



UNIVERSITY of MASSACHUSETTS  
AMHERST

373 Whitmore Administration Building  
181 Presidents Drive  
Amherst, MA 01003-9313

Office of the Provost

Voice: 413.545.6223  
Fax: 413.577.3980  
[www.umass.edu/provost](http://www.umass.edu/provost)

To: Deans and College Personnel Officers  
From: Katherine Newman, Provost & Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
Subject: **Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty Searches**  
Date: **Revised** September 18, 2014

Please share copies of this document with your Associate Deans, Department Chairs and Search Committee Chairs.

For **all** tenure-track faculty searches, please observe these guidelines. These guidelines have changed significantly this year in response to the expressed desire of faculty, chairs, and deans for a fast, streamlined, flexible, responsive, and competitive search process. The changes you will recognize in the following process will make UMass more competitive in hiring the most promising faculty.

### Overview of Checkpoints

The tenure-track search process involves three major checkpoints:

Requisition, Invitations, and Offer (R.I.O.).

#### Checkpoint #1: Requisition

- A. Faculty Personnel Requisition (signed by Department Chair and Dean) is submitted to the Office of the Provost via e-mail to [Academic.Personnel@umass.edu](mailto:Academic.Personnel@umass.edu). Requisitions no longer require a rationale for the position, provided the position is on the college/school's approved hiring plan.
- B. Provost reviews requisitions for fit with faculty hiring plans, budget and space implications, and diversity concerns. The Provost reviews the requisition with EO&D. Those not approved will be returned to the Dean for revision or further discussion.
- C. Provost determines whether any changes are needed and communicates with the dean and/or department chair.
- D. Provost approves search and returns the requisition to the Dean, Chair, and Committee Chair simultaneously by e-mail.

#### Checkpoint #2: Invitations

- E. Search committee recruits, reviews and recommends to department chair, who reviews and recommends to the Dean the set of finalists to be invited to campus.
- F. Dean recommends candidates to be invited to campus to the Provost who authorizes

invitations to recommended approved campus candidates.

### Checkpoint #3: Offer

- G. Search committee interviews campus candidates and then recommends finalists to the Department Chair who recommends to the Dean.
- H. Dean recommends up to two candidates deemed outstanding to the Provost, in order of preferences for hiring. If the Provost approves, the “hiring authority” (the dean unless the dean has delegated such authority to the chair) makes a formal offer to the first candidate. If that offer is declined, by prior agreement, the hiring authority may proceed with second candidate with no further approvals needed beyond informing the Provost that the department has moved on from candidate #1. Should the department/dean wish to move to a third candidate, the Provost will need to review that file and communicate with the Dean to ensure that the strongest candidates are under consideration. In rare cases, the Dean may make multiple simultaneous offers; see below for details.

## **Detailed Summary Checkpoints for Tenure-Track Faculty Searches and Hires**

### **Communications Chain**

Search requisitions, recommendations to invite a set of candidates, and recommendations to hire a particular candidate should be made by the Dean directly to the Provost in care of Associate Provost John Bryan ([Academic.Personnel@umass.edu](mailto:Academic.Personnel@umass.edu)). To speed the process, departments and colleges must use email wherever possible. In order to ensure that the strongest, most diverse candidate pool possible has been constructed, the Provost’s Office needs information at each checkpoint to affirm that a proactive search will be or has been undertaken. In addition, early in the process, the department chair must identify and account for a potential hire’s likely demands for or effects on resources (particularly those that are difficult to meet, such as laboratory animal care and housing requirements, high performance computing, etc.). Direct all questions regarding the search process to John Bryan.

### **Checkpoint #1: Requisition**

The following process presumes that the Dean and Provost have already agreed upon a hiring plan for the college and that no requisition will be submitted for positions not on the hiring plan. For that reason, the requisition no longer requires inclusion of a rationale for the position.

Regardless of the procedures within a School/College and Department, a duly signed (Department Head/Chair plus Dean) Faculty Personnel Requisition (electronic form now available from your college personnel officer, Interview Exchange requisition module coming in mid-October) must be submitted to the Provost’s Office by e-mail to [Academic.Personnel@umass.edu](mailto:Academic.Personnel@umass.edu) with a copy to the college personnel officer.

