**Unconscious Bias Video Transcript**

You're sitting on a selection committee for a new executive position. The shortlist has been narrowed to a racialized woman (candidate A) and a white woman (candidate B). When it's their turn to speak, another member of the selection committee says "I think the qualifications of these two candidates are relatively equal. But I'm just concerned about Candidate A's ability to get organized quickly. They were a few minutes late to the interview room, and I found their thoughts were disorganized. Moreover, I'm just not sure they're 'professional' enough. Just look at how they were dressed… their hair was everywhere, their clothes were sloppy, and they just had their papers everywhere. I'm not sure they'll be the best fit." You are surprised by this assessment, in part because many candidates had trouble finding the interview room.

You debate whether it's worth saying something to your colleague.

Think about what you as a committee member could say. You could decide to either call in or out your colleague. When we choose a private moment for a one-on-one follow-up conversation after someone says or does something offensive, this is known as 'calling someone in', as we're inviting them into dialogue with a goal of deepening their understanding and changing behaviour. When we deal with problem behaviour immediately and often publicly, this is referred to as 'calling someone out'. The goal is to stop the oppressive behaviour in a way that is non-negotiable. If you think it's important to raise publicly, you might call someone out. If you want to have a deeper conversation and reach a place of mutual understanding, you might choose to call someone in.

In this case, you might decide to address it in the moment. "What do you mean by that?" you might ask. Or ask what evidence do they have that indicates this candidate is disorganized? Simple questions like this might cause your colleague to reframe what they're saying. You might even call it out more specifically and say "I think we should be making hiring decisions based on the criteria for research, teaching, and service excellence. Can you tell me where this might fit in to the criteria of the position?" Or, if you feel it's important to directly address the specific racial bias in this situation, you might highlight some of the specific biases that are at play. For instance, we know from multiple research studies that white applicants of equal or comparative quality to racialized applicants are more likely to be described using standout or ability keywords like exceptional or best. White applicants are also more likely to be described as organized, while minor mistakes or errors are interpreted as red flags for racialized applicants. You might reference this research and engage the Committee in a conversation about whether these comments are affected by these biases. You might finally remind the Committee of the rule of 3… what are three pieces of objective evidence that support our opinion of this candidate? Directly highlighting the bias that might be at play in this situation will be tremendously important in situating the Committee's work through an equity lens.