



Toward Inclusive Academic Librarian Hiring Practices

editors

Kathryn Houk

Jordan Nielsen

Jenny Wong-Welch





Toward Inclusive Academic Librarian Hiring Practices

editors

Kathryn Houk

Jordan Nielsen

Jenny Wong-Welch

Association of College and Research Libraries

A division of the American Library Association

Chicago, Illinois 2024

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992. ∞

Library of Congress Control Number: 2024942510

Copyright ©2024 by Association of College and Research Libraries

All rights reserved except those which may be granted by Sections 107 and 108 of the Copyright Revision Act of 1976.

Printed in the United States of America.

28 27 26 25 24 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

vii Acknowledgements

ix Foreword

Tarida Anantachai, Camille Chesley, Twanna Hodge, and Jamia Williams

PART 1: TRAINING FOR SEARCH COMMITTEES AND STAKEHOLDERS

3 Chapter 1. Launching for Search Success:
Establishing and Training Search Committees in
Academic Libraries

Tarida Anantachai and Nicole Westerdahl

15 Chapter 2. Including Voices and Mitigating Bias:
Evaluative Practices for Final Interviews

Xan Arch and José Velazco

27 Chapter 3. Setting up Candidates for Success:
Using a Library Community of Practice to Develop
Screening Tools and Candidate Questions to
Minimize Bias in Hiring

*Claressa Slaughter, Charlotte Beyer, Chelsea Eidbo, Jaena Manson, and
KatieRose McEneely*

41 Chapter 4. Creating an Equity Advisor Program on
any Scale

Paula H. Martin

55 Chapter 5. Discussing, Understanding, and
Assessing: Moving Beyond the Performative to
Examine the Candidate Diversity Statement

Breanne Crumpton, Mollie Peuler, and Kelly Rhodes

PART 2: REMOVING BARRIERS FOR CANDIDATES

- 73 Chapter 6. Ensuring Empathy in Interviewing through Open Communication
Gail Betz, Hilary Kraus, and Amy Tureen
- 83 Chapter 7. I Still Don't Fit: How Academic Libraries Create Barriers in the Profession Before Hiring Even Takes Place
Simone Williams
- 97 Chapter 8. Trans and Gender Diverse Inclusion in Academic Library Hiring
Keahi Adolpho, Stephen G. Krueger, Luke Sutherland, and Adrian Williams
- 111 Chapter 9. Beyond Compliance: Accommodating Differently in The Interview Process
Jennifer M. Jackson
- 123 Chapter 10. Improving Inclusion with Universal Design in the Academic Library Hiring Process
Katelyn Quirin Manwiller, Heather Crozier, and Samantha Peter
- 137 Chapter 11. Planning for the On-Campus Interview: Creating a Descriptive Library Accessibility Guide for Job Candidates
Kimberly A. Looby

PART 3: TRANSFORMING THE PROCESS FOR ALL

- 161 Chapter 12. Remote Interviews, Processes, and Documentation: How COVID changed Hiring at One Academic Library
Arielle Lomness, Sajni Lacey, and Donna Langille
- 181 Chapter 13. The Interview Pivot: Implementing Changes to Interview Protocols to Respond to Pandemic Restrictions and Provide Greater Inclusion
Mary Beth Lock, Elizabeth Ellis, and Summer Krstevska
- 201 Chapter 14. Reflections on a Faculty Cluster Hiring Approach at a Large PWI Academic Library
Shawnta Smith-Cruz, April M. Hathcock, and Scott Collard

- 221 **Chapter 15. Disrupting the Academic Librarian Hiring Process Through Transparent Communication**
Michelle Colquitt, Shamella Cromartie, Anne Grant, Kelsey Sheaffer, and Megan Sheffield
- 239 **Chapter 16. Walking the Walk: Searches that Demonstrate Commitment to an Inclusive, Diverse, and Equitable Library Workplace**
Marlowe Bogino, Ash Lierman
- 255 **Chapter 17. Approaches to Inclusive Recruitment: Practical and Hopeful**
Adriana Poo, Anamika Megwalu, Nick Szydowski, Kathryn Blackmer Reyes, Peggy Cabrera, and Ann Agee
- 267 **Chapter 18. Developing Recommendations for More Inclusive Academic Librarian On-Site Interviews**
Christina M. Miskey, Kathryn M. Houk, and Jason Aubin
- 297 **Chapter 19. From Applicant to Employee: Developing and Evaluating an Inclusive Hiring and Onboarding Process**
Gary R. Maixner, Kindra Orr, and M. Sara Lowe
- 319 **Afterword**
Kathryn Houk, Jordan Nielsen, and Jenny Wong-Welch
- 323 **About the Authors**

CHAPTER 14

Reflections on a Faculty Cluster Hiring Approach at a Large Predominantly White Academic Library

Shawnta Smith-Cruz, April M. Hathcock, and Scott Collard

Background

New York University (NYU) is a large, private, research-intensive institution with a global reach and a predominantly white faculty and student body. The Division of Libraries, which serves the university and its campuses and sites around the world, connects users across NYU and beyond with the goal of advancing the university's mission and promoting an environment of open and equitable inquiry. To this end, the Division of Libraries'



top priority since 2019 has been to increase diversity and equity within our ranks as well as to improve the sense of inclusion and belonging among the institution's students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community members. This work has taken many shapes, including not only recruiting a more diverse workforce, but also creating an environment in which those faculty and staff members remain, flourish, and advance their careers. We refer to this strategic priority as Inclusion, Diversity, Belonging, Equity, and Accessibility, or IDBEA.

