

EC Search and Hiring Protocols (Approved by the EC Dec. 7, 2020)

As the committee responsible for coordinating hiring priorities and appointing search committees, the Executive Committee, in collaboration with the Department Chair and Associate Chair, has developed the following protocols for conducting department searches and addressing issues that might emerge during the search process.

Hiring Proposal Timeline (aligned with the 2007 English Department Hiring Procedures)

Fall quarter:

- Review existing or (if there isn't a plan in place) develop new hiring plan (see Department of English Hiring Procedures).
- Chair submits the department hiring plan to the College.

Winter quarter:

- While waiting to learn if the College has included the department's hiring proposal(s) as part of its hiring plan submitted to the Provost, the EC (in coordination with the proposal drafters) will stage conversations about the submitted proposals, with the goal of discussing the parameters, assumptions, relationship to the department, and visions of the field that are embedded in the proposals. This conversation is an opportunity to secure wider buy-in and identify shared interests and stakes.

Spring quarter:

- For any hiring proposal(s) that are included as part of the College hiring plan to the Provost, the EC appoints a small group(s) of faculty to draft a job ad(s) and criteria.
- The small groups will draft job ad(s) and criteria, share them with the Chair and EC for feedback, and then the chair and EC will circulate the ad(s) and criteria to the faculty.
- Once the Provost has approved a search(s), the EC will appoint a search committee(s).

Search Timeline and Protocols

Fall quarter:

- After the search committee(s) meet with the Divisional Dean, Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, and the Department Chair to review the search process and best practices, the EC meets with the search committees (or committee chairs) to discuss what efforts they are making/plan to make to recruit a diverse pool of applicants, ensure equity, and meet departmental goals/shared values. The EC will share guidelines for shared values as well as protocols for dealing with conflicts of interest and objections.

- In the case of a conflict of interest involving a member of the search committee (which includes having served on an applicant's graduate committee), the EC requires the following steps (see Appendix for UW Faculty Code section on conflicts of interest):
 1. The conflict of interest needs to be immediately disclosed to the search committee and the department chair.
 2. In accordance with the faculty code requirement that "no faculty member, department chair, dean, or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, appointment, tenure, promotion, salary, or other status or interest" of a faculty or staff member or student with whom they have a conflict of interest, a search committee member who has a conflict of interest should recuse themselves from deliberations and voting about the individual.
 3. The search committee must provide to the EC and Department Chair an account of how they handled the conflict of interest, including the steps they took to address it.

- After reviewing applications and selecting their long list of candidates to interview but before conducting interviews, the search committees will report to the EC and department on efforts they undertook to advertise the position and recruit a diverse pool of applicants; efforts they undertook to ensure equity; provide a general overview of the applicant pool; review the ad and criteria they used to assess applicants; discuss successes and challenges; and overview the long list interview candidates. Faculty members will have an opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns.

- The chair announces the long list interview candidates to the department.

- After the search committee selects its campus finalists and the dean gives approval, the department chair sends an intention to invite notice to the faculty, with a deadline for objections.

- If an objection is raised to the department chair, the EC chair, or any member of the EC, they will take the following steps:
 1. The objection (its exact text) needs to be brought to the entire EC.
 2. After consulting with the EC, the department chair will then share the objection with the search committee, which will have a chance to respond to the EC.
 3. At that point, the EC will decide whether to continue with the campus invitation or pause the process for 48 hours in order to consult with College leadership, the Office of Faculty Advancement, Academic HR, and/or other appropriate offices.
 4. Based on the guidance it receives, the EC and department chair will determine the best course of action.

Winter quarter:

- Conduct campus visits; the search committee makes hiring recommendations; the faculty vote; the chair makes an offer in coordination with the divisional dean; negotiations follow.

Appendix: Conflict of Interest as Defined by UW Faculty Code

Section 24-50 Conflict of Interest Regarding Appointment, Employment, and Academic Decisions

A conflict of interest exists when a person participating in a decision has a substantial connection or interest related to individual(s) affected by the decision that might bias or otherwise threaten the integrity of the decision process or that might be perceived by a reasonable person as biasing or threatening such decisions. This includes familial, romantic, or sexual relationships and financial conflicts of interest. This may also include some professional relationships. No list of rules can provide direction for all the varying circumstances that may arise; good judgment of individuals is essential.

The procedures set forth in this chapter shall apply in all cases, except that no faculty member, department chair, dean, or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, appointment, tenure, promotion, salary, or other status or interest of a faculty or staff member with whom he or she has a conflict of interest. [See also Executive Order [No. 32.](#)]

In addition, no faculty member, teaching assistant, research assistant, department chair, dean, or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, promotion, academic status or evaluation of a student with whom he or she has a conflict of interest.

Conflicts of interest resulting from romantic or sexual relationships are detrimental to the functioning of the University because, if present, the professional authority under which decisions are made may be called into question. The University's responsibilities to the public and to individual members of the University community may be compromised if such conflicts of interest are not avoided.

The faculty's decision-making responsibilities should not restrict the faculty's rights as citizens, including the personal rights of association and expression, unless the exercise of those freedoms conflicts with the institutional necessity of impartiality in academic and employment decisions. In that case, the faculty member must restrict his or her participation in such decisions.

State law and University rules preclude a faculty member from participating in decisions which directly benefit a member of his or her family. The same rules should apply to decisions involving sexual or romantic relationships between faculty and students, since these relationships, like formal family relationships, may call into question the ability of the faculty member to assess the performance of another solely on academic or professional merit.

Romantic or sexual relationships between faculty and students may in some instances infringe on the rights of that student or other students or colleagues. The possibility of sexual harassment may arise, if the faculty member's immediate power to influence a student's academic progress brings into question the ability of the student genuinely to consent freely to the relationship. The possibility of impeding the student's academic or professional progress may also arise if the faculty member is already in a position of significant decision-making authority with respect to the student, since the faculty member must abstain from further participation in such decisions, thereby denying the student access to the faculty member's professional assessment. The possibility of an unwelcome, hostile or offensive academic environment may also arise if the faculty member fails clearly to separate personal interests from his or her professional decision-making.

Faculty members should be aware that the harms listed above do not arise only from existing relationships, but may also arise if an individual in a position of authority to a student makes overt sexual or romantic advances upon that student. Even if the advances are welcome, the faculty member should remove him or herself from the teaching or supervisory role, which may impede the student's academic progress. If the advances are unwelcome, the student may suffer unneeded stress, and the academic relationship may suffer.

S-A 38, March 22, 1971 with Presidential approval; RC, December 4, 2013; S-A 137, March 30, 2016 with Presidential approval.