The Provost forwards to EO&D only approved requisitions, then follows up with the Dean and Department Chair concerning any comments added by EO&D and works to resolve any outstanding issues and to refine the recruitment strategy to maximize a diverse candidate pool. The following facets of the requisition form receive focused consideration:

**Composition of the search committee.** Given what we know about the relationship between the composition of search committees and the goals we seek to advance, namely the recruitment of a diverse faculty, it is helpful to include colleagues from under-represented groups. While we should still seek to compose diverse search committees, we must be mindful of the importance of protecting the time and research capacity of all members of our faculty, including those who can serve in this vital capacity. Therefore, given appropriate training, all faculty should be able to advance the interests of diversity. In the end, the test of our commitment lies in hiring outcomes more than the composition of committees as we all bear responsibility for creating a faculty that fully represents our society. We will benchmark our success by how far we move the needle and will do so annually to ensure continuous attention.

Changes in the composition of the committee throughout the search should be avoided in order to ensure continuity in the assessment of candidates; therefore, a faculty member who may not be able to serve to the search's end should not accept appointment to the committee. A committee need not get approval to make a single substitution for a departing member, but the committee chair must record the timing and reason for any such substitutions. Any further substitutions require approval of the Provost's Office.

➤➔ **Faculty who have mentored, published with, written grants with or enjoyed a personal friendship with applicants should disclose these relationships to the search committee, department chair, and dean. The dean will notify the Provost's Office of the relationship and ask for guidance. If a faculty member has mentored, published regularly with, written multiple grants with and/or enjoyed a close personal relationship with the applicant, they should be prepared to (or will be asked to) recuse themselves from the search process; such faculty should never participate in evaluative discussions of such applicants.**

**Language of the position description/advertisement.** Ads must now include the following language adapted from AAU/AAAS guidelines:

*The university is committed to active recruitment of a diverse faculty and student body. The University of Massachusetts Amherst is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer of women, minorities, protected veterans, and individuals with disabilities and encourages applications from these and other protected group members. Because broad diversity is essential to an inclusive climate and critical to the University's goals of achieving excellence in all areas, we will holistically assess the many qualifications of each applicant and favorably consider an individual's record working with students and colleagues with broadly diverse perspectives, experiences, and backgrounds in educational, research or other work activities. We*

*will also favorably consider experience overcoming or helping others overcome barriers to an academic degree and career.*

(See below for additional language required for inclusion in searches for faculty at the assistant professor rank.) Some past applicants who otherwise might not have been interested in UMass have told us that this straightforward, non-perfunctory expression of institutional commitment to diversity led to their applications.

We intend to make UMass more competitive as we seek to hire the best faculty available. Toward that end, we need to speed our process by shifting from a paper-based to an all-digital workflow. By mid-October, we plan to incorporate the requisition process into Interview Exchange (<http://umass.interviewexchange.com>); until then, requisitions will be submitted on temporary electronic forms, soon available from the Office of the Provost. All faculty positions must be posted on Interview Exchange, and all applicants for faculty positions must apply through Interview Exchange. Within the next few months, we expect the entire workflow for the search and application processes to occur electronically through Interview Exchange, including requisitions, receipt of applications, secure online review of applications, advancement of shortlists to the Dean, EO&D, and the Provost. Your college personnel officer can give review rights to search committee members, can authorize departmental staff (the “Hiring Manager”) to keep application records in the system, and can provide basic assistance with navigation of the IE system.

**Rank.** If a senior-level hire or an open-rank search is proposed, the rationale of the Department Chair and Dean should justify the proposal in the context of department demographics, areas of research excellence, and Red Book Sections 4.2a, b, c (effect on program plans, flexibility as affected by rank and tenure distributions, and department affirmative action goals). It is important to be transparent about these considerations – the department as well as the Provost should be informed.

With respect to junior searches, however, in order to maximize our chances of landing outstanding faculty with experience supporting the mission of diversity and inclusion, the following language should be used in ads for all searches at the junior level:

*We are seeking talented applicants qualified for an assistant professor position. Under exceptional circumstances, highly qualified candidates at other ranks may receive consideration.*

This language will permit us to consider candidates who surface in the course of a junior search for diversion into the Campus High Impact Position program (CHIP). Such exceptional candidates may require a tenured rank, and the inclusion of that language in the ad will fulfill the requirement of conducting a search.

