

In attendance:

Burch, Christina	Kieber, Joseph	Slep, Kevin
Coble, Jennifer	Liljegren, Sarah	Sockman, Keith
Copenhaver, Gregory	Lohmann, Cathy	Stegenga, Barbara
Dangl, Jeff	Lohmann, Kenneth	White, Peter
Desaix, Jean	Matthysse, Ann	Wiley, Haven
Duncan, Mara	Matera, Gregory	Yeh, Elaine
Duronio, Robert	Mitchell, Charles	
Gensel, Patricia	Pukkila, Patricia	
Goldstein, Bob	Reed, Jason	
Grant, Sarah	Reice, Seth	
Hedrick, Tyson	Rogers, Steve	
Hulbert, Allen	Searles, Lillie	
Johnson, Corey	Sekelsky, Jeff	
Kier, William	Servedio, Maria	Elizabeth Wojtowicz (grad student)
		Laurie McNeil (visiting speaker)

I- Announcements (Bill Kier)

- a. Karin Pfennig is the recipient of a 2008 NIH Director's New Innovator Award.
- b. Jason Lieb was awarded one of the 2008 Phillip and Ruth Hettelman Prizes. He will be giving a lecture that is yet to be scheduled and food is always provided.
- c. Bowles nomination. Associate Dean Tom Clegg was very impressed with our choice, Annie Schmitt. Our nomination has been approved at the Dean's office and has been forwarded to the Provost. The provost should be moving quickly and there is optimism that Annie's seminar visit on November 4th may become a formal interview.

II- Computational Biology Search (Bill Kier-for Jason Lieb and Todd Vision)

- a. The advertisement has been posted and review of candidates will begin November 17th.
- b. In an effort to identify and recruit the very best candidates this year, faculty members are encouraged to personally contact colleagues and solicit applications. In the next few weeks, the search committee will provide the department with a detailed letter that we should personalize and forward to colleagues and friends with the express goal of increasing the number and quality of candidates overall but in particular of minority or women candidates.

III- BBSP Grad admissions and recruitment (Bob Duronio)

- a. All MCDB students can come through BBSP, however students can apply directly through Biology. Any MCDB faculty member who wants to recruit a student directly should let Greg Copenhaver know.
- b. EEOB students may go through BBSP or directly to Biology. The EEOB webpage should be clear at this point.

IV- BBSP Grad admissions and recruitment (Bob Duronio)

- a. All MCDB students can come through BBSP however students can apply directly through Biology. Any MCDB faculty who want to direct recruit a student should let Greg Copenhagen know.
- b. EEOB students may go through BBSP or directly to Biology-the EEOB webpage should be clear at this point.
- c. Overview of upcoming recruitment process
 - i. There will be 4 committees. The organization of these committees is different from last year. There will be two MCDB/quantitative committees and two Cell signaling/microbiology committees; students interested in Biology can and will likely be reviewed by any of these committees.
 - ii. The Chairs of these committees are Gary Pielak in Chemistry, Carol Otey (Physiology), Steve Crews (Biology) and Steven L. Bachenheimer (Microbiology)
 - iii. There will be 6 recruitment weekends topically oriented. Three will be MCDB weekends.
 - iv. To get involved in recruitment:
 - 1. Contact one of the chairs to serve on a committee
 - 2. Hold your calendars open for Fridays in Jan-Feb so you can meet with students and attend the Friday night dinner/party
 - 3. Attend the Saturday poster/lunch session

V- EEOB Grad admissions and recruiting (Keith Sockman for Karin Pfennig)

- a. Several changes are underway to improve admissions and recruitment
- b. Improving the pool
 - i. Faculty will be encouraged to update their webpages so we look like the productive department that we are.
 - ii. Improvements are underway to the Biology website in particular to indicate directly who are members of the EEOB faculty
 - iii. There is a suggestion from the EEOB grad admissions committee to make YouTube videos and Facebook entries to try to attract students to apply. Anyone is welcome to take up this project
- c. Evaluation of applicants
 - i. All applicants will be reviewed by two committee members who will assign a score of 1-3.
 - ii. An attempt will be made to identify a potential sponsor for all applicants prior to their visit.
 - iii. Changes to evaluation weekend (Feb 26-28)
 - 1. It is shorter; students will leave on Sat rather than Sun.
 - 2. Potential sponsor will arrange a schedule of appointments for the applicant.
 - 3. There will be a formal evaluation of each applicant by each person they meet with in scheduled appointment (Students, faculty, postdocs).
 - iv. Committee will be making the final say based on evaluations from point i and iii and comments from the prospective advisor.
- d. Recruitment
 - i. The breakfast session on Friday morning will be key. Highlights about new faculty will be featured; the area and strengths of the program will be presented.

