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Abstract:
As part of an effort to improve employee hiring and onboarding, the authors’ library instituted more robust people-centered hiring, onboarding and evaluation processes which align with the library’s diversity, equity, and inclusion strategic priority. The goal of this process and evaluation is to ensure new hires feel connected to and ownership of their onboarding through formal and consistent solicitation and incorporation of stakeholder feedback.

The process consists of multiple stages. One, a sixteen-item survey is sent to all applicants afforded interviews, including first round interviews, and second round interviews either virtual via Zoom, or on site. Two, applicants invited for a second-round interview are provided an extensive online guide which lays out details of the library and the wider community. Three, a robust, mindful onboarding schedule is created which spans the first month of the new hire’s employment. Four, user experience activities are conducted with new employees at several points during their first year at the library. These activities gather qualitative feedback to help library human resources determine the effectiveness and receptivity of the onboarding process.

This chapter details the implementation and analysis of these hiring and onboarding processes. It includes results from the surveys, steps that the library has taken to act on that feedback, and a model for how other libraries can do this.

Citation:
From applicant to employee: developing and evaluating an inclusive hiring and onboarding process

Abstract

As part of an effort to improve employee hiring and onboarding, the authors’ library instituted more robust people-centered hiring, onboarding and evaluation processes which align with the library’s diversity, equity, and inclusion strategic priority. The goal of this process and evaluation is to ensure new hires feel connected to and ownership of their onboarding through formal and consistent solicitation and incorporation of stakeholder feedback.

The process consists of multiple stages. One, a sixteen-item survey is sent to all applicants afforded interviews, including first round interviews, and second round interviews either virtual via Zoom, or on site. Two, applicants invited for a second-round interview are provided an extensive online guide which lays out details of the library and the wider community. Three, a robust, mindful onboarding schedule is created which spans the first month of the new hire’s employment. Four, user experience activities are conducted with new employees at several points during their first year at the library. These activities gather qualitative feedback to help library human resources determine the effectiveness and receptivity of the onboarding process.

This chapter details the implementation and analysis of these hiring and onboarding processes. It includes results from the surveys, steps that the library has taken to act on that feedback, and a model for how other libraries can do this.
Introduction

While it is widely understood that inclusive recruitment and hiring practices have the potential to positively impact representational diversity in academic libraries and foster a more welcoming culture, few organizations are evaluating their efforts in these areas. A 2017 ARL SPEC Kit survey reported that 90% of responding libraries have developed or were developing strategies to cultivate diverse applicant pools. Only 15% of the group indicated they were assessing their inclusive recruitment efforts (Anaya & Maxey-Harris, 2017).

Although few academic libraries report that they are evaluating their recruitment practices, a range of resources are available that identify best practices to support effective recruitment. Both the Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and the American Library Association’s (ALA) CORE membership division have recommended guidelines for recruiting and interviewing librarian candidates (ACRL, 2017; Arch et al., 2021). The ACRL guidelines offer a framework for “managing librarian recruitments in a strategic, proactive, and consistent manner” (2017). CORE’s best practices for academic interviews also aim at promoting consistency. They highlight the need for individual library organizations to examine their practices and assumptions related to hiring and emphasize the benefit of structured interviews, using scripted questions and rubrics, with preparatory training for hiring committees.

The Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) reports that auditing an applicant’s journey is necessary to creating the optimal candidate experience (Maurer, 2017). Examining the steps in the process from recruitment, through hiring, to onboarding helps envision a humane and supportive process that is better for candidates and elevates the reputation of the organization. Candidates are professional colleagues. Sometimes they are also patrons or customers. They often share their interview experiences with their networks, both positive, 77% of the time, and negative, 61% of the time (TalentBoard, 2021). When they
share negative recruitment experiences, there can be significant negative impact on the organization (Steiner, 2017).