**Placing a candidate into the CHIP program requires sign-off from the Provost’s office that funding is available for a higher rank position.** A matching program is available for this purpose, with departments/deans/provost sharing the costs. The Deans will prioritize CHIP nominations coming out of the regular searches in their schools/colleges. The Provost will, in turn, consult the faculty CHIP advisory committee before selecting successful candidates.

The funds available for the CHIP “pool” will vary from year to year, depending on resource availability, but these will be “permanent” funds distributed to the colleges for the duration of the appointment. Should a CHIP appointee leave the university, all funds associated with that position revert to the Provost’s office, mainly to support new CHIP appointments. For 2014-15, we anticipate reserving approximately 20% of our new hiring resources for the CHIP pool, which is approximately \$400,000 in the base and will be used on a matching basis. Deans must be able to cover 50% of the cost of salaries, and the usual practice of allotting start-up costs will prevail: 1/3 to the Provost’s office, 1/3 to the College, and 1/3 to the department. CHIP candidates requiring renovation funds will need to be discussed carefully in the context of available funds, especially until the two-year hiring cycle in science is settled.

**Target-of-Opportunity appointments.** On rare occasions, a distinguished senior scholar may emerge as a possible appointment outside the context of a search. The Provost and Chancellor will entertain nominations of this kind as “targets of opportunity,” particularly when they will enhance our capacity to speak to questions of diversity and inclusion. Targets of opportunity require a formal exemption from the search process. While the usual 1/3 arrangement for start up funds will apply to these appointments (as they do to CHIP appointments), “TOO” appointments requiring renovation funds will need to be discussed carefully in light of available funds.

**Financial support.** Confirm that the department/college has within its budget base funds to cover the salary.

**Space and start-up support.** As much as possible, specifically address at the time of requisition any significant implications for the hire’s space, equipment, and support-service costs (office, laboratory, animal care, high performance computing, etc.).

**If a proposed hire will require facilities beyond a simple faculty office, the Dean must contact the Provost directly at the time of submitting the initial requisition to discuss facilities.** Ideally, the Dean will be able to combine all of the space requests within her/his school so that the Provost’s consultations with those responsible for planning in the Office of the Chancellor, and the offices of Design & Construction Management and Facilities Planning can be comprehensive.

**NOTE: Requisitions received before October 1, 2014 will be reviewed collectively by mid-October in the Facilities and Provost’s Offices to estimate projected budgetary demands tied to facilities.** This evaluation may involve the identification of swing space in the event that renovations cannot meet the timetable for the arrival of new hires. **It is critical for Deans to review the space/renovation issues well in advance with the appropriate offices and to present to the Provost’s office the most accurate forecasts of these expenses, and identify the resources available to support them, at the time of the request for a search.**

**We will be working toward a two-year hiring cycle in order to adequately support the**

**needs of lab scientists when they arrive. It will take time to get this process in order, but that is the goal.**

Any search launched is contingent, with no offer possible until solid confirmation of all space needs and associated costs is in hand. No one will be offered a position without a clear facilities and services pathway signed off on by the Provost's office, which will in turn coordinate with the Office of the Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor Juanita Holler, Facilities and Campus Services, and other offices when relevant (e.g., Animal Care Services, OIT, etc.).

In sum, the earlier the department starts working on this aspect of the hire, the better.

**Recruitment and advertising plan.** The requisition should include a plan for actively contacting appropriate individuals and institutions to recruit a strong and diverse pool. "Detectives for Diversity" is one organizing image for what we hope to foster. Effective search and recruitment strategies entail:

- directly contacting (calls, e-mails) experts in your professional network and senior faculty in kindred fields who may know prospects entering or already in the field;
- cultivating new networks that could help to develop diverse applicant pools such as our own doctoral recipients working elsewhere, the Northeast Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (NEAGEP), etc.;
- developing diverse networks, including connecting with cognate disciplines in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs, such as Howard, Tuskegee, Florida A&M, Morgan State, Jackson State), Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs, such as New Mexico, several Cal State branches, Florida International, CCNY) and other prospective "feeder" institutions. (Non-HBCU Non-HSI top producers of Black and Hispanic Ph.D.'s include Harvard, Maryland, Michigan, Michigan State, NYU, Ohio State, Stanford, UC Berkeley, UCLA, USC, UT Austin);
- announcing position openings in publications and websites that target relevant underrepresented populations such as *The National Registry of Diverse & Strategic Faculty* (to which UMass subscribes, giving us unlimited job postings), *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, and *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*;
- recruiting at relevant conferences—in addition to recruiting at the major association meetings; probably the best is the Annual Institute on Teaching and Mentoring sponsored by the Compact for Faculty Diversity; see [www.instituteonteachingandmentoring.org](http://www.instituteonteachingandmentoring.org);
- directly contacting "pipeline" programs identified by the department, by OIR, or the Provost's office; and
- pursuing best practices that are specific to your discipline.