- ii. There will be a follow-up organized where each applicant will be contacted by multiple members of the Biology department
- e. Comments:
 - i. A comment about the main difference that should be emphasized between Biology and BBSP is the rotation. Some EEOB students want to do rotations. Sockman suggested the example of his own web page which directs students on which to apply to depending on whether they are certain about working with him or want to do rotations.
 - ii. Several comments that BBSP also requires first year seminars and an ethics class. Also that it is important to make explicit the opportunities in BBSP.

VI- Issues to consider in searches and recruiting (Laurie McNeil –chair of physics)

- a. Laurie McNeil presented information regarding why it is important to consider minority and women recruitment and retention and some factors that pertain to said issue.
 - i. WOWS-Working on Women in Science: Evolved from a funding application to the NSF ADVANCE program to enhance the numbers and success of women and minorities. Although the original bid was unsuccessful, Etta Pisano led the push to get WOWS in place with internal funds with the hope of reapplying.
 - ii. WOWS is a 4-faculty member committee that will work with departments to advance the goals through issues that arise in a job search. In particular, they will meet with search committees to discuss in detail
 - 1. What are the best practices.
 - 2. What are unintentional things that lead to less than optimal results
 - iii. This is an expressed goal of the University and the College.
- b. Laurie presented several facts from a powerpoint presentation that Bill Kier will make available. A brief overview of this information
 - i. Companies with the highest % of women in top management have a higher return on equity than their competitors.
 - ii. In comparing Biology to the top 50 schools with PhD graduating programs, we have a lower (17% compared to 24.8%) percentage of total tenure track women Professors, but a higher (40% compared to 36%) percentage of women Assistant Professors. Like most of the top 50 schools, we have very few minority faculty (2% African American, 0% Hispanic).
 - iii. Some of the low recruitment and retention overall may be due to “Gender schemas”
 - 1. Often people associate particular traits with particular genders, and particular traits with ability in particular occupations. Thus unintentionally gender=trait and trait=ability; take out the trait and mentally gender=ability. So unless we are aware of these underlying biases we will not be objective
 - 2. Several studies to illustrate gender schemas were presented, they illustrated
 - a. that reviewers may unconsciously change criteria used to evaluate a male versus a female candidate,
 - b. that women are often not given the benefit of the doubt,
 - c. that women’s letters of recommendation are often different
 - i. Men’s letters are longer
 - ii. Women’s letters more frequently have “doubt raisers”

- iii. Women's letters more frequently emphasize effort over ability
 - d. that people in general prefer to hire and promote males.
- iv. Application of this information to our upcoming search
 - 1. Advertising
 - a. A broad ad will bring in a broader pool with more minority and women applicants
 - b. Try to attract candidate from non-traditional career paths (Industry, National Labs)
 - c. Advertising is not enough- solicit from colleagues. A two part solicitation is suggested: First ask who is exciting in the field and then ask who is exciting in the field and happens to be a woman or minority.
 - 2. Evaluating
 - a. Establish criteria and stick to it
 - b. Be explicit about how candidates meet or fall short of criteria
 - c. Read letters with biases in mind
 - 3. Selection
 - a. Don't rush to vote, discuss how each candidate matches criteria
 - b. Take a second look at underrepresented groups
 - c. Do not speak for the candidate (eg this candidate is part of a dual career couple and would never come here-this is illegal)
 - d. Give the benefit of the doubt equally
 - e. Consider special qualities a candidate might bring to the table
 - 4. Interviewing
 - a. Don't ask improper questions-a list of these is provided at the start of each search. Please review them before the interview,
 - b. Establish one set of questions you ask each candidate
 - c. Establish means to convey "sensitive" information without the applicant having to ask (e.g. Wows is generating a handout on maternity leave)
 - d. Provide contact opportunities with other underrepresented faculty members in the department or at the university
- v. For more information see www.hunter.cuny.edu/genderequity/
- vi. Comments
 - 1. A question was asked regarding minority schema. McNeil did not have any data although it may exist.
 - 2. A discussion about how to effectively use this information boiled down to two main points
 - a. Establish and maintain concrete criteria when evaluating candidates
 - b. Consider speaking with letter writers to get concrete examples of "doubt raisers" and ask questions that direct the letter writer to comment on ability rather than effort
 - 3. Goldstein provided an example of a search committee that reviewed its selection to guard against bias at a point when it was feasible, given the number of applications remaining under consideration.

4. White commented on an example where the contribution of women on multi-authored papers was questioned while the same concern was not expressed for male authors. This once again emphasizes the importance of establishing consistent criteria.

VII- No further issues