In important ways, onboarding is a continuation of the interview process and should focus on engaging new hires through a developmental approach that includes regular feedback (Bugg, 2015). The goal of the library’s process and evaluation efforts is to ensure candidates and new hires feel connected to and ownership of their hiring and onboarding through formal and consistent solicitation and incorporation of stakeholder feedback. Candidates and new hires engage in activities to gather feedback that allows them to feel heard, recognized, and able to respond honestly without fear of retribution. A structured hiring and onboarding process is not only a more positive experience for applicants but also promotes retention after the hiring process is complete (Chapman, 2009).

**Literature Review**

The process described in this chapter draws on two threads in human resources and psychology literature: a welcoming environment, encompassing applicant authenticity; and, socialization theory. A welcoming environment, where applicants and new hires feel they can be their authentic selves and provide feedback to the organization creates a more satisfactory hiring and onboarding process. Authenticity is central to well-being and self-esteem (Wood, 2008). It is comprised of four key factors: one, self-awareness, a knowledge of and trust in your own motives and abilities; two, unbiased processing, clearly evaluating your own strengths and weaknesses; three, behavior, acting in a way that is congruent with your values and beliefs; and four, relational orientation, close relationships which require openness and honesty (Kernis and Brian, 2006). Socialization theory focuses on supporting and providing resources to applicants and new employees so that they develop organizational pride and internalize organizational values (Cable et al., 2013). Van Maanen and Schein (1979) propose six socialization tactics on
a continuum: collective v individual (a common set of experiences, training v internships or personalized training); formal v informal (the new employee is separated from other employees while put through experiences tailored for the new employee v learning through trial and error); sequential v random (a set sequence of steps leading to a target goal v ambiguous steps); fixed v variable (cohesive process for new employees v limited clues as to when socialization and training is complete); serial v disjunctive (experienced employees groom newcomers to assume similar positions v no role models and new employees do not follow in footsteps of others); and investiture v divestiture (ratifies and documents the usefulness and viability of the personal characteristics a new employee brings to the organization v denies and strips away personal characteristics). Jones (1986) contends that these six bipolar frames were institutionalized socialization when they are collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and investiture tactics. Conversely, the other end of the continuum is individualized socialization. Overall, the literature focuses heavily on socialization after hiring, rather than considering the entire hiring and recruitment as part of the process.

In the higher education and library literature, Tierney and Rhoades (1994) describe socialization as a continuous, bi-directional process that results in changes to both the new hire and the institution. While that is the ideal, in interviews with new librarians, Keisling and Laning (2016) found that new librarians were not able to respond fully to questions about what their organizations were learning about them and their strengths. In other words, the onboarding process was perceived as one directional, flowing from the organization to the new hire. Cable et al. (2013) found that socialization focused on employees’ personal identity, rather than organizational identity, led to better new employee engagement and job satisfaction. Ballard and Blessing (2006) describe a structured new employee orientation model that focuses heavily on socialization such as understanding library values and mission and meeting co-workers. Winterman and Bucy (2019) outline the implementation of a structured Onboarding Training
Welcoming environments and socialization in hiring and onboarding are also important in recruiting and retaining candidates from historically marginalized groups (Betz, 2022; Brewer, et al., 2021; Cunningham, et al., 2019). This is especially relevant to the continued lack of diversity in librarianship (Hathcock, 2015). A 2020 systematic review of academic libraries’ efforts to recruit and retain librarians described a range of initiatives. The strategies tended to be broad and programmatic in their approach, including internships and residencies, mentoring, professional development, and surveys. Of the 20 types of documented interventions discussed, two focused on recruitment. Findings demonstrate that programs to foster diversity in academic libraries tend to focus on early-career librarians and those that include an evaluative component showed evidence of contributing to diversity within the profession (Kung et al., 2020). Developmental approaches such as those examined by Kung et al. (2020) help to change the culture of librarianship in meaningful ways. At the same time, it is important for individual organizations to examine norms and identify biases in the administrative aspects of recruitment and hiring. While these process-based, transactional activities make hiring possible, they also shape and define the systems that perpetuate the “whiteness” of libraries (Bourg, 2014).