At least one ad must be placed **either**:

- **one time** in the traditional, print version of a national professional journal; or
- on the electronic or web-based version of a national professional journal for a minimum of **thirty calendar days** (note that websites that only publish job listings are not considered professional journals). If the Department forgoes an ad in a print journal, then it **must** take and keep screenshots of the electronic professional journal

ad on **both** the first and thirtieth days of the ad's appearance on the website.

Departments should indicate clearly which recruitment sources are print and which are electronic. If you want to hire an applicant who will need a permanent visa, the U.S. Department of Labor will not approve the visa unless the position was advertised via one of these two methods; therefore, before devising an advertising plan, you should assess the prospect of selecting a candidate who will need a visa. You must also identify any position that requires US citizenship.

Assuming the above sets of concerns are addressed satisfactorily, the Provost signs off to authorize the search and electronically returns the approved requisition to the Dean. We intend to work toward establishing search approvals that are good for two years, permitting the resumption of a search that fails to produce a top candidate in the first year. Before we can do that, we need to work through certain logistical and budgetary details. At the same time, EO&D will provide the search committee with a "Utilization Analysis," indicating whether the department/discipline's demographic diversity is less than the diversity in the "Availability Estimate" already provided by EO&D. If that diversity is less, the search committee will have "hiring goals," certain special search rules apply; the Provost's Office will provide guidance on those rules.

### **Checkpoint #2: Invitations**

Once the Provost has authorized the search, the committee proceeds to advertise, actively recruit, and review applications. To enhance the diversity of the applicant pool, search committees must employ the diversity-enhancing measures described above, directly contacting relevant individuals and institutions, placing notices on appropriate listservs, recruiting at appropriate association meetings and conferences, and employing discipline-specific best practices.

➤➤ **Early in or prior to its deliberations, a search committee will meet with a representative of the Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity for an orientation and "coaching" session to discuss proper procedures, to review the job ad, and to set criteria for candidate evaluation.**

**Considerations in composing the shortlist.** Generally, finalists will be individuals of significant accomplishment and/or promise. The search committee must be sensitive to the need to fairly evaluate the qualifications of applicants who have "followed non-traditional career paths, including individuals who have experienced interruptions in their work/study history, who follow a partner's relocation, who study/work at physically accessible institutions, and/or who choose to contribute to the alternative rather than the traditional forms of scholarship related to their group memberships."

In holistically assessing the many qualifications of each candidate of any race or gender, reviewers should favorably consider an individual's record of conduct that includes the candidate's prior work with students and colleagues with broadly diverse perspectives, experiences, and backgrounds in educational, research, or other work activities. In addition to weighing other

qualifications, reviewers should favorably consider experience of overcoming or helping others to overcome barriers to an academic career or degree that a candidate would bring to UMass. The search committee must make every effort at every stage of this process to give candidates an opportunity to demonstrate their strengths and potential contributions, even if this involves, when in doubt, providing an interview opportunity. An applicant's potential contribution to workforce diversity is an asset that should be carefully considered.

**The Search File.** The search committee must create, maintain, and eventually submit a "Search File" that describes the demographics of the applicant pool and the proactive steps taken in the search process to enhance the diversity of the pool. The file should include the following materials:

- The composition of the search committee at every stage of the search process.
- A summary of the actions taken to seek the broadest pool of high-quality candidates. Describe how and by whom prospective candidates were contacted. To the extent possible, identify why some prospective candidates chose not to apply; such information may help us refine our approaches to recruitment.
- A list of the candidates proposed for invitation to a campus visit, showing their expertise and relating it to the position searched. Discuss how the candidates proposed for invitation outmatch all other candidates remaining in the pool.
- Demographic data (gender, ethnicity, race) for each candidate proposed for invitation to campus, if known. Compare the diversity of the short-list to diversity of the rest of the pool and to the diversity of the discipline more generally. Note whether any candidates from underrepresented populations have qualifications close to those on the shortlist.

