Running a queer- and trans-inclusive faculty hiring process

1. **JL Weissman***, Department of Biology, The City College of New York, New York, NY, USA
2. **Callie R. Chappell†**, Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
3. **Bruno Francesco Rodrigues de Oliveira†**, Department of Microbiology and Parasitology, Biomedical Institute, Fluminense Federal University, Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
4. **Natalya Evans†**, Marine Science Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA
5. **Anna C. Fagre†**, Center for Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA
6. **Desiree Forsythe†**, Schmid College of Science and Technology, Chapman University, Orange, CA, USA
7. **Steven A. Frese†**, Department of Nutrition, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, USA; University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine, Reno, NV, USA
8. **Rachel Gregor†,** Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
9. **Suzanne L. Ishaq†,** School of Food and Agriculture, University of Maine, Orono, ME, USA
10. **Juliet Johnston†**, Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Atlanta, GA, USA
11. **Shayle B. Matsuda†**, Conservation and Research Department, John G. Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, IL, USA
12. **José Vargas-Muñiz†**, Department of Biological Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA, USA
13. **Nasa Sinnott-Armstrong†**, Herbold Computational Biology Program, Public Health Sciences Division, Fred Hutch Cancer Center, Seattle, WA, USA
14. **The Queer and Trans in Biology Consortium‡**

Corresponding author: jackie.weissman@stonybrook.edu
†*Authors contributed equally and are listed in alphabetical order by last name*
‡*See end of manuscript for complete list of consortium members*

Abstract

Queer and transgender scientists face documented systemic challenges across the sciences, and as a result have a higher attrition rate than their peers. Recent calls for change within science have emphasized the importance of addressing barriers to the success and retention of queer and trans scientists to create a more inclusive, equitable, and just scientific establishment. Crucially, we note these calls come primarily from early career researchers; relatively few of us have passed through the gauntlet of the faculty job search, which is a key stage for long-term persistence in the field. Our lack of representation creates a self-reinforcing cycle in which queer and trans trainees do not see their needs considered in established

processes and power structures. Moreover, this status quo has been historically and continues to be harmful; this disproportionately impacts those of us who have multiple marginalized identities. Here, we provide concrete guidance to search committees to support queer and trans candidates throughout the faculty selection process based on our personal experiences as early career scientists on the job market.

Introduction

The attrition of queer and transgender (trans) trainees from Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and Medicine (STEMM) fields is well-documented across career stages [1,2]. Queer and trans folks in STEMM are more prone to harassment, burnout, and social exclusion, and more likely to experience unsupportive working environments, absence of role models, and biased stereotypes [1,3–9]. All of this occurs against a global political and legal backdrop where anti-queer and anti-trans legislation is being passed at a record rate [10–12]. Early career scientists have urgently called for the establishment of professional support and advocacy networks for queer and trans researchers, and for the implementation of institutional policies to support and protect us [13–16]. The number of tenure-track trans faculty in STEMM is exceedingly small, although it is difficult to quantify due to limited assessments and pressure to remain "closeted" to reduce workplace harassment or discrimination [17–19]. At the same time, due to a documented increase in "out" queer and trans adults [18], departments will naturally see a rising number of openly queer and trans applicants. This influx creates an opportunity for institutions to improve queer and trans inclusion in STEMM through more equitable and thoughtful hiring practices.

Yet, when it comes to determining what such inclusive policies would entail, even the most motivated departments often struggle due to a lack of local expertise. Due to historic exclusion, there are few queer and trans faculty who can be consulted about strategies to counteract their own exclusion within many departments. We are hoping to break that paradox, as an international working group of queer and trans scientists[13,14], by sharing specific actions to support queer and trans candidates throughout the faculty recruitment and selection process. We provide guidance for running faculty searches in areas of particular concern to queer and trans applicants, rather than a comprehensive set of best practices for running faculty searches in general [20,21], keeping in mind that faculty hiring processes vary widely across regions. Our guidance may help institutions successfully recruit queer and trans candidates, but we remind departments that continued, proactive support is needed to guarantee the success of queer and trans scientists at all levels, especially in the face of mounting anti-trans and anti-queer movements[16,22]**.**

Language & Scope

Language choices vary across cultural contexts; always respect the words a person uses to describe themselves. Here, we use queer as a broad term to encompass the range of sexualities and genders falling outside strict heterosexuality and/or a prescriptive, rigid gender binary. We specifically highlight transgender and nonbinary identities as being further

marginalized even within this marginalized group. However, our recommendations can make the hiring process more equitable for *all* candidates, especially those with multiple marginalized identities (*e.g.,* disability, first-generation student status, socioeconomic status, and/or marginalized race or ethnicity), by building feelings of wellbeing and belongingness [23].

Our perspectives are centered around the biological sciences. However, our guidance may be generally applicable to searches in STEMM fields more broadly. While we focus on the hiring process in academia, these recommendations are useful for hiring STEMM professionals in research positions at museums, aquariums, non-profit organizations, and local, regional, and national governments.

Setting the Tone for the Search

Before a job is posted, there are a number of actions a committee should take to ensure an inclusive and equitable search process. First and foremost, care should be taken in determining the composition of the committee, which should reflect the diversity of candidates an institution hopes to recruit. Unfortunately, longstanding biases in faculty hiring [24,25] mean that search committees, primarily composed of tenured faculty, usually have fewer scholars of color, queer and trans scholars, women, disabled scholars, and especially fewer scholars holding multiple marginalized identities. Specifically, the number of trans faculty in STEMM is small enough that many committee members are likely to have never knowingly interacted with a trans person as a colleague. Search committee inexperience can manifest in an uncomfortable environment for queer and trans candidates. Even well-meaning committee members can become hesitant and stilted due to fear of making a misstep, leading to an exhausting and uncomfortable experience for trans candidates especially.

Diversity, equity, inclusion and justice (DEIJ) training, beyond the basic compliance training required by many institutions, is therefore critical. A single training on DEIJ for the search committee is unlikely to solve systemic issues, but it can set behavioral expectations for committee members during the search process and facilitate dialogue amongst them in the event of a misstep. We recommend that at least one committee member receive extensive DEIJ training. If such expertise is not available in the department, we propose including (compensated) members from the institution's DEIJ office, if one exists, or a professional DEIJ consultancy (preferably, one familiar with the local landscape). Unfortunately, in some regions it may be difficult to locate such expertise, but established organizations like the Safe Zone Project offer free resources to conduct such training [26].