In the spring of 2021, the university presented the Division of Libraries, and all its schools and divisions, with an opportunity to actively promote IDBEA through increasing diversity among our faculty. Based on research demonstrating that cluster hiring, or the “practice of hiring faculty into multiple departments or schools around interdisciplinary research topics” (Urban Universities for HEALTH, 2015, p. 5), can increase faculty diversity and improve institutional climate, NYU launched a cluster hiring initiative as part of a concerted effort to increase faculty diversity across its divisions. Issuing a road map and call for proposals across the institution, the university centered its program on several large thematic areas of focus for potential cluster hiring among the various schools and divisions. These areas of focus were broad and purposely interdisciplinary, designed to create opportunities for cross-departmental partnership and collaboration and to reinforce the initiative's goal of assembling diverse pools of applicants who would be attracted to work and research in these areas. The original university themes included

- inequality and anti-racism
- urban environments, politics, and problems
- population health and health equity
- public interest technology
- public humanities

With this opportunity set before us, the Division of Libraries soon became a prolific participant of the NYU cluster hiring initiative. Normally when the Division of Libraries seeks to hire for existing or new faculty positions, library leadership submits annual requests for approvals to the office of the provost. Once a request is approved, the Division of Libraries organizes search committees for each position and conducts the search in the academic semester for which the position has been approved. Under the cluster hiring initiative, the same approval process applies, with the additional submission of specific cluster proposals for the thematic groups of position we are looking to fill.

Following this approval process, by the end of the three-year initiative, we will have proposed and recruited for eighteen positions across five clusters, using a streamlined, inclusive, and highly collaborative process. This chapter provides an overview of our work on the cluster hiring initiative thus far: (1) joining university-wide structures that served as the groundwork for the cluster initiative; (2) mobilizing libraries' faculty support in creating, drafting, and refining cluster proposals; (3) implementing best practices in recruitment and committee work, including the appointment of a libraries-wide faculty diversity

search liaison; (4) conducting extensive after-action reviews with search committees and candidates; and (5) developing comprehensive research-grounded plans for supporting the success of new hires. Our goal in sharing this case study of our diversity hiring work is to showcase how one academic library at a predominantly white private institution is putting its theoretical commitment into meaningful practice to diversify the faculty of our institution and in service to the broader profession.

The Work Begins

The Division of Libraries began work crafting our own approach to the larger NYU cluster hiring initiative in 2021. Due to a large number of open positions (like many institutions, we had frozen search activity during the pandemic), we knew we had an unusual opportunity to reshape our staff. From the start of the work, we wanted to foster a maximally collaborative and inclusive process that would energize our existing faculty and staff in this important reshaping. This collaborative and inclusive process meant that rather than a relatively top-down approach to defining the clusters and positions contained therein, our faculty themselves would shape the proposals. And because we would be hiring multiple faculty simultaneously, we knew we had the opportunity to redefine positions around themes of strategic importance to us, in areas that would be well suited to cross-departmental collaboration.

A small group of libraries leadership introduced the university's strategy and its starter themes to our libraries faculty body, after which we set about securing volunteers to take on the primary work of defining our own clusters within these thematic areas. This definitional work followed a university cookbook of sorts and asked any proposer to follow a template of responses designed to steer the outcomes toward interdisciplinarity, highlighting the research opportunities promised in each cluster and exploring how any proposal would meet the twin goals of increased collaboration and progress on building a diverse faculty. The groups had a sense of which open positions might be associated with the various clusters but were also asked to shape the positions further in light of the clusters or to suggest or define novel positions.

Our small groups worked for around six weeks, finding resonance within the original themes but, in the end, building significant richness and perspectives that centered libraries needs and goals. Each cluster, by definition, would have at least three positions that drew from different areas of library work and would acknowledge interconnections that are sometimes not considered in hiring processes. For example, our resulting cluster within the inequality and anti-racism theme included a liaison librarian focused on African American and Black diaspora studies, an EDI-focused student success librarian, and an audiovisual metadata librarian. Though each of these positions would be in a different department, the connective tissue between the positions was encapsulated in a commitment to supporting underrepresented voices within library services and materials,

a commitment made explicit in the final title for this cluster proposal, “Centering Underrepresented Voices: Anti-racist Practices in Libraries and Archives.” As shown in table 14.1, our other resulting clusters similarly expanded on the university’s themes, pushing on some key issues for our library.

University Theme	Libraries Proposal
Inequality and Anti-racism	Centering Underrepresented Voices: Anti-racist Practices in Libraries and Archives
Urban Environments, Politics, and Problems	The Politics of Space: Data, the City, and Structures of Inequality
Population Health and Health Equity	Health and Scientific Literacy, Openness, and Equity
Public Interest Technology	Building STEM for the Public Good: Cultivating Openness in the Sciences
Public Humanities	Transformative Humanities for All: Building and Sharing the Cultural Record

Indeed, in all the resulting proposals, we remade the themes in ways that created capacity for collaborative interdisciplinarity while highlighting our strategic focus on centering IDBEA. This ended up being the most potent approach to take: had we defined the positions individually, as has been our past practice, we wouldn’t necessarily have discovered the interrelationships between them. Foregrounding the collaborative discovery process of the clusters first and foremost—and only then reshaping our positions within this stronger contextual framework—helped us break new ground, reframe our positions, and also begin to understand a more expansive vision for how our new staff would find themselves in our library (work that continues, as we’ll see later). In the end, we made all five of these proposals to the university and were approved to open searches for most of the positions suggested by the proposal writers over a two-to-three-year period.

With this milestone past, we turned our attention to enhancing our processes to support what would be a sustained, complex, and deep scope of work to recruit our new staff. Several actions proved to be consequential as we entered the search phase for the new positions, generally focused on a deeper attention to the process itself. The libraries faculty had previously invested a good deal of work into more clearly defining and documenting faculty search best practices, and this documentation proved to be a critical component within the cluster searches. Roles and responsibilities for searches were made clear, and all individuals involved in a search were expected to have a solid familiarity with the best practices. In a particularly important change, it was now expected that search committee members (who weren’t necessarily the same folks who had written the cluster)

would take as a starting point the small stubby position descriptions within the clusters and—in collaboration with important stakeholders, hiring managers, and libraries leaders—build these into more fulsome descriptions that would be advertised to candidates. This approach enabled us once again to expand the circle of input into these roles, build greater connective tissue between positions, and most importantly, combat the potential for implicit bias that can seep into search processes. Every one of the position descriptions changed in some way, and some of them changed fairly radically by the end of the search committee's work. But because the initial unifying feature remained the clusters themselves, the outcomes stayed well aligned with our identified needs.

We also instituted some additional layers of support and oversight for these searches. The most important of these was to designate a standing faculty diversity search liaison (FDSL), a role initiated by the university for every school or unit that hires faculty, to develop strategies and support committees in attracting diverse pools for faculty searches (New York University Office of the President, n.d.). The Division of Libraries chose to integrate our appointed FDSL deeply into searches by ensuring that their role would maximize diverse applicant pools. The FDSL in turn helped committees understand how to conduct equitable searches, avoid bias, access tools and training, and develop a recruiting mindset to grow a diverse applicant pool (more on the FDSL in the following section).

Last, though we didn't know it at the time, it soon became clear that the complexity of the many moving parts of these searches would require some sort of overall search orchestration group. This small group of library leaders included the libraries dean, the FDSL, the libraries faculty affairs representative, and another of the associate deans. It was quickly apparent this group would be key to successfully managing the searches. The sheer quantity of positions we would be recruiting for (fifteen searches taking place over about nine months) meant that the group had to carefully construct the search committees, assuring that every one of our library faculty was assigned to at least one search, but also trying to avoid over-assigning any given person. Similarly, we knew we needed to keep our processes on track and avoid competing searches, interview slots, and overcommitment, all of which required the orchestration group to think carefully about timing and pacing. The orchestration group would also be on the lookout for potential crossover effects between the searches—situations where multiple searches attracted the same candidates, or where individuals may be good candidates for searches other than the one they applied for.

With all this work and setup finally in place, we were ready to start our search processes.

Collaborating during Searches

Search committees, like the cluster proposal writing process, were rooted in collaboration between faculty and human resources (HR). In the past, our libraries-based HR

department managed the bulk of faculty hiring logistics, including coordinating position description uploads, contacting potential employees, generating final day schedules, checking references, and making final offers. At the start of the cluster process, however, tasks and duties were split between HR and faculty, with the particularities determined by the orchestration group. An imperative to maintain clear lines of communication between faculty and potential candidates enabled a formal breakdown of the labor attributed to each search (see appendix A).

Clear roles among various individuals allowed for sustained confidentiality coupled with clear lines of communication among colleagues. Committees included members of the faculty as well as administrative staff, all of whom collaborated with their senior leaders and HR team in ways that allowed for agency in communication with candidates and each other. To avoid overlap of final-round presentations, HR constructed time lines to provide a clear trajectory of each component of the search process. Schedules and time lines for the simultaneous searches were back-timed based on the desired candidate projected start dates. This more rigorously designed search time line approach allowed for an equal number of days between post and closing, from closing to evaluation, and then from evaluation to first and second interviews.