**Institutional Context**

Following best practices, as part of an effort to improve recruitment and retention, our library has worked to institute a more robust people-centered hiring, onboarding, and evaluation process, which aligns with the library’s diversity, equity, and inclusion strategic priority (University Library, n.d.). For the purposes of this chapter, we refer to individuals who were invited for first or second-round interviews as candidates. Individuals who applied for a position are collectively referred to as applicants.
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) is an urban research institution located in the Midwest. As of Fall 2022, over 25,000 students are enrolled (Institutional Research and Decision Support, n.d.). IUPUI is a relatively diverse campus. Among undergraduates, 28% come from underserved populations and 28% are first generation students (Hansen, 2021). Among tenured or tenure-track faculty and librarians, 69% identify as White, 20% identify as Asian, 5% identify as Black or African American, 4% identify as Hispanic or Latino, and 2% identify as belonging to two or more races. (Institutional Research and Decision Support, n.d.).

University Library is the main library on campus serving all students except for those in professional programs (Dentistry, Medicine, and Law) which have their own libraries, and the Herron Art Library which is a separate library but is under the administrative umbrella of University Library. University Library has two employees who have Human Resources positions, one staff, and one Assistant Dean (who has wider responsibilities beyond Human Resources). Library human resources personnel work in conjunction with IUPUI Human Resources in hiring. Library human resources work with search and screen committees and the position supervisor to coordinate job searches, hiring, and onboarding. Librarians at IUPUI are tenure-track faculty. University Library has 29 librarians in tenured, tenure-track, or visiting positions and 44 individual staff members in both exempt and non-exempt positions. Across the library, 14% of librarians and staff identify as Black or African American and 3% identify themselves as belonging to two or more races.

**Process Changes**

Our library has already incorporated specific interventions to increase the diversity of applicant pools for both library and staff positions and to ensure a welcoming experience for candidates. These include, but are not limited to:
● Including language about the library’s and the campus’s commitment to diversity in the opening paragraphs of all job ads (Black & Leysen, 2002; Bugg, 2015).
● Earmarking funds to support posting jobs in outlets that are more likely to be seen by applicants from underrepresented minorities (ACRL, 2017).
● Hosting search and screen workshops for all library employees, to ensure that a wide range of personnel are trained and available to serve on search committees (ACRL, 2017).
● Holding launch meetings for each job search to ensure all committee members are aware of the tools and processes, policies, and guidelines available to support the recruitment and hiring process (ACRL, 2017).
● Scripting interviews and developing rubrics based on individual position descriptions for use by committee members (Arch et al., 2021).
● Blinding or anonymizing applications upon receipt (Kumar, 2018; Meena, 2016; Rinne, n.d.).
● Providing search committee questions and presentation topics to first and second-round candidates ahead of time (Arch et al., 2021).
● Documenting steps in our library’s search and screen process, as well as guidelines for creating a fair search and screen process, to support consistency across searches.
● Partnering new hires with a “buddy” or informal mentor (Olivas & Ma, 2009).

In addition to these best practices, this chapter examines additional unique aspects of University Library’s recruitment and hiring strategies, all of which are aimed at making the process more welcoming and transparent for candidates.

1. Sending a candidate experience survey to all applicants afforded an interview.
2. Providing second-round candidates access to a virtual welcome packet
3. A robust, mindful onboarding schedule.
4. Inviting all new hires to participate in our onboarding assessment process.
Candidate Feedback

With the goal of understanding the lived experiences of job candidates, University Library developed and instituted a candidate experience survey, launched in 2021. Based on guidance and examples drawn from consultancies focused on for-profit organizations (Talent Board, 2021; Workable, n.d.; retorio, n.d.), and drawing on goals of the library's strategic priorities (University Library, n.d.), the survey gathers information about candidates' perceptions and feelings throughout the interview process. According to a national survey of the 100 best companies to work for, when candidates are asked for their feedback after the application process, they are 38% more likely to apply for future jobs with the organization. When asked for feedback following an interview, they are 74% more likely to refer others to the organization and when asked to share feedback at any point during the recruitment process, there is a 93% increase in positive candidate experience ratings (Talent Board, 2021). Although these results clearly illustrate the value of seeking feedback from job applicants regarding branding and recognition, a remarkable 56% of candidates are never asked to provide feedback about their experiences during the screening and interview process (Grossman, 2018). Before launching, the library invited representatives from another campus unit, the Office of Equal Opportunity, to review the survey with an equity lens. This external analysis ensured that the survey would reflect the library’s espoused diversity values and reliably surface potential biases in the hiring and recruitment process (DeEtta Jones & Associates, n.d.).

Every applicant afforded a first-round interview receives an email thanking them for their interest in the position and inviting them to share their feedback through a Qualtrics survey (see Appendix I). The survey questions focus on candidates’ communications preferences, how effectively the search committee explained the details of the position and the programs and priorities of the library, and whether they were satisfied with opportunities to present their strengths and ask questions during interviews. Additionally, candidates were asked
what would have helped them do their best during interviews and how comfortable they felt being their authentic selves throughout their interview experience. Candidates receive the survey email after an offer has been made and accepted by the most qualified candidate. Survey feedback is reviewed by library administration and committee chairs to identify opportunities for improvement and enhancements to the hiring process.

Candidate Resources

Candidates invited for a second-round interview are provided an extensive online guide that lays out details of the position’s library unit, the library itself, the university, and the wider community. This guide contains information about health and retirement benefits and the library annual review and promotion and tenure processes. It continues to act as a resource for the successful second-round candidate upon their hire. See, for example https://web.archive.org/web/20230331002505/https://iupui.libguides.com/instructionlibrarian.

This package helps the library communicate information and values about the organization and supports anticipatory socialization (Black & Leysen, 2002; Recruiting, Socializing, and Disengaging, 2012).

Onboarding Resources

Once hired library human resources and the new employee’s supervisor create a robust, mindful onboarding schedule for new librarians which spans at least the first month of the new hire’s employment (Black & Leysen, 2002; Graybill et al., 2013). This schedule incorporates a variety of pre-planned meetings for new hires with colleagues and campus partners, to help them to gather information and more importantly, form connections for them to be successful in their new position. While there are some common meetings across all onboarding schedules (e.g., library human resources, computer safety with information technology) other meetings are specific to the position and job responsibilities. Black and Leysen (2002) stress the importance
of academic libraries to provide a supportive mentoring environment for new librarians. A part of the schedule also involves informal meetings with a “buddy,” someone identified to be the primary point of contact for the new hire, who is not the new hire’s supervisor, to answer questions and help them learn about the culture of the library and the campus.

**Onboarding Feedback**

Onboarding is an important step in the socialization, success, retention, and engagement of new hires at any institution (Hewitt, 2003; Tierney and Rhoades, 1994). Evaluating the success of onboarding can be done in several ways, by looking at the physical effectiveness of the onboarding (e.g. new employees have necessary log-ins, parking passes, etc.) intellectual effectiveness (the new employee understands their role in the organization and how to do their work), and emotional effectiveness (the new employee feels welcomed and heard in the organization).

While onboarding is an ongoing process that is generally viewed as the first full year of employment (Black & Leysen, 2002; Graybill et al., 2013), our evaluation focused on the first three months of a new employee’s time at the library. This was due to the amount of control and formality that the library has over those first months with scheduled meetings, lunches, and activities for new hires. There is room to investigate further out in an employee’s career, especially at their one-year anniversary. This work includes librarians and library staff, and adjustments were made to create more parity between the experiences of these two groups. The onboarding process includes multiple components, a survey, journaling, and interviews, which are discussed below.