Once a committee is formed, they should draft a set of agreed-upon goals and values for the search, specifically with respect to how the committee envisions incorporating DEIJ principles into the search process. These goals and values should be shared more widely with the department for feedback, as well as applied consistently throughout the search process, to ensure fairness and accountability. Sharing these values with candidates may also proactively create an environment of trust. It is essential to perform ongoing evaluation to determine if these goals are being met during the search process and to have internal mechanisms for committee

members to raise concerns. Consider seeking the assistance of a DEIJ professional in drafting these goals and ensuring their implementation/evaluation *(e.g.*, through the use of periodic evaluation with a rubric).

Posting the Position & Collecting Responses

Small differences between job announcements can dramatically change who decides to apply. For instance, binary language, such as "he/she", may communicate to non-binary applicants that their gender identity will not be seen or respected [27]. Ensuring language is inclusive, such as using impersonal pronouns such as "they" or "the applicant" can directly impact the message of who is encouraged to apply.

The job description and desired qualifications can also affect whether queer and trans candidates apply. How are desired candidates described? For example, does an institution only look for "exceptional researchers", or are contributions to teaching, mentorship and campus culture valued? While the balance of research, teaching, and service is typically fixed based on the nature of the institution, committees often have latitude in indicating that they value a commitment to good mentorship, collegiality, and inclusion, and also in choosing the specific adjectives used in a posting. Keep in mind that high-quality candidates from marginalized backgrounds may be less likely to apply words like "exceptional" to themselves and, consequently, these words may lead some individuals to be less likely to apply for opportunities [28]. Consider whether listed qualifications are required or simply desirable, and consider writing a statement encouraging applicants to apply even if they do not meet every single criterion.

Job announcements can also be crafted to indicate that the department values diversity and seeks to build an inclusive and equitable environment. Consider expanding such language beyond a boilerplate institutional paragraph. For example, consider using language like "We encourage scientists of marginalized genders and sexualities to apply…". In some countries, DEIJ statements are now a standard element of the application package, and can signal institution-wide efforts to promote inclusivity. In places where such statements are now illegal, committees at the very least can ask candidates about their approaches to mentorship and the creation of a welcoming laboratory environment.

Inclusive language must also be used in the application forms themselves. First and foremost, application forms must accurately capture how applicants would like to be referred to. There should be an option for candidates to specify their pronouns, and this should be write-in rather than multiple choice. Candidates may have multiple sets of pronouns that can be used interchangeably, such as "they/them/theirs or she/her/hers", may use neopronouns that the committee is unfamiliar with, or may not use pronouns at all. Some candidates may vary their pronoun usage over time. If you are confused as to how to correctly use a particular set of pronouns and a web search or trip to your institution's queer resource center (if it exists) does not resolve your questions, send the candidate a polite email asking for clarification. The term "preferred pronouns" should be avoided, as it implies that identity is merely a preference. Use the correct pronouns to refer to candidates even when they are not present in a conversation.

Many barriers exist for queer and trans people to legally change their names, and an applicant's name may not match their legal identification documents [29]. If a legal name must be collected as part of the application process, please also include a space for "Name" (the word "preferred" is unnecessary) and then clarify if the applicant has a different legal name. If a legal name is not required, then indicate that clearly on the form so that candidates are aware of what is being asked. In cases where the name and legal name do not align, always use the applicant's name for all correspondence and do not share a legal name (known as a "deadname") with any individual unless it is absolutely essential (e.g., for immigration documents or a legal contract). Similarly, ensure the candidate is able to choose the title appropriate for them, otherwise default to "Dr. X" where appropriate.

In many countries, it is standard to collect at least some demographic data on candidates. If demographic data is to be collected, great care must be taken to do so in a way that is gender-inclusive and that maintains the candidate's privacy. While regional laws may require a binary gender question in some forms, institutions should consider adding (optional) questions collecting gender data more comprehensively when this is the case [30–32]. A number of best practices for collecting gender data in a way that is trans-inclusive are available and should be reviewed when putting together the application form (*e.g.,* [32–34]).

It is important to be explicit about what demographic data will be used for (e.g., tracking overall DEIJ efforts across years) and whether the information is confidential or available to search committees, so that applicants can understand the implications of answering such questions. Being "out" is not a simple matter for queer and trans applicants. Individuals may share parts of themselves during a job search that are not widely known by everyone in their personal and professional circles, which could have severe repercussions. With this in mind, while data privacy is crucial for all applicants, it may be especially important for those who are queer and trans. Therefore, the search committee should inform candidates about any public information that will be provided to the department or university, for example, their speaker's biography and abstracts for talks, and request that candidates supply these descriptions. It should always be possible to opt-out of sharing demographic information publicly. Similarly, even publicly out candidates may not include information about their identity in their applications for a variety of reasons; all recommendations we make are best applied uniformly across candidates instead of assuming that candidates are straight or cisgender by default. Keep in mind committees are not automatically entitled to such information about identity, nor should assumptions be made about candidates or, *e.g.*, their partners.

Evaluating Applications

Well before applications are solicited, we recommend designing a comprehensive rubric for the ways that applications will be evaluated. Considerations include the scoring criteria and prioritization of supporting material. Ensure that the rubric scoring matches the search priorities and its advertised description, and apply this rubric consistently to candidates. In particular, consider how service is scored. Queer and trans trainees–as well as other trainees with marginalized identities–often contribute a great deal to service initiatives at their institutions,

particularly those focused on advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion [35,36]. These contributions tend to be undervalued, despite being one of the best indicators (in our view) of whether someone is likely to be a collaborative and community-oriented colleague. Furthermore, such experience is directly relevant to the role of faculty, which becomes increasingly service-oriented as individuals advance in their careers. Where possible within institutional constraints, include these activities in faculty search scoring rubrics and weight them comparably to other areas like research and teaching.

Some institutions currently require a "Diversity Statement" or "DEIJ Statement", but the expectations and evaluation criteria of these statements are often unclear [37]. We encourage committees to develop a consistent rubric for evaluating these statements across candidates and be specific and transparent about their expectations in the job ad. Some institutions apply the DEIJ statement as a first-pass filter, after which a candidate's teaching and research potential is considered. We support this specific use of DEIJ statements. We also strongly recommend that committees value specific actions over statements of values; optimally a DEIJ statement should demonstrate that the candidate has already worked to improve conditions in the academy and/or community and discuss specific actions the candidate will follow at the hiring institution.

At least some of every search committee's decision comes down to "fit". "Fit" includes a number of intangible criteria that can make or break a candidate, including how well a candidate's research complements existing departmental strengths to how collaborative they seem as a colleague. We don't dispute that this is an important criterion, but we urge committees to take a structured and specific approach to assessing "fit," using a detailed rubric that allows for consistency across candidates. Keep in mind that trans people, in particular, are often culturally coded as "hostile" and may be less likely to be perceived as charismatic and sociable than their cis colleagues, regardless of behavior [6,38,39]. Additionally, stereotypes or assumptions about a candidate's personality or personal life may lead some committees to inappropriately decide "they will never come here", leading to fewer or retracted offers [17]. While assessing a candidate's interest is within the committee's purview, trust your candidates, and have an honest conversation with them before discounting their candidacy. For example, despite common perceptions, many queer and trans candidates are specifically interested in moving to rural areas or areas without a large queer or trans community.