Once the search committees began their work, they immediately met with the FDSL. The conversations and tools available via the FDSL's involvement in the university-wide FDSL community of practice were put into practice in the libraries immediately. The three areas of focus by the FDSL are described in depth below: (1) improving inclusive language within the position description; (2) using active recruitment strategies with a target of at least 21 percent (the current employee demographic breakdown by race according to ARL) applicants of color; and (3) utilizing best practices for running an inclusive search process (Mian, 2021, p. 3).

Improving Position Description Language

Search committees in consultation with the FDSL worked to broaden the language in position descriptions to connect explicitly to the cluster proposals. Position description language was purposely designed to attract the widest range of eligible applicants, including applicants of color who would be otherwise sought after by similar initiatives or were outside of the library science field altogether. Qualifications were strategically formatted with consideration of placement in preferred versus required, acknowledging that new and recently graduated professionals as well as applicants who did not already hold an MLS or equivalent were still eligible to apply. Key components evaluated as attractive to a diverse pool of candidates were foregrounded in position descriptions, including language that highlighted a focus on *anti-racism*, *openness*, *queer*, *decolonization*, *interhemispheric*, *global*, *critical race theory*, *equity*, and other terms that were a focal point of that particular position. Terms such as *urban* or *underrepresented* or *diverse* were evaluated for purpose and intention to enhance their practicality to the role and deter from use of diversity

jargon. These terms were then tied to the work already taking place within the university and the Division of Libraries, with an invitation to new hires to continue this work (see appendix B for sample position description).

Lastly, a separate diversity statement was requested with each application. These statements had previously been optional or not uniformly requested. The prompt for the diversity statement was linked in the “How to Apply” section and limited to a single question, with a request for only one to two paragraphs, followed by a list of resources on constructing diversity statements. The result of the diversity statement allowed all applicants, regardless of experience, nationality, or representative identities, to disclose their comfort and intentions behind the work of anti-racism, equity, and inclusion within libraries. This additional component further illustrated to candidates our commitment to engage in work that holds IDBEA as a central value (see appendix C for diversity statement prompt).

Getting to 21 Percent Applicants of Color

Committee members were encouraged to develop a multitiered recruitment strategy in advertising the position. A successful recruitment strategy would yield at least 21 percent applicants of color reached by the preferred application deadline, a number that reflected the Division of Libraries track record according to our previously reported ARL statistics. The goal was to increase the person of color representation in the applicant pool as reflected by “the overall racial/ethnic distribution of professional staff in US ARL university libraries: White 79.9%, Asian 6.9%, Black 7.4%, Hispanic 4.2%, Two or More Races 0.8%, Native American or Alaska Native 0.7%, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander 0.1%” (Mian, 2021).

Searches were grounded in active transparency and communication to potential applicants about the positions and process. To allow for transparency, committees held a remote, anonymous, unrecorded “Search Info Session” live on Zoom. Presenters at the session included a search committee representative from each open position with their contact information on slides that also featured images of the library and campus. Details of the expectations of the role and climate of that particular department were bookended by opening remarks from the dean of libraries, a benefits overview by the HR office, an outline of faculty status at the libraries, expectations for the diversity statement, and a robust anonymous Q&A to surface a wide range of topics, from moving to our area, to work culture and pay rates. Registrants’ identifiable data was controlled by a department unaffiliated with the searches, which facilitated the Zoom session and organized the Eventbrite registration. This additional layer of anonymity ensured that the webinar would protect participants’ identities.

To recruit further applicants, committee members gathered names of potentially interested candidates by tapping into their immediate professional networks, scanning conference lists, sourcing authors of recent publications, and soliciting recommendations

from e-mail discussion lists. The FDSL provided a list of professional organizations of interest that was generated within the FDSL community of practice. E-mail templates allowed committee members to arrange one-on-one conversations with potential candidates and the hiring manager, the FDSL, or the committee member. In the end, dozens of conversations were scheduled. The majority of successful candidates of color noted having spoken to someone before applying for the role and affirmed that their decision to apply or interest in the position increased after having a conversation unique to their particular concerns.

As a final step in our recruitment efforts, we routinized a status check at the preferred application deadline. At this juncture, HR exported a demographic report from Interfolio (our application portal) and submitted it to the committee chairs and the FDSL. Following this export was a conversation on whether applicant pools reached at or above our 21 percent target. For the small number of searches that were extended due to a lack of eligible applicants who identified as people of color, committee chairs met with the FDSL to evaluate missteps and reintegrate outreach strategies with an accelerated time line to bring the search back on track.

Fostering Search: Best Practices

It was critical that committee members be able to bring a shared commitment and knowledge of IDBEA to conversations with prospective candidates. For this, we leaned heavily into preexisting anti-racist teachings and learnings within the libraries that fostered a more inclusive and equitable workplace and affirmed the diversity in our communities. For years leading up to the cluster initiative, an IDBEA steering committee sponsored a set of working groups and initiatives to spread the values of anti-racism, foster community involvement, and increase our knowledge base. These various initiatives included programs such as a semesterly day-of-learning speaker series, retreats, lunch-and-learns, and other practices, all of which helped prepare staff from across departments to engage with hard conversations or acknowledgment of inequitable distributions of power based on race. The commitment to an anti-racist workplace, library, and institution was premeditated and embedded in day-to-day prioritizing, and indeed became the libraries' number one strategic priority. This climate allowed a lighter lift when introducing and implementing best practices for combating bias throughout the search.

We supported deploying best practices for running a diverse search by ensuring at least one committee member enrolled in Best Practices for Inclusive Faculty Searches led by the Office of Equal Opportunity, which was "designed to mitigate unconscious bias at each stage of the search process" (New York University Office of Equal Opportunity, n.d.). At the same time, the FDSL met with each committee a minimum of two times along the way to keep best practices at the forefront. We adopted and upheld the use of a rubric drawn from the components of the position to evaluate applicants. We used the

diversity statement, CV, and cover letter together to assess the strengths of an applicant's commitment to IDBEA as another evaluative metric in their application.

We also developed a set of practices for virtual interviews to create consistency and accessibility. These included the following:

- Using the same list of interview questions for all candidates.
- Pasting interview questions into the chat while asking them.
- Enabling captions to allow for multiple modes of intake.
- Contextualizing unseen activity, such as sharing that the committee will be taking notes but will still be very much engaged.
- Communicating the time allotted for the full interview, breaking this down into a projection of time per question. For example, committees were offered this language to consistently begin each interview: “We have thirty minutes and four questions; that means you’ll have about five minutes per question, and that should leave you time at the end to ask us some questions. We will place each question into the chat after asking. Are you ready to begin?”

Though we used the same questions for each candidate, we also felt it was important to make an allowance for follow-up questions, as some candidates chose to respond briefly while others took more time. Some committees even chose to send along some areas or themes for what would be covered in the interview ahead of time (though not the actual questions), with the idea that fewer surprises would put candidates at ease.

Two to four candidates were chosen for final-round interviews in each search. It was recommended, though optional, that the committee would use a nuanced strategy to choose a varied group of final-round candidates. Identifying differences in experiences and qualifications helped to not replicate a single applicant type. For example, a committee might have one slot for a candidate who is a recent graduate, another slot for a seasoned professional, and a third slot for a career shifter; committee choices to implement a varied final group would differ depending on the role. Candidates who made it to the final round were given presentation prompts with the same number of days in advance of their presentation.

Between rigorous and predictable processes and search time lines, inclusive descriptions and a recruitment-focused strategy, and relatively transparent search practices, we were able to bring in full slates of excellent candidates and encourage broad and sustained participation of the libraries' staff and faculty in final-round interviews and presentations. We had high turnouts, fruitful conversations, and, eventually, accepted offers.

Looking Forward

As we looked to wrap up our searches, one of the critical elements we knew we needed to integrate into the process was a moment of reflection and learning to help inform

our searches moving forward. Realistically, we had no intention of conducting searches on such a wide scale again; indeed, even under a cluster hire initiative, conducting over ten faculty searches over a single academic year is beyond ambitious. Nevertheless, we recognized that this unique moment in our search practice offered many potential lessons that could inform how we approach searches moving forward. In addition, because this work involved participation from across our library organization and beyond the library, we recognized there would be lessons to learn about how best to embark on large-scale, organization-wide projects such as this one. This cluster hiring work could help us to learn how to do all of our major organizational projects in ways that are equitable, inclusive, and as transparent as possible.

Evaluation

With this potential for reflection and learning in mind, we made the intentional decision to conduct rounds of extensive after-action reviews to solicit feedback from various search stakeholders. We asked each search committee to include an after-action review with their final committee reports, detailing what worked well for their work on the search and what needed improvement. In addition, the dean met with the staff of HR for an after-action session aimed at evaluating the process from their perspective. Finally, two of us with positions represented in the cluster hire initiative set up one-on-one meetings with the nonfaculty members of the search committees to get their feedback on what it was like serving on a faculty search committee and ways in which this form of faculty-staff collaboration could be improved.

Once we had gathered all the after-action review feedback, we imported it into a spreadsheet, organized into one of four main themes (see appendix D):

- *Search logistics* involved feedback on selecting and following search time lines; navigating the mechanics of posting job descriptions to job boards and e-mail discussion lists; and overall communication between the search administrators, HR, and the search committee.
- *Committee activity* included feedback on the composition of the search committees, setting and following group norms, and working with the FDSL to incorporate inclusive practices into the search process.
- *Interviews* incorporated feedback on developing open-ended, inclusive questions; soliciting and evaluating diversity statements from candidates; and crafting relevant and comprehensible presentation prompts.
- *Wrapping the search* involved feedback relating to the use of candidate assessment tools and practices, the offer and negotiation process, and following up with the committees once a hiring decision had been made.

With the results of the after-action reviews organized in this way, we met with the search committee chairs to go over the spreadsheet and ensure that the committees'

feedback was accurately and adequately represented. The search orchestration team then met separately to go over all the feedback in the spreadsheet and begin making decisions about the next steps based on feedback recommendations. Some of the next steps that stood out for our administrative team included the following:

- Scheduling more time for the committees to check in with the FDSL throughout the search.
- Providing better clarity in the roles of the search committees and the search committee chairs during the kickoff meetings for the searches.
- Creating a more systematic workflow for wrapping up searches, including following up with search committees when we have accepted offers and managing search documentation after the search.

A current round of searches began at our organization during the writing of this chapter, and we have been working to implement these changes across the board. While our new searches are not nearly as extensive as the first round of cluster hiring was, we have learned and are implementing many valuable lessons from the after-action reviews.

Onboarding and Retention

Another key element for us in wrapping up our searches has been thinking critically about how to integrate our new colleagues into the organization once they arrive. We recognized that conducting inclusive searches was only the beginning; we had to be sure that we as an organization were ready to welcome our new colleagues into an environment where they could thrive. To that end, midway through this first academic year of cluster searches, our library faculty governance, along with the faculty members of library senior leadership, charged a small group of faculty from across the libraries to serve on a faculty cluster hiring support working group. We charged this working group with developing research-based recommendations for providing effective support to new cluster hires through the lens of IDBEA. Importantly, the working group was responsible only for crafting recommendations and *not* for implementing those recommendations; we viewed implementation as the responsibility of library faculty governance and senior leadership. We also acknowledged that these recommendations, while important for the cluster hires, would serve as a helpful template for how we should handle faculty support and onboarding for *all* our new faculty.

The working group did excellent work over a very short time frame. In a matter of four months, they investigated practices at other institutions with cluster hiring initiatives, explored plans being developed across the university, and curated best practices from the literature in library and information studies and other disciplines. The working group organized their resulting recommendations into five key areas (see appendix E):

1. *Relationship building*: concerned with mentorship and professional socialization

2. *Communication/training*: involving information-sharing, onboarding, and professional development
3. *Research*: focused on providing protected research time and equitable access to financial and other forms of support
4. *Service*: comprising a clear articulation of service expectations and opportunities and a system of equitably dividing service responsibilities
5. *Assessment*: centered on conducting clear and consistent assessment of the cluster hire program, soliciting candid feedback from the new hires throughout their early career with us

It is important to note all of the recommendations were particularly rooted in research showing that faculty who identify as Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) and who identify as cis women, trans, nonbinary, or gender nonconforming are often shut out of informal and formal mechanisms benefiting the attainment of tenure and promotion, while they are overwhelmingly expected to bear the brunt of under- and uncompensated service work (Moody, 2011). Given these demonstrated inequities, our library would need to work hard to continue building an organization in which all of our new colleagues could thrive. With the challenge set, the working group passed these recommendations on to library faculty governance and senior leadership, where we have been making great strides in implementing them for the benefit of not only our new colleagues but also all our faculty.

Conclusion

As we prepare to enter a new phase of faculty hiring, with cluster and non-cluster positions alike, we take stock of the work we have done in this first phase of cluster work and the lessons we have learned for more successfully integrating inclusive hiring practices in our organization. The collaborative work we have done in getting our searches set up, during the searches, and moving forward in our hiring has yielded powerful results: we have welcomed over ten new faculty librarians, the majority of whom identify as BIPOC or members of another historically and intentionally marginalized community in our profession. This work has been rooted in iterative processes that we hope will lead to durable changes in our organization. We continue, now with the feedback and collaboration of our new colleagues, to develop and refine our hiring processes to build more inclusiveness in our recruitment and more belonging in our culture. Our effort in taking a faculty cluster hiring approach at our large, predominantly white academic library has transformed for the better the way we approach faculty hiring and culture for all of our faculty.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to extend a heartfelt thanks to their colleagues in the Division of Libraries for all their hard work in making the cluster hiring initiative a success thus far. Special thanks to our dean for her leadership and support. And a huge welcome to all our new colleagues: you make our organization a much better place.

APPENDIX A

Sample Responsibilities of HR, Faculty Committee, and Library Leaders

Human Resources	Faculty Search Committee	Search Orchestration (Library Leaders)
Schedules kickoff meeting between search committee, hiring manager, HR, FDSL, faculty affairs representative, and dean	Creates, reviews, and finalizes position descriptions, rubrics for evaluation, and interview questions	Generates list of potential committee members, coordinates between other groups, and initiates launch of committees
Schedules committee meetings, search time line, and all interviews with candidates	Actively recruits, and tracks posting of position description across various sites and e-mail discussion lists	Develops diversity statement prompt for all position descriptions
Generates demographic review of candidates after preferred application deadline	Identifies potential candidates: First round: 8–10 candidates Second round: 2–4 candidates	Checks position description for bias and language connected to cluster
Places position description into Textio and Interfolio	Identifies and contacts stakeholders for second-round itinerary with division-wide and university-wide stakeholders	Evaluates demographic review with committee chairs
Creates and distributes templates for rubrics and interview questions	Conducts reference checks	Conducts after-action review of the search process
Communicates with candidates for first- and second-round interviews	Makes initial offer, negotiates offer, and discusses salary, housing, and other faculty-specific benefits	

APPENDIX B

Sample Position Description



Community Engagement Librarian and Head of External Engagement

The Community Engagement Librarian and Head of External Engagement will lead the department of External Engagement which aspires to engage external communities of the Division of Libraries' (DoL) through the development of programmatic opportunities that emphasize anti-racism and rectify inequalities. Using concepts such as critical race theory, queer theories, reparative justice models and feminist practices, to name a few, this new position will incorporate the DoL values and missions of Inclusion, Diversity, Belonging, Equity, and Accessibility (IDBEA) into our engagement practices.

This tenure-track faculty position will apply critical teaching and learning practices to its engagement work, and support the coordination of current and new external partnerships. The position will also work to coordinate library-focused NYU-based engagement programs and university-wide initiatives such as NYU Welcome, NYU Reads, and Gallery exhibitions, to name a few. The Community Engagement Librarian and Head of External Engagement will have supervisory oversight of (3-6) full-time administrative staff, including the Associate Director for Annual Fund, Alumni Outreach, & External Engagement to support development, as well as the Assistant Director of Special Events to coordinate events and programming. This position will work closely with the Department of Communications to brand strategic priorities for community engagement, the Reference Services department, and Undergraduate & Instructional Services department to enhance engagement priorities in teaching and learning. This position will be required to provide periodic reference services, library instruction, and participate in Division-wide committees.

Programs of the External Engagement Department include, but are not limited to fundraising, internships, mentorships, gallery exhibitions, events, and collaborative partnerships such as Friends of Bobst, and NYU's Dual Degree program with The Palmer School of Library and Information Science at Long Island University. The External Engagement Department resides in the Teaching, Learning, and Engagement subdivision, and includes a sub-department of Engagement and Development. This position will report directly to the Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning and Engagement.

A list of duties is below:

- Hiring, training, and evaluating 3-6 full-time administrative professional administrative employees within the External Engagement department
- Manage and coordinate engagement offerings, supporting library-based programming and outreach to students and external communities.
- Formulate and continue partnerships with community organizations as well as NYU-based schools, centers, and institutes, such as LIU Palmer School of Library and Information Science, to plan and deliver library programs and services to a broad range of community members, both within and outside the library.
- Steer student engagement activities including site-based welcome programming such as tabling, student-club engagement, and library tours in collaboration with library committee members and partners.
- Explore new types of engagement programs such as fellowships, internships, exhibitions, residencies, mentorship, symposia, conferences, co-sponsorships, and events, in a collaborative manner with cross-functional teams both in and beyond the library.
- Establishes engagement goals, objectives, and performance targets aligned with the institutional strategic plan and priorities. Support budgetary projections to meet goals.
- Maintain and report statistics/metrics for evaluation of library engagement programs.
- Provide in-person and virtual reference desk service, library instruction, and orientation sessions.
- Participate in and chair committees, and develop policies and procedures as needed.
- Produce research and scholarship as a requirement for tenure.

NYU Cluster Hiring Initiative

NYU Libraries is participating in the [NYU Faculty Cluster Hiring Initiative](#) to recruit, welcome, and support new library faculty working across the Division on timely themes of social importance, such as Inequality and Anti-racism, Population Health and Health Equity, Open Science and the Public Good, and Urban Environments and Politics. NYU Libraries will use the cluster-hire approach to address our goal of building a more diverse faculty community in a concerted way, with the full weight of the University's recruitment and retention toolkit. It also allows us to mobilize our internal resources, including onboarding, cohort

APPENDIX C

Diversity Statement Prompt

NYU Division of Libraries Developing and Writing a Diversity Statement

New York University and NYU Libraries are expressly committed to upholding the values of inclusion, diversity, belonging, equity, and accessibility (IDBEA). Because these are organizational tenets, we ask that each job applicant submit a brief diversity statement reflecting their professional perspectives, experiences, and interests regarding IDBEA, which includes concepts of labor, power, and/or structures of oppression, in relation to librarianship.

In 1-2 paragraphs, please answer the following prompts to reflect on your professional perspectives with IDBEA:

- How do you think diversity should inform work in the library and information field?