*Example: Our shortlist comprises two men and two women, yielding 50% diversity, which compares favorably with the diversity of the overall pool (40%) and with the field as a whole (35%). The 5th and 6th ranked candidates would not further enhance the diversity of the short-list.*

- If the applicant pool or short list lacks diversity, specific descriptions of efforts made to diversify the pool must be provided.

**Changes to the Shortlist.** The Provost's approved shortlist is, in a sense, a "**contract.**" The search committee must immediately request clearance from the Provost for any additions to the approved list.

**Approval for Campus Visits.** Before the Search Committee schedules campus visits for shortlist candidates, the committee chair must forward its recommended shortlist and the application letters and CVs of those on the shortlist to the Department Chair, then to the Dean, and then to the Provost. At this point, the committee chair should also forward the Search File electronically, including the Applicant Log Summary (obtained from the Hiring Manager, formerly known as the record keeper), proposed shortlist, and CVs of the candidates on the shortlist to EO&D for a technical review of the search process up to this point. (Digital templates for the Applicant Log Summary and related Search File documents will be provided for this purpose.) The committee and Hiring Manager must continue to maintain the Search File and resubmit it and the applicant log to EO&D at the search's conclusion.

➡➡ **To comply with equal opportunity regulations, identify and invite the complete shortlist more or less at the same time. In exceptional circumstances, requests to proceed with invitations may precede the identification of the complete set of those on the shortlist.**

Before the first candidate visit, any remaining issues of budget, space, services, and start-up—to the extent that they are identified—should be resolved by the Provost. If no issues remain outstanding, the Provost will confirm that candidate visits may begin.

**Campus Visits.** The visits of candidates invited to campus should show off our quality and diversity and should strive to be substantially the same from one candidate to the next. The conduct of everyone in contact with candidates during their visits must be sensitive to diversity concerns in questions, comments, assumptions made, information given, activities required, and people involved. Candidates who participate in campus interviews for a given position should ideally receive access to the same levels of decision makers.

**Partner Employment Program.** The partner employment program (PEP) was developed several years ago to position the university competitively when recruiting top candidates for faculty positions. A cost-sharing program for qualified partners of our “target” recruits, it was designed to ease the transition to a new community by creating employment opportunities. It has been very successful. Indeed, it has grown so much and so fast, that unfortunately it is poised to consume far more of our hiring budget than we can afford. While the program has resulted in hires that have benefited the university, we need to be more strategic in our faculty recruitment so that departments and colleges will be able to support the hires they need to develop their core programs. Accordingly, we need to return to the original vision of the PEP program, which was intended to be invoked for only the highest priority hires.

1. Going forward, search committees and departments should not assume that there is either central or college-level funding for partner hires.
2. Whereas the program’s previous guidelines urged search committees to inform candidates about the program, search committees and departments should no longer do so.
3. Only the most extraordinary circumstances will lead to the creation of a new position for a partner, and in such circumstances, that creation will likely occur through a negotiation between deans, occasionally with the assistance of the Provost. But the principal focus will be bilateral between deans, and the long-term financial implications of the arrangement will need to be discussed between them from the outset.
4. In these rare cases of creating new positions, the process for approval will resemble that of the previous PEP, including:
  - an initial outreach to the partner’s potential host college to determine whether any interest exists in the partner as a candidate,
  - getting a search waiver through the Provost’s Office,
  - treatment of the partner as an independent candidate to be interviewed and evaluated, and
  - if being considered for a tenured position, routing through the tenure review and approval process.

Because this approach will be approved only in rare circumstances, search committees must

not encourage candidates to depend upon it.

5. In all other circumstances, a candidate's request for information regarding potential employment for a partner should elicit from the department and college an aggressive effort to explore existing employment opportunities that are consistent with the qualifications of the candidate's partner. "Existing employment opportunities" means imminent or currently posted job openings on campus or at external employers, including other members of Five Colleges, Inc.
6. Remember that filling staff positions can be difficult if the position is in a bargaining unit because many collective bargaining agreements prescribe terms of hiring and often give preference to current employees before going outside to fill a position.

### **Checkpoint #3: Offer**

After campus interviews, the search committee recommends finalists to the Department Chair and Dean, both of whom should carefully assess the recommendations before forwarding them to the Provost.

