens teaching expertise and range within the department
- Potential to collaborate on curriculum development or programmatic development (*e.g.*, peer facilitator training programs, programs to enhance diversity)
- potential to expand or contribute to existing diversity and equity efforts in the department and community

---

[1]Footnote on Scholarly Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as defined in Dolan et al. 2018:

"Scholarly teaching involves teaching in ways that are consistent with research on learning, such as collecting assessment data from students to inform instructional decision making (Angelo & Cross, 1993). SoTL extends scholarly teaching beyond the private environment of the classroom to the public domain through sharing and peer critique, bringing a level of systematicity and professionalism to improving instruction (Shulman, 2000). SoTL activities are typically descriptive and focus on innovations that address learning goals. Data collection and analyses are generally limited to one's classroom or program with the aim of making local improvements; when published following peer review, SoTL can also serve as a tried-and-tested curriculum or instruction for other instructors to adapt for use with their own students."

(3) Exciting and innovative teaching methods (Yes for at least two criteria)

- Potential for or demonstrated implementation of creative and exciting teaching methods aligned with evidence-based and inclusive teaching approaches
- Potential for or demonstrated achievement addressing students' major conceptual challenges in their disciplines
- Potential for collaboration on bridging disciplines within biology or forming connections with other departments or schools on curriculum design or implementation
- Use of assessment to reflect on impact of teaching practices on student learning and/or retention

(4) Productivity (Yes for at least 2 criteria)

- Cogent and compelling description of past teaching and learning accomplishments
- Participation in conferences or faculty development programs to stay current on the latest evidence-based teaching methods. Participation can be as an attendee or a conference facilitator or organizer
- Participation in regional or national education societies or education committees of science societies (*e.g.,* ASPB, ASCB, ESA)

(5) Mentorship and Diversity (Yes for at least one criterion)

- Potential for or demonstrated excellence in mentorship of teaching associates, teaching assistants, undergraduate researchers, or undergraduate peer facilitators
- Evidence of sustained commitment to diversity and potential for expanding or contributing to existing diversity and equity efforts in the department, UW and community

In addition, DEC members separately read each candidate's short statement on perspective on mentorship, diversity, equity, and inclusion. These are ranked as: concerning, average or excellent.

Example of the process previously used review procedure, described by a former DEC chair.

1. Before reviewing diversity statements, reviewers revisit the following resources.
"Reimagining the Faculty Search: Redefining Excellence and Merit" in "Strategies to Improve Equity in Faculty Hiring" by Needhi Bhalla (Molecular Biology of the Cell 2019) and "Rubric to Assess Candidate Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" (University of California 2019)

Here we highlight points from "Strategies to Improve Equity in Faculty Hiring."

"Diversity statements allow for a more holistic evaluation of applicants (Harris et al., 2018). For scientists from well-represented groups, they provide an opportunity to consider and discuss how one will educate, train, and/or mentor students, particularly those from historically marginalized groups, who may have very different life experiences. Considering the increasing diversity of the undergraduate and trainee populations, this will provide an opportunity to identify candidates who take diversity seriously."

"For scientists from historically marginalized groups, diversity statements can play an even more important role: They highlight the important diversity, equity, and inclusivity work candidates may have done, information that may be difficult to glean or that may even be completely absent from a candidate's CV. Because this essential work is not typically recognized with prizes, awards, titles, or promotions, it can often be 'invisible'; diversity statements can help to make this crucial work visible."

"Further, diversity statements also provide an opportunity for scientists who are underrepresented to talk about the barriers they have overcome in their careers and how these accomplishments may have shaped their approaches to research, teaching, and mentoring."

2. Each diversity statement is reviewed by two DEC faculty members, with an emphasis on identifying excellent or concerning outliers with regard to (1) knowledge, (2) past engagement, (3) life experience, and (4) plans. Next, the reviewers meet for discussions of consensus recommendations.

3. A committee member enters the consensus recommendations into the Phase 1: Diversity Review site, converting consensus recommendations of "excellent" (in one or more of the four areas), "average," and "concerning" (in one or more of the four areas) into "yes," "maybe," and "no," respectively.

For the FSC meeting, scores are converted into numeric equivalents (yes = 2, maybe = 1, no = 0). For each candidate, scores from the three FSC reviewers are averaged and summed across all five criteria. After examining the distributions of scores, and discussing the relative importance of the rubric criteria, the FSC divides the candidates into three groups based on their overall or specific criteria scores: “Yes” (to advance to Phase 2): “Maybe” or “No”:

From the “Maybe” group, individuals who received a score of “Excellent” from the DEC are promoted to the “Yes” group and individuals who had received a score of “Concerning” from the DEC were demoted into the “No” group. For the remaining candidates in the “Maybe” group, FSC members review their short statements rapidly and nominate individuals to promote to the “Yes” group. After this review, some candidates may be promoted to the “Yes” group to advance to Phase 2.

If there are applicants applying for an Assistant Professor position who already hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, the FSC Chair discusses these cases with the Department Chair who determines the next steps for considering the candidates.

Phase 2

All members of the faculty, including adjunct and affiliate faculty with the appropriate expertise in the search area, are invited to participate in online review of the applications. Some faculty members may opt out of the process because of sabbatical status or other constraints.

Each full application is read and scored by several randomly assigned reviewers, including two FSC members and two non-FSC faculty members. The FSC will monitor assignments to ensure that at least two field experts review each application. Scores assigned are: “Exceptional”, “Above average”, “Average” or “Below average” across four criteria according to the following:

(1) Impact and innovation

- Evidence of or potential for significant impact on student learning in their discipline
- Evidence of or potential for innovation in teaching approaches, methodology, and/or assessment
- Evidence of or potential for significant community outreach, including K-12 schools, museums and/or community groups
- Evidence of or potential of taking innovative approaches in their service/outreach activities

(2) Teaching, mentoring and diversity

- Evidence of reflective teaching (e.g. demonstrated changes in response to DBER findings, assessments of student learning, collegial evaluations or student feedback).
- Evidence of or potential for using evidence-based practices in teaching
- Evidence of reflective mentoring and use of best practices in inclusive mentoring
- Potential for strengthening or expanding the department's curriculum by creating new courses or revising existing courses.
- Evidence of sustained commitment to diversity and equity issues and potential to expand or contribute to existing departmental, university and community efforts

(3) Productivity (relative to applicants of similar rank)

- Evidence of consistent scholarship of teaching shown through presentations at local, regional or national meetings
- Evidence of broader impact in the education community (e.g. publication of innovative in-class activities/curricula aligned with national learning goals
- Evidence of course management as an instructor of record
- Evidence of new course and/or lecture development
- Evidence of funding (local, regional, or national sources)
- Evidence of mentoring (Peer Facilitator or Graduate Teaching Assistant professional development)

(4) Interdisciplinarity

- Evidence of or potential for incorporating interdisciplinary approaches and methodology
- Evidence of or potential for interacting with colleagues of different disciplines (at the department level, across departments, across UW).
- Potential for bridging, strengthening. or extending disciplinary knowledge within the department

Separately, the full diversity statements for all Phase 2 candidates are read by members of the DEC and ranked by consensus as "Excellent", "Average" or "Concerning", as described above in Phase 1.

The FSC meets to discuss the candidates. For guiding the discussion, numerical scores are generated (Exceptional = 3, Above average = 2, Average = 1, Below Average = 0) and averaged across reviewers. Depending on the score distribution, candidates are sorted into "competitive" and "not competitive" categories. Further discussion includes or eliminates a small number of candidates based on DEC scoring. Remaining individuals are discussed. The FSC aims to reach unanimous consensus on

recommending ~15 candidates to progress to Phase 3 (semifinalists). At a personnel meeting of the voting faculty, the FSC chair moves to advance this group of candidates to Phase 3. All voting faculty members have access to all of the candidates' application through the department's internal search site prior to the meeting, and at the meeting the FSC summarizes semifinalists' names, current institutions, and research topics.

After substantial discussion at the personnel meeting, and a faculty vote, the Department Chair presents the list to the Divisional Dean, along with a written description prepared by the FSC Chair of the search procedure. This allows the Divisional Dean to monitor efforts to maintain diversity in the candidate pool.

Phase 3

Letters of support are requested for the remaining candidates. Each semifinalist is scheduled for a short (20-25 minute) confidential Zoom interview with FSC members. This interview should include the majority of FSC members and one guest (a Biology graduate student or postdoc) and is recorded (with the candidate's permission) for later review by FSC or DEC faculty members only. For consistency and fairness, candidates are asked the same questions and the questions are sent one hour in advance of the interview start time to give the candidate an opportunity to think about their answers, but not fully script and rehearse responses.

Sample interview questions and estimated allotted times are:

Teaching Vision [10 min]:
• What major discipline-specific concepts or pedagogical issues do you see as challenges to student learning, and how has your contribution in this area distinct from and/or complementary to the work of others? (3 mins).
• What would be a major teaching accomplishment you would be most proud of in 5 years? (3 mins)
• Where do you see your teaching in 20 years and how will you help it get there? (3 mins).

Community Vision [10 min:]
• What attracted you to the University of Washington and the Biology Department? (2 mins)
• What do you think will make you a good mentor for undergraduate students and graduate teaching assistants? (2 mins)
• How will you increase equity and inclusivity as a faculty member of UW? (2 mins)

Do you have any questions for us? [2 min]

All members of the FSC score every applicant on five criteria ("Excellent", "Good" or "Not competitive") according to the following rubric:

Vision: Insight, originality, and clarity of teaching vision. For example, did the candidate express new ideas and approaches or just 'more of the same'?

Citizenship: Will this person be a good departmental citizen? Do they speak respectfully of their co-workers, lab mates, collaborators, or instructional support staff?

Communication: Will this person be a good teacher and mentor? Do they show skills in communicating their ideas in a compelling way? For example, did the candidate express their thoughts in terms understandable to non-experts, or was jargon used excessively? Did the person answer the questions asked?

Scholarship: Good command of disciplinary knowledge in the field, well-reasoned perspective on their teaching vision

All FSC members also write comments on each candidate.

The FSC discusses each semifinalist individually and weighs impressions from Zoom interviews, written applications and the letters of support which are only available to FSC members. The FSC considers scores and comments from earlier evaluation phases and aim to reach a consensus on recommending candidates to invite for full (two-day) finalist (virtual or in-person) interviews. The goal is to complete these tasks by mid-January.

All Biology Department voting faculty are provided with the list of finalists, access to the written applications through the departmental internal search site, and a summary of anonymized written comments on each candidate from the FSC members. At the department personnel meeting (goal: mid-January), the FSC Chair make a motion to invite the finalists for interviews.

Phase 4 - Finalist interviews

Before interview invitations are extended, the format for the visit, whether in person or remote, must be set by the FSC. The events should include: entry (45-60 min) and exit (30-45 min) meetings with the Department Chair; seminar; chalk talk; meeting with DEC; meeting with graduate students and postdocs; meetings with faculty members, likely in small groups. If the interview is in person, we use meals as well to maximize interactions with the candidate. In some cases, or upon request by the candidate, meetings will include faculty colleagues outside the department.

Internal candidate(s) should be invited to interview first, in accordance with The Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches Part 4: Assessment.

Seminar introductions should be standardized across candidates and brief to allow full time for the seminar.

Chair entry meeting: congratulations on being here and getting to this stage; the main goal is to determine if the fit is right for the candidate; discuss department philosophy, role in teaching undergraduates, and overall values on teaching/service; emphasize strengths of UW culture; review schedule; discuss needs and available facilities; ask if they have any questions.

Chair exit meeting: ask how things went; provide any feedback; clearly explain the timeline for the decision process; state directly how and when the chair expects to communicate with the candidates. Explain that typically the decision will be one of: (A) “you are our top candidate; we want you to

return for a second visit"; (B) "we are working towards an offer to another candidate but you are still in the running; I'll be in touch roughly every week or two until the situation clarifies; if you get any formal offers, please let us know"; (C) "we won't be able to move forward."

Interview structure:

Duration and organization of visits and interviews are similar for all candidates

Candidates give a 1-hour seminar at noon on Day 1 of their visit (Monday or Wednesday), and a "chalk talk" on their future plans on the morning of Day 2. "Chalk talks" are open to all faculty members and a small number of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.

In separate meetings, candidates meet with representatives of stakeholder groups: DEC, graduate students and postdocs, and staff and they have up to 6 meetings with small groups of faculty, mostly from the Department of Biology, but also including a few colleagues from other departments whose work or teaching interests are closely related to the candidate's interests.

Evaluation rubrics and process for finalists:
The Voting Faculty score finalists on the seminar and chalk talk performance using the following rubrics:

Departmental Seminar:
● Impact and innovation: evidence of or potential for significant impact on the undergraduate curriculum; evidence of or potential for innovation in teaching approaches, methodology, assessment.
● Scholarship: good command of disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge in the field of the candidate; well-reasoned perspective on most important questions.
● Communication: skill in communicating their ideas in a compelling way; ability to clearly and concisely answer questions; ability to use language aimed at an audience that is not specialized in the specific field of the candidate.

Chalk Talk on teaching plans:
● Vision: Insight, originality, and clarity of potential teaching contributions
● Impact and innovation: evidence of or potential for significant impact on the curriculum or the undergraduate community; evidence of or potential for innovation in approach, methodology, assessment
● Communication: skill in communicating their vision; ability to clearly and concisely answer questions; ability to use language aimed at an audience that is not specialized in the specific field of the candidate.

A simple method is to use the scores 'outstanding', 'good' and 'not competitive', which are later converted into numerical scores: Outstanding = 2, Good = 1, Not competitive = 0.

Candidates are also evaluated based on their small group meeting interactions.

The FSC summarizes the scores for Voting Faculty consideration and voting.