STANDING LEADERSHIP SEARCH COMMITTEE (**SLSC**) OVERVIEW

**Options for Committee Formation**

Of note, for all SLSC configurations members should have diverse identities including sex/gender, race/ethnicity, and career stage.

1. **Standing SLSC:** 5 – 6 members responsible for taking *Gender-Career* and *Race* IAT and IAT debrief, review + update job descriptions, interview criteria, etc. and convene for open calls
2. **Core SLSC:** 2 -3 members responsible for taking *Gender-Career* and *Race* IAT and IAT debrief, review + update job descriptions, interview criteria, etc.; additional 2 – 3 rotating (department or non-department) members participate in open calls
3. **Inter-Department SLSC:** 5 – 6 members across 2 – 3 departments/sections responsible for taking *Gender-Career* and *Race* IAT and IAT debrief, review + update job descriptions, interview criteria, etc. and convene for open calls

**Diversity Advocate**

1. Suggested: Columbia University recommends asking a senior team member to be the diversity advocate, who may feel more comfortable with such advocacy than an early career team member. This person should preferably not be the only URG or woman on the SLSC, but we recognize that this decision will be department-specific
2. Roles + Responsibilities
   * Lead *Gender-Career* and *Race* IAT de-brief
   * Review applicant pool to ensure it is reflective of department demographics; if not, consider whether evaluation biases or assumptions have influenced your ratings + elevate to SLSC and ask the SLSC if they have fully tapped their network
   * Reviewing applicant evaluations by the committee and flagging for gendered/racial language
   * Questions for the Diversity Advocate to raise during and between committee meetings (see Inclusive Language Practices)
     + Are there any occupational, gendered or racial stereotypes used in how the committee is considering the applicant’s prior expertise and experiences?
     + If an applicant’s race, sexual orientation, sex or gender, or disability, is mentioned in the interview or in the discussion of their qualifications, was it necessary to do so?
     + Are the same kinds of information and descriptions used when discussing or considering people of different groups? Are phrases or language that highlights “being a part of a team,” empathy, and teaching skills used when discussing women, but phrases like “decisive” and “leadership” used when discussing men? The use of such language reinforces gender biases and stereotyping and seriously undermines the perceived professional expertise of women
     + Are people making assumptions (including things like an applicant not having time or bandwidth for the role)? If so, encourage seeking out the unknown information
     + Has the committee paid attention to the applicant’s prior experiences with diversity, equity and inclusion efforts?
     + Are there “non-traditional” experiences that would bring an important new perspective to the position?
   * The Diversity Advocate is **not expected** to be the only member responsible for promoting a diverse candidate pool, and is **not expected** to control the outcome of the search