Intended to be interpreted broadly and from a global perspective, “diversity” includes the political implications of societal constructions on human differences (including, but not limited to, race, sexual orientation, gender identity, socio-economic status, ethnicity, ability, religion, etc.).

Additional Resources

NYU Division of Libraries Diversity and Inclusion Values Statement <https://library.nyu.edu/about/general/values/diversity-inclusion>

NYU Division of Libraries Commitment to Anti-Racism <https://library.nyu.edu/about/general/values/anti-racism>

NYU Division of Libraries’ Commitment to IDBE <http://library.nyu.edu/about/general/values>

NYU School of Law Diversity Statements Guidelines <https://cas.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu-as/casPrelaw/documents/NEW%20Law%20School%20Diversity%20Statement%20Quick%20Guidelines%20-%20Needs%20Edit.pdf>

NYU Faculty of Arts and Sciences Guide to Developing Diversity Statements <https://as.nyu.edu/departments/facultydiversity/recruitment/diversity-statements.html>

Vanderbilt Guide on Writing Diversity Statements <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/developing-and-writing-a-diversity-statement/>

UNC Writing Center

<https://writingcenter.unc.edu/tips-and-tools/diversity-statements/>

APPENDIX D

Sample After-Action Review Spreadsheet

Search Logistics

Went well	Searches kickoff and framing	Dean's kickoff; best practices documentation; public webinar for potential candidates
Improve	Searches kickoff and framing	Kickoff meetings need to be longer; need to be sure to advertise positions internally to lib-all

Committee Activity

Went well	Committee composition and norming	Including staff (nonfaculty) brought needed multidimensionality; great to have wide representation; defining meeting norms; defining process for candidate selection
Improve	Committee composition and norming	Need search committee norms template/ starter; should orient nonfaculty committee members to faculty roles and expectations; all search committees should include BIPOC members

Interviews

Went well	Diversity statements	Helpful for understanding applicant
Improve	Diversity statements	Could be better focused to job; many statements were pro forma

Wrapping the Search

Went well	Feedback and assessment tools and processes	Standard and value-added feedback form; scoring rubrics developed within committees
Improve	Feedback and assessment tools and processes	Need to consider if "skills tests" have a role in these interviews (e.g., quantitative analysis tools) for specific roles

APPENDIX E

Sample Faculty Cluster Hire Support Recommendations

Relationship Building

- Develop a structure for meaningful mentorship relationships that provides agency for the mentor and mentee and that includes training for the mentors.
- Develop a structure for peer and cohort mentoring that allows new colleagues to collaborate, learn from, and support each other in ways most meaningful to them.

Communication/Training

- Clearly delineate the difference between onboarding and ongoing support. Develop clear documentation about roles, responsibilities, and tasks related to onboarding and ongoing support.
- Scaffold all information shared with new hires so as to avoid overwhelming them with too much information or stranding them with too little as they begin.

Research

- Build out multiple models of protected research time. Communicate these models to all supervisors of librarian faculty members, and encourage supervisors to provide as much flexibility and choice as possible among these models.
- Ensure that processes to get protected research time are simple to navigate and easy to keep track of.

Service

- Build some documentation or guidelines around the nominations process that encourages nomination of new faculty members to advance their access to a select number of impactful service and governance opportunities. Include

considerations of how to interrupt patterns in which the same people tend to be appointed or elected to specific types of service repeatedly.

- Beyond the nominations process, consider library senior leadership's and the library faculty governing body's role in inviting faculty members to nonelected service and how these invitations can be used to interrupt patterns in which faculty of color, especially women of color, are overloaded with service that is not always well-rewarded in tenure and promotion, and faculty members who are white men are often tacitly excused from service that isn't highly rewarded in tenure and promotion.

Assessment

- Both the ongoing support structures for faculty and the overall cluster hire initiative should be subject to assessment. Assessment of the support plan should allow for a variety of methods of soliciting and collecting feedback, allowing both anonymous and identified communication.
- Assessment should be clear and consistent and should ideally be framed to increase new faculty members' trust in our organizational commitment to support them, rather than instilling fear or anxiety around their performance.

References

- Mian, A. (2021). *ARL annual salary survey 2021*. Association of Research Libraries. <https://doi.org/10.29242/salary.2021>
- Moody, J. (2011). *Faculty diversity: Removing the barriers*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- New York University Office of Equal Opportunity. (n.d.). *OEO 601: Best practices for inclusive faculty searches* [Workshop]. New York University. Retrieved March 27, 2023, from <https://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/equal-opportunity/training-and-development.html#OEO601>.
- New York University Office of the President (n.d.) *Guide to diverse faculty searches* [Online publication]. Retrieved March 27, 2023, from <https://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president/office-of-the-provost/faculty/guide-to-diverse-faculty-searches.html>
- Urban Universities for HEALTH. (2015, April). *Faculty cluster hiring for diversity and institutional climate*. <https://www.aplu.org/library/faculty-cluster-hiring-for-diversity-and-institutional-climate/file>