**Survey**

To evaluate the individual elements of the on-boarding process, we created a survey for each calendar item scheduled for the new employee. The first two weeks for a new employee
are incredibly structured, with library administration setting meetings for the new employee on a variety of things, including benefits, parking permits, and meeting new colleagues. The goals of these meetings are defined by administration and inform the questions on the survey. The Google Forms survey was written to be taken multiple times, at the end of every workday by the new hire. It took advantage of logic tools in the survey software, so that the new hire was able to select which onboarding activities they took part in that day. It then presented questions specific to the selected activities.

There were several challenges with the survey. First, the meeting schedule and intensity were different for faculty and staff. Staff also had the added complexity of attending vastly different meetings to facilitate their onboarding. This means that a new survey would need to be written for every staff member and the disparities in the surveys would make analyzing the data difficult. New hires also expressed that the survey instrument was challenging to use, especially when they would attend meetings that the survey didn’t cover. For these reasons we retired the survey instrument and created the journaling activity.

**Journaling**

This activity tasks the new hires with writing a brief journal entry about their onboarding experience at the end of every day. They are asked to do this for the first two weeks of their employment, running parallel to the structured onboarding experience they receive. While participants are free to write what they like, they are provided with prompts to springboard their writing. Likewise, the mode of the writing is not prescriptive, although we expect many of them to be typed. After their first two weeks are complete, new hires are asked to provide those journal entries to the User Experience librarian to be read and coded for evaluation. These files are only accessed by the User Experience librarian and the new hire with findings aggregated for administration.
Interviews

The library conducts interviews with new hires about their time at the university. These interviews were conducted at roughly the one- and three-month mark (see Appendix II). This timeframe means that the specifics of the formal onboarding process is still fresh in their minds but provides time for new hires to contextualize their experience with their job.

The interviews took place in the test administrator’s office or over Zoom. To ensure that the participant would feel at ease with the interview and could speak candidly the test administrator is someone that does not directly interact with the new hire in day-to-day capacities and does not directly report to their supervisor.

If the participant consented, the interviews were audio recorded in addition to the administrator taking notes. These recordings are transcribed and coded to look for patterns in the data.

The questions in the one-month interview focus on the new hire’s comfort with the organization, how friendly they found their new peers, and lingering questions they may have. Where appropriate, the administrator asks follow-up questions for elaboration. Participants were also asked to speak about their perception of the library’s purported goals with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion and if the library was living these goals. Since this question could be emotional for the participants, the anonymity of their responses was reaffirmed.

The questions of the 3-month interview focuses on the intellectual preparedness of the new hires. It was felt that the 3-month mark was the perfect opportunity to ask new hires if they felt the on-boarding process adequately prepared them for their work, since they would have had time to understand their role in the library while being able to recall the on-boarding experience. As with the 1-month interviews, these were audio recorded, transcribed, and coded, and the administrator took notes for reference later. In addition to the standard questions, the facilitator followed-up with points from the previous interview.
Evaluation

Candidate Survey

Job candidates for both library staff and librarian positions were sent a link to University Library’s candidate experience survey (N=71). Twenty-six individuals responded for an overall response rate of 37%. The pool of respondents included candidates from four librarian searches and five staff searches from 2019-2022. Of the 26 respondents, 15 of them were seeking librarian positions and held Master’s degrees in Library and Information Science. Fifty percent of responding candidates reported feeling extremely satisfied with their individual recruitment experience, 35% reported feeling satisfied, 12% somewhat dissatisfied. Most respondents, 85%, said the library communicated just the right amount with them throughout the interview process. 96% of respondents said they were allowed enough time to ask questions throughout the interview process. 54% of respondents indicated that they would be extremely likely to recommend job opportunities at University Library to a friend or colleague. Another 31% said they would be likely to do so, 8% said they would be somewhat unlikely to recommend a job opportunity at our library and 4% said they would be extremely unlikely to make such a recommendation. Reasons candidates said they would or would not recommend a job at University Library focused on the positive reputation of IUPUI and its personnel, employment benefits offered by the university, and one description of a misunderstanding in the regret process, resulting in frustration for a candidate. See Table 1 for survey feedback.
Table 1