Finally, keep in mind that many trans and cisgender candidates alike may have changed their names for a variety of reasons, and this may impact the calculation of metrics committees sometimes use as heuristics for impact (*e.g.,* h-index). Changing names on prior publications can be difficult even after a legal name change [40,41], and multiple authors on this piece have faced a great deal of difficulty in changing their names even at journals with publicized name change policies.

Selecting Finalists

At many institutions, it is typical to conduct a round of short phone or virtual interviews and collect letters of reference before inviting finalists for an on-campus interview. We recommend committees take care to ensure these key filtering steps are performed equitably.

For screening interviews, applicants should be permitted to choose to have their camera off or interview by phone, without impacting the committee's decision-making process. Visual data about the candidate is irrelevant at best and a source of potential bias at worst. As we discuss later, trans candidates in particular face a great deal of pressure around presentation and may also experience gender dysphoria triggers related to the use of a camera [42]. Removing this stressor can result in better interview performance. We recommend having a standard set of questions for each applicant and to only ask follow-up questions to gather a better understanding of the candidate's original answer. In an effort to minimize interview stress and/or anxiety, it is recommended to make these questions accessible to the candidate at least one day before the interview. As you schedule the interview, ensure the candidates have the resources to bring their full selves to the interview. Consider factors that they might need, like child care, access to a hotel room, etc., to be able to have an honest, open conversation, and cover those expenses. Ideally, have an administrative individual coordinate any needed accommodations beforehand. Such accommodations should be kept confidential to avoid bias.

We also encourage search committees to be thoughtful in how they incorporate information from recommendation letters into their evaluation of candidates, especially given strong evidence of gender bias in letters across fields [43–47]. For example, much has been written in academic advice blogs and editorials about when it is acceptable to exclude a graduate or postdoctoral mentor as a letter writer (*e.g.*, [48]). Common wisdom suggests that leaving a mentor off the list can signal to committees that there is a problem with the applicant. We strongly caution committees against making these assumptions. In our experience, mentees exclude writers in cases where the mentor was dismissive and even abusive, which can be true even of well-liked and high-profile individuals. In some cases, we have seen applicants avoid requesting letters from mentors who would surely write positive letters, because of the emotional cost of dealing with casual queerphobia or transphobia. The expectation that a "missing" letter is a negative reflection on the mentee, or that applicants should "give an explanation" for a missing letter from a key mentor, specifically harms queer and trans mentees, and even more worrisome, enables retaliatory withholding of recommendation letters from mentees. Further, candidates may be concerned that committees will reach out to "get the whole story," which we strongly discourage.

As a straightforward solution, applicants should be able to indicate a conflict of interest (COI) exists with individuals at the applicant's institution, past workplaces, or the committee's institution. COIs should not be discussed or evaluated. COIs can exist for any number of reasons, beyond those specific to queer or trans people, and offers an opportunity for all applicants to avoid needing to explain a 'missing' letter, or be 'outed' as searching for a new career or position, or when their advisor has conflicting interests with the candidate. We recommend that any disclosed COIs be kept confidential only to the search committee chair, and if a question emerges on a 'missing reference' in discussion of candidates, the chair can state that a COI was disclosed. Other letter writers, such as the candidate's other mentors or

close collaborators, can speak just as effectively about what it is like to work alongside a candidate.

Finally, sometimes letter writers may use the wrong (or inconsistent) name or pronouns for an applicant. In these cases, the best policy is to politely ignore the mistakes. Applicants may not be fully out to letter writers, or letter writers may unfortunately not take the identity of applicants seriously. Sadly, many of us have been in the difficult position of choosing writers who would make good strategic choices from a professional perspective, but do not see us for who we really are. As a rule, we recommend that committees consider the self-disclosed information submitted by the applicants themselves over other sources of commentary about a candidate's identity.

Campus Visits

It is common to invite finalists to campus to meet with faculty and give a research seminar and/or teaching demonstration. Because the candidates will meet with a broader set of faculty than the search committee during the interview, it is important to ensure the faculty at-large is prepared for such visits. Training on appropriate interview etiquette, and on what kinds of questions are legal to ask candidates, should be mandated for all faculty that will interact with the candidates or vote on their hiring. Ideally, this should occur well in advance of the announcement of a candidate's visit in an effort to prevent faculty members associating a particular individual with mandatory training. Even in self-professed "welcoming" departments, faculty may need some guidance on how to behave professionally during interviews. For example, if you make a mistake when referring to a candidate's pronouns, simply correct yourself, offer a brief apology, and move on.

It seems obvious that addressing your guest with the correct names and pronouns would be expected during the on-site interview. Nevertheless, we have found that many faculty would greatly benefit from practicing in advance, especially those introducing candidates to others during the interview for the academic job position. Make this expectation clear to your faculty before the interview. Make sure a candidate's pronouns, if known, are shared with faculty, staff, and students who will be meeting the candidate ahead of time. It is extremely jarring to be misgendered or to have awkward pauses come up around pronouns, and this can have a real negative impact on a candidate's performance during a conversation or talk. Introductions should use academic titles (e.g., Dr.), especially before a talk, and titles should be used consistently (*i.e.,* do not refer to a candidate by their first name after referring to a senior faculty member as "Dr. X")

It is possible that your department has a number of "bad actors" who may be hostile despite training and guidance. It is important to be honest with your candidates about such departmental dynamics, while also shielding them from these negative interactions during the interview, a time when they are already likely to be under a great deal of stress. Be prepared for specific stages of the interview where such individuals can do the most harm (e.g., chalk-talks in some US departments). In particular, we recommend offering your faculty, staff, and students

training in effective tools for bystander intervention so that they are prepared for these situations [49–51]**.**

It is also important to make sure you have infrastructure in place to ensure the comfort of your candidates and allow them to present the best versions of themselves on the interview day. Interview days are long; ensure your candidates have regular bathroom and hydration breaks. This is especially important for trans candidates on certain anti-androgens that are diuretics (*e.g.,* spironolactone), as well as many cis candidates who may be taking the same medications for other purposes or need to visit the restroom for other reasons. It is best practice to give all candidates, regardless of perceived gender identity, a map of all gendered and gender-neutral or single-use bathrooms on campus. Whenever possible, schedule in-person meetings, breaks, or presentations in buildings where these options are all available, optimally on the same floor.