- **When describing candidates' strengths and weaknesses, the committee's rationale must focus strictly on their qualifications for the job itself. Do NOT comment on their race, ethnicity, accent, personal appearance, clothing, personality, age or maturity, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, or marital status.**
- **BEFORE writing their own recommendations to the Provost, Department Chairs and Deans must *closely* review search committee recommendations. The process will move much faster if the Chair, or, as a last resort, the Dean has made sure that all recommendations focus on qualifications for the job and do not make inappropriate references to protected personal characteristics.**

**Recommendation contents.** The most important aspect of the recommendation is the candidate's professional accomplishments, potential for future achievement, potential for contributing to the success of our students, and expected contributions to the department's stature. In addition to the usual information about when and where they got their degrees, their current position and other professional experience, the recommendation should dwell at length on their publication portfolio or record of creative achievements, specifically its contribution to the field, their record of external support through grants, achievements including fellowships and prizes, an extended discussion of their teaching experience, including evaluations if available, their experience as mentors for postdocs/junior faculty/graduate and undergraduate students, and any other aspect of the candidate's accomplishments that formed the basis of the department's selection.

The proposed hire should rank among your top two or three choices. Because we are seeking the best choice, not necessarily the one that is nearest at hand, **it is always advisable to extend a search rather than settle for less than what the department deems an outstanding choice.** However, when multiple candidates are similarly strong, departments may specify a list of no more than two candidates in order of best fit and make an offer to the first preference. If this candidate is not available, the department may proceed to the second candidate without further

consultation, but should simply notify the Provost's office for the record. Should the second candidate be unavailable, the Dean may contact the Provost about the possibility of making an offer to a third candidate, but this will require justification to ensure that only very strong candidates are recruited.

**Communication with top finalists.** Neither the committee members nor anyone else in the department or college may communicate with finalists regarding terms of employment, salary, or working conditions before receiving explicit authorization from the Provost. There may be no "informal" or "unofficial" offers contingent on subsequent approval. The Provost must review and approve the formal offer letter prior to its delivery to the candidate.

**Approval of offer terms.** Terms of offers require the Provost's prior approval and must not be contingently or speculatively offered to a finalist. For example, years of credit towards tenure should only be promised with the explicit permission of the Provost. As one Dean put it in an e-mail to her department chairs:

*I wanted to remind everyone that it is absolutely essential that no verbal or written offer is made without the express approval of the Provost. I know that recruiting involves many different levels of conversation and negotiation, but even in informal discussions, emails, phone calls, etc., it is really critical that the candidate understands that nothing is final until the Provost has officially signed off on the offer. When you write offer letters, or orally communicate the offer, please ensure that you explicitly state that the terms are those that you are going to recommend to the Dean and the Provost. Would you please pass this on to your faculty and particularly to search committees and search committee chairs.*

[quoted with permission of former Dean Janet Rifkin]

**Contents of the offer.** By the time a tenure-track search has reached the offer stage, the search committee, department, and college office are likely very enthusiastic about the top finalist and wish to do everything possible to complete that person's recruitment. But at that stage, the university has also devoted enormous resources and is about to make a substantial commitment of future resources to the new hire. For candidates requiring specialized laboratory facilities, specialized services, significant renovations or equipment purchases are generally necessary. The Dean must consult with Tom Shaw and/or the Provost if the resulting offer materially differs from (especially if it is significantly more costly or time consuming) what was envisioned at the requisition stage. Specific candidates naturally generate greater clarity about these set-up costs and it will help to smooth the process and provide for the financial underpinnings of the offer if this is factored in when offers are being developed. Surprises that come later on in the process generally do not help us in the recruitment or arrival phase.

Offer letters must carefully balance the desire to "close the deal" with careful delineation of the position's benefits and of the university's expectations of the new faculty member—in the first year and potentially across decades to follow. Because the offer constitutes something akin to a contract, the Provost's Office has developed a set of templates for several types of appointments, and I strongly encourage you to base your offer on the appropriate template, which is available from your college, school, or library personnel officer. At a minimum, the offer should include:

- Rank & Title (state title and appropriate working title, which may overlay the faculty title with an administrative title—such as “program director”)
- Limits on administrative appointments, if any (such as, “the administrative position serves at the pleasure of the [department head/dean] and subject to university policies”)
- Effective date and duration of initial appointment
- FTE & appointment type (academic-year or calendar-year)
- Governance of the appointment (such as “within the faculty collective bargaining unit”)
- Eligibility for tenure & specification of tenure decision year
- Compensation (must break out any individual components of the compensation, such as base salary, summer supplement, administrative stipend; also indicate that raises are governed by the collective bargaining agreement and/or policies of the university)
- Benefits (include only a broad characterization and referral to HR Benefits)
- Acknowledgement that faculty may earn additional compensation through grants and contracts and, **with prior approval**, through consulting or other outside activities that do not present a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment. Be careful **not** to state—contrary to what some people believe— that a faculty member has a right to perform outside consulting or similar work one day per week; prior approval is always required.)
- Initial workload & initial teaching schedule (for unit faculty, indicate that workload may initially consist of \_\_\_\_\_ but that future workload composition may vary, depending on program needs, and will be assigned by the department chair/dean. Be careful not to make open-ended promises concerning workload or schedule.)
- References to faculty rights & responsibilities as governed by the collective bargaining agreement and university policies
- Reassurance of effective mentoring and appropriate resources (crucial factors in helping to recruit candidates)
- An explicit declaration that, by signing the appointment letter, the individual is making a total professional commitment to the university. Apart from the usual need to be responsible in transitions, especially to students in the process of completing their degrees, we expect that new colleagues will terminate formal ties with prior institutions and eschew creating new ones unless specifically authorized by the relevant Dean. Any gray-zone questions on this point should be reviewed by the Provost.

**Final offer approval.** The Dean recommends to the Provost. If all is in order, the Provost authorizes an offer being made. The Dean must notify EO&D of any offers made, offers declined, and any offer accepted and must identify the person actually hired. This is a critical responsibility as EO&D is charged with the responsibility of reporting to the federal government on our hiring record. Accordingly, as soon as an offer is accepted, the Dean’s Office must notify by e-mail both the Provost’s office ([Academic.Personnel@umass.edu](mailto:Academic.Personnel@umass.edu)) and EO&D.

**Multiple simultaneous offers.** In general, the Dean may not make simultaneous offers to top candidates. However, in some highly competitive fields where the demand for qualified candidates far outstrips the supply, the Dean may ask the Provost for permission to make multiple simultaneous offers with the hope of hiring one person. Such a hiring strategy must be carefully

planned at the requisition stage, not during the search, and the financial liability of more than one candidate's accepting the offer will rest entirely on the college.

**Final submission of the Search File.** Once the search is complete and either a final offer is accepted or the search has closed without a hire, the committee chair must submit the completed Search File, including the Applicant Log, to EO&D.

### **UMass Amherst Excels as the Commonwealth's Flagship University!**

In our current hiring environment, we must all strive to anticipate potential obstacles or questions that will slow the process. Experience shows that in competing for top candidates, we are distinctively disadvantaged by any delays in moving the process forward, especially by late submission of requisitions. Increasingly, academic offers are being made by other universities before the winter holidays. Advantage therefore goes to the institutions that review files in October, arrange campus visits in November and early December, and send out offers by mid-December.

This timetable is not realistic for every field, and the timing of national meetings can affect the appropriate speed. But every effort should be made to find efficiencies (such as sending paperwork to EO&D and to the Provost's Office simultaneously when appropriate), and departments should avoid the practice of waiting for finalists who cannot visit campus within a reasonable period.

To the extent possible, the requisition and approval process for new hires should be concluded by April of the year before the search begins. Late breaking budget news can make this difficult and hence this may be more of an aspiration than a reality. But aspirations matter!

Given the inherent challenges of today's hiring environment—with more complex facility needs and highly competitive market—our current, non-nimble schedule puts our campus at a competitive disadvantage, tends to generate unneeded drama later in the hiring cycle, and leads some of our top finalists to opt for other institutions before we even have a chance to make an offer. For the best hiring outcomes, searches should commence as early as possible, should proceed with appropriate vigor, and should conclude swiftly once all approvals are granted.

### **Some Useful Reference Works**

Handbook on Diversity and the Law: **Law Diversity Book (posted on Provost's website)**  
University Leadership Council, "Breakthrough Advances in Faculty Diversity: Lessons and Innovative Practices from the Frontier" The Advisory Council. Washington, D.C., 2008. Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions*. N.Y.: Routledge Falmer. Turner, C.S.V. (2002). *Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges & Universities.  
Vicker, L. A. & Royer, H.J. (2006). *The Complete Academic Search Manual*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers.