Interviews with Subset of Candidates who Accepted or Declined

Most common reasons for accepting offers:
- Positive impression of MSU/department (4 of 5)
- Liked geographic location (3 of 5)
- Spouse/partner found employment (2 of 5)
- Attractive start-up package (2 of 5)

Most common reasons for declining offers:
- No employment opportunity for spouse/partner (3 of 7)
- Spouse/partner did not want candidate to accept (3 of 7)
- Geographic location- expensive, difficult for travel (2 of 7)
- Received a more attractive offer (2 of 7)

Evaluation of work-life integration initiatives:
- 100% positive evaluation of meeting with family advocate
  - Representative comments:
    - “I loved the family advocate meeting!”
    - “It made me feel more comfortable asking about (work-life integration).”
- 100% positive evaluation of work-life integration initiatives
  - Partner employability identified as the most important initiative, followed by childcare availability and family leave options.
  - Initiatives regarded as beneficial in the abstract, though few candidates identified them as personally relevant at the present time.
  - Representative comments:
    - “MSU is the only place that talked about any of these issues.” (Echoed by all 12 respondents.)
    - “We need to catch up to Bozeman!”

Selected ADVANCE Search Toolkit suggestions:
- Bring more women to campus to interview (request supplemental search funding if needed)
- Identify an outstanding woman candidate from an on-going search and request a Target of Opportunity hire by leveraging a future line
- Support work-life integration by providing information (e.g., meet with the family advocate) to all candidates about work-life integration
- Enhance recruitment of top candidate by working creatively to make partner accommodations

To Consider: How can we better accommodate partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partner Accommodation</th>
<th>Diversity Depth/ Target of Opportunity Hires</th>
<th>Supplemental Search Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests Submitted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Outcomes**
- Offered: 2 2 1 8 0 5 0 1
- Accepted: 2 2 1 3 0 2 0 1
- Declined: 0 0 0 4 0 1 0 0
- Pending: 0 0 0 1 0 2 0 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure Track Lines Leveraged by the Provost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 1 0 2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Six STEM women were brought out (1 with funds from Dean). A Diversity Depth/Target of Opportunity Hire is under review for the sixth woman.
2. One women in accepted and the women who declined were also counted in the outcomes of the Diversity Depth/Target of Opportunity Hires section as both were utilized in offering the position.
3. 12 STEM/SBS women were offered positions, 9 accepted and 1 is pending.

The number of job candidates who had an in-person meeting with the University Family Advocate (Sara Rushing).
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