Keep in mind that trans people, including non-binary people, should be allowed to use whichever restroom they are most comfortable in, and do not necessarily need to use gender-neutral restrooms exclusively. One of our authors recalls a specific incident where a faculty member insisted on putting a "temporary gender-neutral restroom" sign they had made on a women's room door while a candidate who was a trans woman went in. While the faculty members felt they had been a good ally at that moment, the candidate felt humiliated and confused. If there are university or legislative policies that prevent trans people at your institution from using the bathroom that aligns with their gender identity, or if you have a lack of gender-neutral facilities on campus available for non-binary candidates, let your candidates know before they travel to campus so that they can plan proactively with you.

Accessibility of local infrastructure is also essential, as queer and trans individuals are more likely to also be disabled and/or chronically ill [52,53]. This includes holding seminars and meetings in buildings that are accessible to all (including bathrooms). It also means working proactively with your candidates to ensure COVID-19 safety protocols during their visit that will guarantee their health and safety [54]. If candidates are staying overnight, allow them the option to book their own accommodations. Candidates may have specific needs around access to services and safety that impact their choice of accommodations.

Finally, consider offering candidates a guest office or other private space. All eyes are on a candidate during a job interview. Queer and trans people already face an incredible degree of scrutiny around expectations for professional dress [42] and gender presentation. This scrutiny manifests as "hypervisibility", affecting trans women in particular, where our actions and presentation are consistently surveilled even as our needs within society are rarely considered or met [55,56]. Giving us a private space, optimally with a mirror, a trash can, and a door that locks, and sufficient time to get ready and "freshen up" before research talks, teaching demos, chalk-talks, etc. can significantly reduce pressure around presentation. Many candidates may want to change when they arrive at or leave campus as well. For example, depending on the surrounding area and the candidate's own comfort level, they may choose intentionally less conspicuous clothing for travel. Please provide them with space and time to do so. One author

recalls an interview as a newly-out and nervous trans person where they ended their visit by changing their outfit inside of the department chairs' office closet before running to the airport.

Be Prepared to Answer Difficult Questions

Interviews almost always include time for candidates to ask questions to the committee. Be prepared to answer challenging questions about the local area, and campus and departmental culture. For queer and trans applicants, getting a sense of the environment is critical not only to our professional success but also for our own safety and wellbeing, as well as that of our friends and family. Recognize that trans people have historically been left out of many legal movements, such that the adoption of some queer-friendly policies (*e.g.,* early legalization of gay marriage) does not always mean a region has trans-friendly policies [57,58]. Responses such as "[Insert location] is great! You won't have any problems" are not satisfactory, and can be a red flag to applicants that the committee is not knowledgeable or able to advise them about the local climate. Even countries with many legal protections in place have hostile regions to queer and trans individuals. We challenge our readers to think critically about what supporting your queer and trans colleagues would look like where you live and work. This means being transparent about any existing or anticipated problems at your institution when speaking with candidates so that they can make an informed decision about their futures.

Many of these concerns can be addressed by providing all applicants with an info packet including benefits information and relevant contacts (especially in countries lacking universal healthcare), information about the local legal landscape (including any bans on gender affirming care), university DEIJ policies and resources, information about faculty mentoring programs, and contacts for affinity and employee resource groups on campus (e.g., as provided by the University of Nevada Reno QLAB [59]). This packet should also include information on how to report instances of discrimination, and clearly indicate which reporting mechanisms are anonymous. Such information will be useful even for candidates who may not be queer or trans (e.g., candidates with a queer or trans family member such as a partner or dependent).

While search committees may not be able to address all of a candidate's questions themselves, if there are queer and trans faculty or staff on campus who are not involved in the search and may be able to speak to candidates about the institution and surrounding area, it can be very helpful to offer to share contact info with the candidate's prior approval. Additionally, many institutions have queer and trans faculty and staff groups that can serve as resources about campus and community climate for queer and trans people. Optimally, make these contacts available to all candidates regardless of perceived identity. At least one of the authors took a job in what many might consider a hostile area because of one of these discussions, and another of us turned down a job in a "safe" area because of a similar conversation.

When discussing benefits, the committee should make every effort to provide information that is easily accessible to the candidate (*i.e.* not on an internal website) and clearly worded (*e.g.,* provide a benefits summary fact sheet during negotiations)."Good" health benefits often means something very different to your trans and queer applicants. Many insurance plans and/or state

healthcare systems offer only incomplete coverage of gender affirming care, and this varies widely by country. Further, many governments discriminate or prohibit reproductive services such as *in vitro* fertilization, prenatal testing, surrogacy, or adoption for trans and queer people. Offer all applicants time to speak with someone knowledgeable about the local healthcare landscape, especially if that candidate is coming from a different healthcare system, and make sure that person knows specifically what gender affirming care is covered and can answer questions. This may happen during the on-site interview or during negotiations. Given the cost of healthcare, this may be an important point of discussion during negotiations for queer and trans candidates and for candidates with a queer or trans family member, and so committees should be prepared to offer compensatory benefits or pay if health insurance coverage is insufficient. Keep in mind this may also be true of many candidates for a variety of reasons unrelated to gender affirming care.

Finally, don't hesitate to ask for more time. If an applicant asks a question that the committee cannot answer, rather than giving a poorly considered answer, tell them you will look into it and get back to them. Then make sure to follow up promptly over email or in another meeting. We appreciate our concerns being taken seriously and want to see that there will be an effort at a departmental and institutional level to address them. This is a great way to show that.

Making an Offer

Keep in mind when making an offer of employment that queer and trans people are much more likely to face financial precarity than the general population [60,61], and may be cut off from familial sources of support. We also face severe pay disparities, which are most pronounced for trans individuals; for example, trans women in the USA make an average of 60 cents on the dollar of the average worker, trans men make 70 cents on the dollar, and non-binary, genderqueer, genderfluid and two-spirit workers also make 70 cents on the dollar [60,62]. These gaps are further exacerbated by racial inequality, so that queer and trans people of color make less than their white peers. Thus, salary offers should be based on the job in question, not previous income. Healthcare requirements and often incomplete insurance coverage often elevate the costs of living for queer and trans people, such that job packages may need to reflect these costs to be appropriate. Providing resources like subsidized childcare or faculty housing may go a long way towards alleviating some of this financial strain, and making it clear in the initial offer which of these are available is critical.

