Facilitator's Guide for Video 1

C·I·C AGEP Professorial Advancement Initiative
FUNDING PROVIDED BY: NSF 1309028 1309173

Note to table discussion facilitator: Review the video in advance of the workshop. There are three different versions available (with closed captioning). Use the links below to view the version that will be shown during your hiring workshop.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JqqTLjdo9i8&feature=youtu.be
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kFxdsmK-gjc&feature=youtu.be
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g3Dh2Bzi2ag&feature=youtu.be

Many of the points and issues addressed in the video are subtle and can be missed on the first viewing.

Prior to showing the video during the workshop, an introduction will be given to set the stage. The introduction slides are attached for your review.

After the video has been shown, use the following questions to guide your table discussion. The comments printed in red are points that you should make sure are identified during your discussion.

a) What did you observe that was concerning?
   - Two of the faculty members are strongly biased by the accomplishments of Ryan Trent's advisor.
   - Strong bias toward Ryan's area of research (nano structures).
   - Bullying behavior by Professor Bill Schuster.
   - LaNeisha's contribution to undergraduate projects and undergraduate education was dismissed by Bill Schuster.
   - LaNeisha's engagement with industry partners was not recognized as being important.
   - While LaNeisha's research was observed to have received the same level of external recognition, the value of her research work did not enter the conversation. The problem is that Professors Schuster and Roth work in the same area as Ryan and were able to comment on his work. But, no one on the committee worked in LaNeisha's research area (antenna design—also very important) and therefore the importance of her research to the department was not discussed.
   - Ryan worked as part of a team with his advisor. His work was theoretical. How Ryan would be able to function outside of his group was not addressed.
   - In the interview flashback, Ryan is observed buttering up Professor Schuster. Ryan credited Professor Schuster's paper with providing the path for his success.

b) What is your assessment of how the committee chair ran the meeting?

- There was no voting process used. The chair steered the committee to accepting Ryan as the third finalist.
- The chair did not focus the committee discussion on the evaluation criteria.

c) If you were a member of the committee (but not the chair) what would you have said to change the discussion?
Possible actions
- Raise the issue of evaluation criteria. Ask that each candidate be discussed in the context of the criteria.
- Request additional input from faculty experts on LaNeisha's research, i.e. the importance of her work in antenna design and her contributions to the field, noting that none of the committee members were knowledgeable about her field.

d) Have you ever been on a committee where you've encountered this kind of dynamic?

After the table discussion, the workshop leader will ask each table to report highlights from the discussion. It is suggested that you ask one or two of the participants at your table to be prepared to comment. Note that there are many subtle issues embedded in the video and it may not be possible to cover all four questions listed above in the time allotted. Therefore, we have assigned each table one question to focus on and ordered the remaining questions so that collectively all questions will be addressed in depth by at least one table. The table assignments are listed below.

Tables 1, 5 and 9:
Start the discussion with question (a). During the reporting session which will immediately follow the table discussion, be prepared to share your list of "concerning" observations. Then continue down the question list: (b), (c), and (d).

Tables 2, 6 and 10:
Start the discussion with question (d). Then proceed to question (a). During the reporting session, immediately following the table discussion, be prepared to share the observations you identified in response to question (a). After addressing question (a), continue with questions (b) and (c).

Tables 3, 7 and 11:
Start the discussion with question (a). Then proceed to question (c). During the reporting session, which will immediately follow the table discussion, be prepared to share the interventions you identified in response to question (c). Then continue the discussion with questions (b) and (d).

Table 4, 8 and 12:
Start the discussion with question (a). Then proceed to question (b). During the reporting session, which will immediately follow the table discussion, be prepared to share your assessment of the committee chair in response to question (b). Next discuss questions (c) and (d).

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under AGEP-Transformation #1309028, #1309173. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.