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied were you with your recruitment experience?</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, how prepared were search committee members during your time</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How clear were search committee members in their efforts to help you</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well would you say you understand University Library’s mission and</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often during the course of the interview process were you able to</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How comfortable did you feel being your authentic self throughout your</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would recommend job opportunities at University</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to open-ended questions in the survey, several themes emerged. Many respondents shared specific comments about the attractiveness of the job opportunity. They described it as a chance to apply specific individual skills and expertise, mentioning feelings of excitement, aspirations of growing in their career, and their hopes about supporting students. Respondents also shared perceptions of the interview process itself, including thoughts about the responsiveness, flexibility, and transparency of library personnel in their communications.
Numerous comments reflected perceptions of library personnel who candidates encountered during interviews, whether they were welcoming and supportive, or presented as being passionate about their work with the library. Other comments referred to: the reputation of the library and library personnel; university or library policy information shared during interviews; identified stress points in the process, such as the rigor of the process and the number of activities applicants were asked to participate in. Figure 1 further describes the themes and represents how many comments focused on each of the thematic areas across n=68 total comments.

**Figure 1**

*Themes from Open-ended Candidate Experience Survey Questions*

More candidates for staff positions mentioned specific positive perceptions of the recruitment process than did candidates for librarian positions. Librarian candidates were more
likely to identify stress points by a margin of almost three to one. Librarians were also more likely to mention perceived reputations of the library, the campus, and library personnel as a reason for applying for the position. Librarian respondents were twice as likely to mention the welcoming and friendly stance, professionalism, and expertise of the people they met during the interview process. It is not clear whether this was due to the behavior of search committee members across both staff and librarian searches or to differences in expectations about the interview process among staff versus librarians.

Sixty-nine percent of responding librarian candidates reported feeling extremely satisfied with their individual recruitment experience, 15% reported feeling satisfied, and 15% were somewhat dissatisfied. All librarian respondents said the library communicated just the right amount with them throughout the interview process. 69% of respondents indicated that they would be extremely likely to recommend job opportunities at University Library to a friend or colleague. Another 8% said they would be likely to do so, 15% said they would be somewhat unlikely to recommend a job opportunity at our library and 8% said they would be extremely unlikely to make such a recommendation. When asked to explain why not, librarian candidates questioned whether the rigor of the application process was worth the effort, and described difficult feelings in reaction to receiving a personal phone call informing them that another candidate was selected.

**Onboarding**

Since we began evaluating our onboarding process, N=6 new hires have participated. All participants have completed the follow-up interviews, with only 2 completing the survey/journaling exercise. We are working on ways to increase participation.

In the one- and three-month interviews, participants were forthcoming with what they saw as the organization’s strengths as well as its weaknesses. While the library was prepared for criticism, on the whole participants found the experience welcoming, useful, and warm.
Participants claimed that this was the most hands-on onboarding experience that they had encountered and were grateful for its structure and pacing.

As for ways that the library could improve, the list was fairly small. The main point of contention was that the onboarding experience was so full that participants routinely felt that they did not have time for a lunch break or to reflect on the onboarding process day-to-day. The second major point was a need for better explanations and timelines regarding the promotion and tenure process.

**Discussion**

In alignment with recommendations from SHRM, our library envisioned and implemented a series of interventions to better understand a job candidates’ journey, looking at processes and how they can impact candidates’ experiences, from when they first apply through the onboarding process. The library worked to provide personalized messaging and information resources for candidates to better support them throughout the process. The candidate experience survey gathered first impressions of job opportunities, feedback about interviews and communications with library personnel, and asked candidates to identify gaps in the interview process such as questions, steps, or opportunities that may have been missing from the candidate’s perspective. Robust interview and onboarding resources helped candidates and new hires feel supported during the process. Guided conversations with new hires provided individual opportunities for reflection and useful feedback to enhance the onboarding process. Each of these interventions can be applied in an iterative manner, as more information shapes a clearer picture of individual candidates' recruitment and hiring journey.

Results of the candidate experience survey indicate that most candidates were satisfied with their recruitment journey. The library communicated with them just the right amount and search committee members were prepared and welcoming. The majority of candidates felt they
had ample opportunity to highlight their strengths and ask questions. Most said they felt comfortable being their authentic self during interviews. While comments generally reflected positive perceptions of the job opportunity, the library, and the people candidates met in interviews, they also mentioned stress points in the process.

Based on information gathered via the survey, the library has already made some changes, as well as recommitting to practices:

- Providing interview questions in advance is perceived as being beneficial and supportive.

- The library now offers candidates a choice of either dinner the evening before, or lunch on the interview day, or both, depending on their preferences. Previously, librarian candidates were invited to both a dinner the night before their interview day and lunch on the day of the interview.

- The library changed the process for regretting candidates after second-round interviews. Previously, search committee chairs called all candidates invited for second-round on-campus interviews to thank them for their time and explain that they were not chosen for the position. After the time and energy individuals invested in this interview process step, the library felt this was the most respectful and personal approach to declining candidates. However, based on feedback from the survey, this practice is currently under review. Personal calls after second-round interviews are often initially understood to indicate a forthcoming offer. With this expectation, candidates who learn in the call that another candidate was selected may feel more disappointed than they might have felt receiving a regret email from the library and as a result may develop negative feelings toward the library as an organization.
When the library’s Human Resources Coordinator, a staff member in administration, served as a single point of contact and managed follow-up communication with candidates, they described the library as being more responsive and felt a higher level of satisfaction with recruitment communications. This created more continuity of experience among candidates.

The library’s candidate experience survey revealed numerous opportunities to better support candidates throughout the recruitment and interview process. In addition to the data we collected to improve our human resources practices, there is evidence that the action of inviting feedback from candidates has its own rewards (Talent Board, 2021).

From the evaluations of the library’s onboarding process, we see strong evidence that our process not only works but serves new employees in both the short and long terms. New hires indicated that they felt welcomed by everyone and that their onboarding experience was more robust and thorough than any other place they had previously been employed. They also shared that they generally felt the library was making good on its promises to them in regard to work-life balance, DEI initiatives, and in establishing their career.

From the interviews with new hires, we did uncover areas for improvement in the onboarding process. The easiest to fix, but also the most important, was to ensure they were given adequate time to decompress and process every day. This aligns with what Tokarz (2018) notes: a better balance of scheduled and unscheduled time in an onboarding schedule led to stronger employee engagement. For many of them this meant providing at least two hours of unscheduled time around the lunch hour. Another problem was the uneven experience of meeting with committee chairs for faculty governance. As these positions rotate yearly it was determined that the best way to move forward with this is to have the current chair prepare an overview of the work that can be used year to year, to ensure consistency. Finally, all participants expressed a desire to know more about the promotion and tenure process. While it is felt that more documentation and supplemental learning can be provided to new hires, there
is a fear that new hires would be burdened with information that would be more relevant later. We are investigating providing a visual representation of the process to new hires, so they can see a bird’s-eye view of the promotion and tenure process. We believe that this would satisfy their need to know without overwhelming them.

**Conclusion**

Through a comprehensive suite of hiring and onboarding best practices, IUPUI University Library has worked to increase candidate and new hire socialization and satisfaction. Overall, the majority of candidates were satisfied with their individual recruitment experience, thought that the library communicated just the right amount with them through the interview process, and that they would be extremely likely to recommend job opportunities at the library to a friend or colleague. New employees reported that the onboarding process was welcoming, useful, and warm. They also noted that this was the most hands-on onboarding experience they had encountered in their careers and that they were grateful for the structure. The process includes following best practices such as common training for search and screen committees and providing interview questions to candidates prior to interviews. It also encompasses providing candidates and new hires robust documentation and scheduling. Importantly, feedback from candidates and new hires is solicited at multiple stages in application and onboarding.

While this chapter outlined specific aspects of the library’s hiring and onboarding process, we stress that the entire package is necessary. In other words, libraries should incorporate as many of the best practices as is possible given the institutional context, not just the enhancements discussed here. It is the development of a holistic candidate and new hire experience that leads to better outcomes for both the candidate and the library.
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Candidate Experience Survey

Thank you for your interest in a position at IUPUI University Library. We appreciate the time and energy you invested in preparing your application materials, and in getting to know our personnel, projects, and services.

We would be grateful for your feedback about your experience as a job candidate with our library organization. This survey includes 16 questions and should take 5-7 minutes.

All applicants who participated in first and second phase interviews will receive this invitation to share feedback. Your responses will remain anonymous.

Your input will help us continue to improve our search and screen process, making it a welcoming experience for all applicants.

1. **Overall, how satisfied were you with your recruitment experience at University Library?**
   - Extremely satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Extremely dissatisfied

2. **What was it about this job opportunity as described in the online ad that made you want to apply?**
3. We want to know if we communicated enough with you throughout the interview process. How would you describe the level of communication?
   Too much
   Too little
   Just the right amount

4. If there was a specific part of the interview process that you would like to comment on, please use the box below to share your thoughts.

5. In general, how prepared were search committee members during your time with them?
   Extremely prepared
   Prepared
   Somewhat unprepared
   Extremely unprepared

6. How clear were search committee members in their efforts to help you understand the role and associated responsibilities?
   Extremely clear
   Clear
   Somewhat unclear
   Extremely unclear

7. How often during the course of the interview process were you able to highlight your strengths for this role?
Very frequently
Frequently
Occasionally
Rarely

8. Were you allowed enough time to ask questions throughout the interview process?
   Yes
   No

9. How well would you say you understand University Library’s mission and values after your candidate experience?
   Extremely well
   Moderately well
   Not well
   Not well at all

10. We want to support candidates in doing their very best during interviews. With this in mind, please complete the following sentence, "It would have been helpful to me during the interview process, if University Library had..."

11. How comfortable did you feel being your authentic self throughout your candidate experience?
    Extremely comfortable
    Comfortable
    Somewhat uncomfortable
    Extremely uncomfortable
12. Is there anything University Library could have done to make you feel more like your authentic self throughout your candidate experience? Please explain.

13. Based on your experience, how likely is it that you would recommend job opportunities at University Library to a friend or colleague?

   Extremely likely
   Likely
   Somewhat unlikely
   Extremely unlikely

14. Why did you choose the rating above?

15. What other feedback would you like to share about your candidate experience?

Thank you for taking time to share your feedback with us.

Best wishes to you in your continued professional endeavors,

University Library Business Affairs Team
Appendix II

Onboarding Assessment Protocol

1 Month After Starting

Overall, how did you feel about the onboarding process?

Did you feel welcomed by everyone during the onboarding process?

Did you feel comfortable asking questions when you needed more information?

Was it clear to you who to go to in order to get answers?

Do you feel equipped to do your work now?

What other questions do you have about working at University Library? IUPUI?

Is there anything important about your experience at UL that you would like me to share?

Do you feel like UL is living up to its purported goals, e.g. DEI initiatives?

How do you feel about these follow up meetings? Do you think UL should continue them? If so, who would be an ideal person or type of person?
3 Months After Starting

Overall, how did you feel about the onboarding process?

Looking back at your onboarding experience, do you feel that it was a valuable use of your time?

Did you feel prepared to get to work after the onboarding process?

Were you given adequate time to digest what you learned from the onboarding process?

Do you feel like you've been provided the information and tools you need to feel confident and be successful in your position?

What words would you use to describe your future as a librarian? Do you feel that UL is providing you an environment that will realize that future?

What do you think could have been improved about the onboarding process?

What questions do you still have about working at UL? Any confusion that could have been addressed earlier?

Compared to previous employers, how do you feel UL compares in preparing their employees for their career?
Is there anything important about your experience at UL that you would like me to share?