At some institutions, salary and startup packages are determined through an extended negotiation process. The quality of a candidate's offer should not depend on their skill as a negotiator [63–65]**.** We urge departments and administrators to actively describe negotiation as a process and emphasize that the purpose of negotiation is to find a mutually beneficial outcome. Consider linking candidates to early career faculty internally who are willing to discuss what their offer packages included. Applicants may not know what is reasonable to ask for, so be active and try to identify opportunities for compromise to meet the candidate's needs. This is particularly true for applicants without close peers applying for academic jobs. Queer and trans applicants may not feel that they have "permission" to ask for these things, and may more easily

be perceived as asking for "too much" than other candidates [66]. It is critical to be transparent about the average faculty salary in the department, and at the minimum let candidates know where to find information on pay bands for position ranks at the institution. Standardized packages can help, but we caution against using equity as an excuse for underpaying faculty: paying incoming faculty less does not solve the problem of paying senior faculty too little (*i.e.,* salary compression).

In some countries, it is common to accommodate "spousal" hires for married and sometimes unmarried couples [66]. If such arrangements are possible, ensure these accommodations are equitable regardless of a couple's genders or marital status, and consider how you might accommodate other family arrangements that fall outside of a traditional two-person relationship or nuclear family. If spousal accommodations are offered, set a policy of finding placements for non-academic partners regardless of marital status: many queer and trans people may face workplace discrimination, and partner employment at your institution may help minimize this risk [67]. Also consider whether benefits associated with the position (*e.g.,* healthcare in countries without universal access) can be extended to non-traditional families (*e.g.,* multiple partners, other kinds of dependents than children).

Finally, consider the requirements for tenure at your institution [68]. It is well documented that minoritized faculty perform more service as they are continually asked to assist on DEIJ committees, provide mentoring for students from similar demographics, and are otherwise asked to be present at service activities to represent their demographic [4]. This unaccounted service requirement immensely benefits the university community, and must be acknowledged in their offer letter and effort responsibilities to ensure these activities are visible and contribute to their retention and tenure. Some institutions have recently formalized such arrangements as "mentor professorships" with reduced teaching loads in exchange for increased service expectations.

A Perspective from the Global South

While the guidance discussed above is written to be generalizable across many different contexts, our colleagues and co-authors from around the globe, in particular the Global South, face myriad country-specific challenges. For example, due to funding limitations and the nature of how funding is dispersed, many early-career scholars in the Global South are often overwhelmed with lecturing and administrative workload and fight hard to get their research groups on track. As a result, their science is still underrepresented worldwide [69,70]**.**

In Brazil, for instance, the selection process for a tenure-track academic position in a higher-education institution differs strikingly from the systems in the US and Europe. In a short timeframe applicants are subjected to several rounds of exams on scientific knowledge, teaching, and their research record, and are subsequently ranked and eliminated. In most cases, there are no DEIJ policies in place and advertisements for positions follow a predefined governmental format, with no regard to inclusivity, gender-neutral language, and usage of pronouns. In particular, DEIJ commissions and committees are still scarce in most Brazilian

universities, and the few that exist rarely consider issues facing queer and trans scientists [71,72].

Ideally, universities and research centers could institutionalize general DEIJ policies and committees, which would facilitate adoption of the strategies to run inclusive and equitable selection processes for queer and trans applicants discussed above in a country-specific manner. As a start, DEIJ statements should be incorporated into the application package and ranking process. Nevertheless, a lack of resources for proper DEIJ training of faculty members and a lack of institutional motivation make these issues more challenging in Brazil, which still has high rates of queerphobic and transphobic violence [73,74]. Yet, even in places with a robust history of research engaging with queer and trans individuals (e.g.,Puerto Rico, [75]), resource limitation can act as a major barrier to success [76]. Thus, legacies of colonialism pose a major barrier to building a more inclusive and equitable scientific practice, both by first-order effects that limit the flow of resources to deserving scientists in the Global South, and through the second-order effects a resource-limited environment creates wherein the institutional and administrative capacity to implement many of the suggestions we provide here may be limited due to an overwhelming workload.

Conclusions

The recommendations we offer are not exhaustive: work with your candidates as partners in this process to meet their needs and help them show the best versions of themselves during the interview. Many of the authors on this article have been in situations where our performance suffered in queerphobic and transphobic academic contexts. For individuals with multiple marginalized identities, this distress is further amplified. By creating an inclusive and equitable environment, you can see the best of each candidate, allowing the search committee to make the best-informed choice possible.

It is not enough to hire a diverse pool of faculty, though this is the main focus of this article. The equitable hiring practices discussed above are meaningless if not backed up by efforts to ensure a safe, inclusive, and equitable working environment in your institution. Consider how to continue supporting queer and trans candidates once they become faculty, especially in the professionally vulnerable years pre-tenure.

In closing, we note that this article is written against the backdrop of a legal and political climate that is becoming increasingly hostile to queer, and particularly trans, individuals globally [77–81], making our recommendations more urgent than ever. While our focus on the job search limits the scope of this article with regards to the rights and marginalization of queer and trans people, we want to highlight that the recruitment process is only one component of hiring a new colleague into faculty. Trans faculty may experience significant harassment in the local community, death threats, and online targeting. We encourage institutions to use their resources and power to protect their marginalized faculty members from political hostility, offering them a safe place to work. At the same time, for many institutions, it may be more difficult than ever to commit to these actions due to legal constraints [82]. We have no easy solutions to these

challenges that a search committee alone can solve, but we encourage you to work directly and transparently with your candidates to creatively problem-solve. Nearly all the recommendations we make can be offered broadly to improve the experiences of all candidates, but will have an outsize effect on queer and trans individuals.

References

1. Thoroughgood CN, Sawyer KB, Webster JR. Because you're worth the risks: Acts of oppositional courage as symbolic messages of relational value to transgender employees. J Appl Psychol. 2021;106: 399–421.

2. Cech EA, Waidzunas TJ. Systemic inequalities for LGBTQ professionals in STEM. Sci Adv. 2021;7. doi:10.1126/sciadv.abe0933

3. Freeman JB. Measuring and Resolving LGBTQ Disparities in STEM. Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences. 2020;7: 141–148.

4. Hanasono LK, Broido EM, Yacobucci MM, Root KV, Peña S, O'Neil DA. Secret service: Revealing gender biases in the visibility and value of faculty service. J Divers High Educ. 2019;12: 85–98.

5. Siegel DP. Transgender experiences and transphobia in higher education. Sociol Compass. 2019;13. doi:10.1111/soc4.12734

6. Moss-Racusin CA, Rabasco H. Reducing gender identity bias through imagined intergroup contact. J Appl Soc Psychol. 2018;48: 457–474.

7. Gazzola SB, Morrison MA. Cultural and Personally Endorsed Stereotypes of Transgender Men and Transgender Women: Notable Correspondence or Disjunction? International Journal of Transgenderism. 2014;15: 76–99.

8. Mckinnon R. Stereotype Threat and Attributional Ambiguity for Trans Women. Hypatia. 2014;29: 857–872.

9. Cech EA, Pham MV. Queer in STEM Organizations: Workplace Disadvantages for LGBT Employees in STEM Related Federal Agencies. Soc Sci. 2017;6: 12.

10. Nakajima K, Jin CH. Bills targeting trans youth are growing more common — and radically reshaping lives. NPR. 28 Nov 2022. Available: https://www.npr.org/2022/11/28/1138396067/transgender-youth-bills-trans-sports. Accessed 21 Feb 2024.

11. State Equality Index. In: Human Rights Campaign [Internet]. [cited 21 Feb 2024]. Available: https://www.hrc.org/resources/state-equality-index

12. GATE, Berianidze L, Castellanos E, Xonorika K. Anti-gender mobilizing: Global and Regional Conversations. New York City: GATE; 2022. Available: https://gate.ngo/anti-gender-mobilizing-global-and-regional-conversations/

13. Getz LJ, de Oliveira BFR, Pérez-López E. We need a Pride in Microbiology Network. Nat Microbiol. 2023;8: 999–1000.

14. Gregor R, Johnston J, Coe LSY, Evans N, Forsythe D, Jones R, et al. Building a queer- and trans-inclusive microbiology conference. mSystems. 2023; e0043323.

15. Kinkaid E. Will we avert geography's "trans failure?" American Association of Geographers. 26 Feb 2024. Available: https://www.aag.org/will-we-avert-geographys-trans-failure/. Accessed 19 Apr 2024.

16. Aghi K, Anderson BM, Castellano BM, Cunningham A, Delano M, Dickinson ES, et al. Rigorous science demands support of transgender scientists. Cell. 2024;187: 1327–1334.

17. Blumenfeld WJ, Weber GN, Rankin S. In our own voice: Campus climate as a mediating factor in the persistence of LGBT students, faculty, and staff in higher education. In: Chamness Miller P, Mikulec E, editors. Queering classrooms: Personal narratives and educational practices to support LGBTQ youth in schools. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing Inc.; 2016.

18. Conron KJ, O'Neill KK, Goldberg AE, Guardado R. Experiences of LGBTQ People in Four-Year Colleges and Graduate Programs. UCLA School of Law Williams Institute; 2022 May. Available: https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/lgbtq-colleges-grad-school/

19. Freeman JB. US agency obstructs LGBTQ+ equity in science. Science. 2024;384: 169.

20. Fine E, Handelsman J. Searching for Excellence & Diversity: A Guide for Search Committees. Madison, Wisconsin: Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute - University of Madison-Wisconsin; 2012.

21. Bhalla N. Strategies to improve equity in faculty hiring. Mol Biol Cell. 2019;30: 2744–2749.

22. McKenzie BJ. Workplace Experiences of Transgender Faculty at Institutions of Higher Education. Vance J, editor. Doctor of Philosphy of Education, Northcentral University. 2020. Available: https://www.proquest.com/docview/2461972497?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses

23. Boustani K, Taylor KA. Navigating LGBTQ+ discrimination in academia: where do we go from here? Biochem. 2020;42: 16–20.

24. Haynes C, Sweedler J. Are We There Yet? Biases in Hiring Women Faculty Candidates. Anal Chem. 2015;87: 6989.

25. Kayes P. New Paradigms for Diversifying Faculty and Staff in Higher Education: Uncovering Cultural Biases in the Search and Hiring Process. Multicultural Education. 2006;14: 65–69.

26. Evans NJ. The impact of an LGBT Safe Zone project on campus climate. J Coll Stud Dev. 2002;43: 522–539.

27. Goldberg AE, Matsuno E, Beemyn G. "I Want to Be Safe…And I Also Want a Job": Career Considerations and Decision-Making Among Transgender Graduate Students. Couns Psychol. 2021;49: 1147–1187.

28. Collier D, Zhang C. Can We Reduce Bias in the Recruiting Process and Diversify Pools of Candidates by Using Different Types of Words in Job Descriptions? Cornell University; 2016 Oct. Report No.: ILRHR 6640. Available: https://hdl.handle.net/1813/74363

29. Ryan JM. Expressing identity: toward an understanding of how trans individuals navigate the barriers and opportunities of official identity. Indian J Gend Stud. 2020;29: 349–360.

30. Casper AMA, Atadero RA, Fuselier LC. Revealing the queer-spectrum in STEM through robust demographic data collection in undergraduate engineering and computer science courses at four institutions. PLoS One. 2022;17: e0264267.

31. Sanchez D, Guerra RC, Farrell S. Demographic Data Collection of LGBTQ+ Identities: Barriers and Motivations. 2022 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition. American Society for Engineering Education; 2022. p. 13.

32. Rasmussen K, Chen J, Colquhoun RL, Frentz S, Hiatt L, Kosciesza AJ, et al. Gender Inclusive Methods in Studies of STEM Practitioners. arXiv [stat.AP]. 2023. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.15802

33. Kronk CA, Everhart AR, Ashley F, Thompson HM, Schall TE, Goetz TG, et al. Transgender data collection in the electronic health record: Current concepts and issues. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2021;29: 271–284.

34. Bond A, Kelly T. A quick guide to data collection for LGBTQ+ characteristics. 2024. doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.24633756.v1

35. Michel LV, Forsythe D. "If I don"t, who will?'. ASBMB Today. 2022 [cited 22 Feb 2024]. Available: https://www.asbmb.org/asbmb-today/opinions/031022/if-i-don-t-who-will

36. Weiser SG, Wagner TL, Lawter M. Double jeopardy: (Trans)versing higher ed as queer trans advocates. Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy. 2018;15: 323–339.

37. Bombaci SP, Pejchar L. Advancing Equity in Faculty Hiring with Diversity Statements. Bioscience. 2022;72: 365–371.

38. Nadal KL, Davidoff KC, Davis LS, Wong Y. Emotional, Behavioral, and Cognitive Reactions to Microaggressions: Transgender Perspectives. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity. 2014;1: 72.

39. Gazzola S. Stereotypes of transgender women and men: Content, strength, and valence. Morrison M, editor. Master of Arts, The University of Saskatchewan. 2012. Available: http://hdl.handle.net/10388/ETD-2012-03-372

40. Langin K. New, more inclusive journal policies ease author name changes on published papers. Science Careers. 25 Feb 2021. Available: https://www.science.org/content/article/new-more-inclusive-journal-policies-ease-author-name-changes-published-papers

41. Gaskins LC, McClain CR. Visible name changes promote inequity for transgender researchers. PLoS Biol. 2021;19: e3001104.

42. Kimberly Zayhowski, MS, CGC (she/her), Nina Sheridan, MS, (she/her). Queer Erasure in Standards of Professionalism. Perspectives of the National Sociey of Genetic Counselors. 2022 [cited 23 Jan 2024]. Available: https://perspectives.nsgc.org/Article/queer-erasure-in-standards-of-professionalism

43. Eberhardt M, Facchini G, Rueda V. Gender Differences in Reference Letters: Evidence

from the Economics Job Market. Econ J. 2023;133: 2676–2708.

44. Madera JM, Hebl MR, Dial H, Martin R, Valian V. Raising Doubt in Letters of Recommendation for Academia: Gender Differences and Their Impact. J Bus Psychol. 2019;34: 287–303.

45. Dutt K, Pfaff DL, Bernstein AF, Dillard JS, Block CJ. Gender differences in recommendation letters for postdoctoral fellowships in geoscience. Nat Geosci. 2016;9: 805–808.

46. Trix F, Psenka C. Exploring the Color of Glass: Letters of Recommendation for Female and Male Medical Faculty. Discourse & Society. 2003;14: 191–220.

47. Madera JM, Hebl MR, Martin RC. Gender and letters of recommendation for academia: agentic and communal differences. J Appl Psychol. 2009;94: 1591–1599.

48. Chang VY, Munson M, Termini CM. Approaches to address bias in letters of recommendation. Trends Pharmacol Sci. 2023;44: 321–323.

49. The Rockefeller University. Bystander Intervention. In: Education & Training [Internet]. 10 Dec 2019 [cited 22 Feb 2024]. Available: https://www.rockefeller.edu/education-and-training/bystander-intervention/

50. LeHigh University. What is Bystander Intervention. In: LeHigh University [Internet]. [cited 22 Feb 2024]. Available: https://studentaffairs.lehigh.edu/content/what-bystander-intervention

51. National Sexual Violence Resource Center. Bystander Intervention Tips and Strategies. In: National Sexual Violence Resource Center [Internet]. [cited 22 Feb 2024]. Available: https://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/2018-02/publications_nsvrc_tip-sheet_bystander-intervention-tips-and-strategies_1.pdf

52. Smith-Johnson M. Transgender Adults Have Higher Rates Of Disability Than Their Cisgender Counterparts. Health Aff . 2022;41: 1470–1476.

53. Fredriksen-Goldsen KI, Kim H-J, Barkan SE. Disability among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults: disparities in prevalence and risk. Am J Public Health. 2012;102: e16–21.

54. Schmitz RM, Gomez G, Propst A, Tabler J, Charak R. Queer Politics of a Pandemic: LGBTQ + People's Conceptions of COVID-19's Politicization. Sex Res Social Policy. 2023;20: 751–765.

55. Hennekam S, Dumazert J-P. Intersectional (in)visibility of transgender individuals with an ethnic minority background throughout a gender transition: Four longitudinal case studies. Gend Work Organ. 2023;30: 1585–1610.

56. Jourian TJ. Who's trans(*)forming who? Journal of Autoethnography. 2022;3: 226–230.

57. Bailey A. "Go home to the second wave!": Discourses of trans inclusion and exclusion in a queer women's online community. Discourse, Context & Media. 2022;50: 100656.

58. Lee Aultman B, Currah P, Brettschneider M. 3. Politics outside the Law: Transgender Lives and the Challenge of Legibility. LGBTQ Politics. New York University Press; 2017. pp. 34–53.

59. University of Nevada Queer and LGBT+ Advocacy Board. UNR LGBTQIA2+ Resource Guide.docx. In: University of Nevada Queer and LGBT+ Advocacy Board [Internet]. [cited 22 Feb 2024]. Available: https://nevada.app.box.com/s/liom6sj41garvpumrsoqov7n0pej1a9n

60. Shannon M. The labour market outcomes of transgender individuals. Labour Econ. 2022;77: 102006.

61. Grant JM, Mottet LA, Tanis J, Harrison J, Herman JL, Keisling M. Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. Washington: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force; 2011. Available: https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/resources/NTDS_Report.pdf

62. The Wage Gap Among LGBTQ+ Workers in the United States. In: Human Rights Campaign [Internet]. [cited 23 Jan 2024]. Available: https://www.hrc.org/resources/the-wage-gap-among-lgbtq-workers-in-the-united-states

63. Toosi NR, Mor S, Semnani-Azad Z, Phillips KW, Amanatullah ET. Who Can Lean In? The Intersecting Role of Race and Gender in Negotiations. Psychol Women Q. 2019;43: 7–21.

64. Recalde MP, Vesterlund L. Gender Differences in Negotiation: Can Interventions Reduce the Gap? Annu Rev Econom. 2023;15: 633–657.

65. Hernandez M, Avery DR, Volpone SD, Kaiser CR. Bargaining while Black: The role of race in salary negotiations. J Appl Psychol. 2019;104: 581–592.

66. Rivera LA. When Two Bodies Are (Not) a Problem: Gender and Relationship Status Discrimination in Academic Hiring. Am Sociol Rev. 2017;82: 1111–1138.

67. Ball N. My Fave Queer Chemist. 2020. Available: https://podcasters.spotify.com/pod/show/mfqc/episodes/Dr--Nicholas-Ball--Pomona-College-ei1t0b

68. Catanzaro SJ. Evaluating Faculty's Multifaceted Work. Inside Higher Ed. 13 Jul 2023. Available: https://www.insidehighered.com/opinion/career-advice/2023/07/13/academe-needs-new-way-evaluating-faculty-work-opinion. Accessed 19 Apr 2024.

69. Amarante V, Burger R, Chelwa G, Cockburn J, Kassouf A, McKay A, et al. Underrepresentation of developing country researchers in development research. Appl Econ Lett. 2022;29: 1659–1664.

70. Nakamura G, Soares BE, Pillar VD, Diniz-Filho JAF, Duarte L. Three pathways to better recognize the expertise of Global South researchers. npj Biodiversity. 2023;2: 17.

71. Staniscuaski F, de Oliveira L, Infanger C, Tzanakou C. Is Brazil ready for gender equality in science? In: Nature Publishing Group UK [Internet]. 19 Dec 2023 [cited 21 Feb 2024]. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-04060-9

72. Oliveira W, Soares BE, Marques P, Souza C, Dias AS, Bello M, et al. Advancing racial equity in Brazil's academia. Science. 2022;376: 707.

73. Mendes WG, Silva CMFP da. Homicídios da População de Lésbicas, Gays, Bissexuais,

Travestis, Transexuais ou Transgêneros (LGBT) no Brasil: uma Análise Espacial. Ciênc saúde coletiva. 2020;25: 1709–1722.

74. Happen – Arte e Política LGBTI+, Grupo Gay da Bahia. Dossiê denuncia 273 mortes e violências de pessoas LGBT em 2022. maio 8 2023 [cited 21 Feb 2024]. Available: https://observatoriomorteseviolenciaslgbtibrasil.org/dossie/mortes-lgbt-2022/

75. Esteban C, Ramos-Pibernus A, Irizarry-Rodríguez A, Díaz-Medero LX, Mattei-Torres E, Jiménez-Ricuarte C. LGBTAIQ+ research in Puerto Rico: What has been documented? In: Chaparro RA, editor. Latinx queer psychology: Contributions to the study of LGBTIQ+, sexual and gender diversity issues. Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG; 2022. pp. 69–88.

76. Karasmanis EP. Doing science in difficult socioeconomic circumstances. Mol Biol Cell. 2018;29: 1271–1273.

77. Lemerand S, Duran A. Supporting Queer and Trans Students Amidst a Rise in Anti Queer and Trans Legislation and Policies. Reczek R, editor. PhD, Ohio State University. 2024. doi:10.4018/979-8-3693-2853-8.ch012

78. Bush K. Anti-Queer Policy as it Translates to Violence Against the LGBT Community. Stracuzzi N, editor. Bachelor of Arts with Honors, University of New Hampshire. 2023. Available: https://scholars.unh.edu/honors/780/

79. Stacey L. Anti-LGBTQ State Policies and Population Health, 2014-2020. Reczek R, editor. Doctor of Philosophy, The Ohio State University. 2023. Available: https://etd.ohiolink.edu/acprod/odb_etd/etd/r/1501/10?clear=10&p10_accession_num=osu1689271170943654

80. The Chronicle Staff. DEI Legislation Tracker. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 9 Feb 2024. Available: https://www.chronicle.com/article/here-are-the-states-where-lawmakers-are-seeking-to-ban-colleges-dei-efforts. Accessed 22 Feb 2024.

81. Flannery ME. Anti-DEI Laws Take Aim at Students of Color and LGBTQ+ Students. NEA Today. 14 Feb 2024. Available: https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/anti-dei-laws-take-aim-students-color-and-lgbtq-students. Accessed 22 Feb 2024.

82. STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS, INC. v. PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE. United States Reports. 2023. Available: https://www.supremecourt.gov/

The Queer and Trans in Biology Consortium

Consortium members are listed in alphabetical order by first name:

1. **Anna C.B. Weiss,** University of Southern California

2. **Heema Kumari Nilesh Vyas,** School of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, The University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

3. **Hilary I. Palevsky,** Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

4. **Irais Ramírez-Sánchez,** Department of Microbiology and Biotechnology for aquaculture and multi-trophic integration, Centro de Investigaciones Biológicas del Noroeste, La Paz, Baja California Sur, México

5. **Jane M. Benoit,** Department of Biological Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

6. **Janice M. Parks,** Department of Plant Pathology, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

7. **Jay Gordon,** Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

8. **Kay McMonigal,** College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK

9. **L.L.M. van Schijndel,** Laboratory of Genetics, Department of Plant Sciences, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands; Biometris, Department of Plant Sciences, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands

10. **Leslie Dietz,** Department of Chemical, Biological and Environmental Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon

11. **Maria Hamilton,** Department of Marine Sciences, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

12. **Melanie Ortiz Alvarez de la Campa**, Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

13. **Mica Yang,** Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University

14. **Michael W. Henson,** Northern Illinois University

15. **Rebekah Penrice-Randal,** Department of Infection and Microbiomes, University of
    Liverpool, UK; Department of Biochemistry and Systems Biology, University of Liverpool,
    Liverpool, UK

16. **Swetha Sridhar,** Systems, Synthetic, and Physical Biology, Rice University, Houston,
    TX, USA

17. **Yu Wan,** Department of Infectious Disease, Imperial College London, London, UK

Figures

Please be aware that we are working with a scientific illustrator to produce a figure for the manuscript (in the works)and to produce high-quality deliverables (below) for the supplement.

Sample faculty interview schedule

Time	Meeting	Location
8:00AM-8:45AM	Breakfast - Dr. J and **Grad Student Search Committee Rep**	
8:45-9	**Intro to staff, setup in guest office, locate bathrooms**	**Guest Office**
9-9:25	Faculty Meeting - Dr. A	Rm 1
9:25-9:30	**Break**	**Guest Office**
9:30-9:55	Faculty Meeting - Dr. B	Rm 2
9:55-10:00	**Break**	**Guest Office**
10:00-10:30	Faculty Meeting - Department Chair	Rm 3
10:30-11:00	**Break and Prep Time**	**Guest Office**
11:00-12:00	Seminar	Seminar Rm 1
12:00-12:50	**Lunch with students**	Seminar Rm 2
12:50-1:00	**Break**	**Guest Office**
1:00-1:25	Faculty Meeting - Dr. D	Rm 4
1:25-1:30	**Break**	**Guest Office**
1:30-1:55	Faculty Meeting - Dr. E	Rm 5
1:55-2:00	**Break**	**Guest Office**
2:00-2:25	Faculty Meeting - Dr. F	Rm 6
2:25-2:30	**Break**	**Guest Office**
2:30-3:00	Faculty Meeting - Dr. G	Rm 7
3:00-3:15	**Break/Walk to Dean**	**Guest Office**
3:15-3:45	Meeting - Dean	Admin Rm A1

3:45-4:30	**Meeting - HR/Benefits**	Admin Rm A2
4:30-5:00	Campus/Facilities/Lab Space Tour	
5:00-6:00	**Return to Hotel/Break**	**Hotel/Guest Office**
6:00	Dinner with Drs. A, G, H, I	

Checklist for an inclusive faculty search

Preparing for the search:
- ☐ Consider diversity in the search committee and provide relevant training
- ☐ Decide on goals and values for the search at the beginning of the process
- ☐ Be attentive to inclusive language in job postings

Data collection and management:
- ☐ Collect names and pronouns accurately
- ☐ Collect comprehensive gender data, ideally fill-in-the-blank
- ☐ Be aware of issues surrounding data privacy

Conducting the search:
- ☐ Design a comprehensive evaluation rubric
- ☐ Value service explicitly
- ☐ Develop clear expectations for diversity/DEIJ statements
- ☐ Consider how the interview will be conducted
- ☐ Be informed of local context
- ☐ Be aware of challenges with letters of recommendation

Campus visits:
- ☐ Ensure candidates have easy access to appropriate bathrooms
- ☐ Provide a place to change and prepare
- ☐ Get name and pronouns right, especially for introductions
- ☐ Train all faculty
- ☐ Offer contacts on-campus and a comprehensive info packet
- ☐ Prepare HR and know your benefits
- ☐ Reconsider "fit"

Making an offer:
- ☐ Be aware of pay and resource disparity
- ☐ Offer quality should not depend on negotiation skill
- ☐ Offer support for all family arrangements
- ☐ Account for service in percent effort