SEARCH CHAIR EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS STATEMENT
[For Ladder-rank Faculty Recruitments – General Campus and SIO]

DEPARTMENT:

Position level and discipline of recruitment:

OADEO recruitment tracking #:

RATIONALE FOR STATEMENT:
The process used to evaluate candidates is vitally important in hiring the best candidate for a position. A search committee will be most effective is all the members agree in advance on the evaluation criteria to be used and the need for a fair, equitable, and defensible selection process.

GUIDELINES FOR THE SELECTION PROCESS:

- **Avoid evaluation bias**. Become knowledgeable about research on bias and assumptions and how they can adversely impact the selection process; strive to minimize their influence.
- **Apply agreed-upon criteria and selection process.** Agree in advance on the evaluation criteria and selection process (including how to handle disagreements during the process). Apply them consistently.
- **Take sufficient time.** Evaluate the entire application of each applicant who meets minimum standards.
- **Get different perspectives.** Have at least two search committee members review each application.
- **Don't rank order immediately.** Assess each candidate using agreed-upon evaluation criteria before determining overall ranking. Ranking of applicants should be derived from evidence-based judgments rather than general impressions.
- **Strive for excellence, not pedigree**. Do not de-select applicants solely on the basis of an affiliated institution; do not select applicants based primarily on who they know.
- **Look for evidence.** Be able to back up statements, opinions, and decisions with evidence in the application.

SUBMISSION:
Submit this document to department staff, who will attach it to the Recruitment Interim Report. The interim report must be approved by the dean before any candidate is invited for an interview.

SEARCH CHAIR STATEMENT:
After discussing the evaluation criteria with your faculty equity advisor, please fill out the information below.

1. Identify the agreed-upon evaluation criteria to be used in evaluating applicants:

Potential for (or evidence of) scholarly impact	Ablity to make a positive contribution to department's climate
Potential for (or evidence of) research productivity	Potential for (or evidence of) contributions to diversity (see "Guidelines to Evaluate Contributions to Diversity")
Potential for (or evidence of) research funding	Potential (or demonstrated ability) to attract and advise graduate students
Potential for (or evidence of) collaboration	Potential (or demonstrated ability) to teach and advise undergraduate students
Potential for (or evidence of) leadership activities	Potential (or demonstrated ability) to be a conscientious university community member
Other criteria:	

2. Briefly describe the <u>selection process</u> to be used from the stage of initial screening to determining the short list of candidates. A typical example is provided below; please edit as needed to reflect *your* selection process.

Using the agreed-upon evaluation criteria, all applicant materials, including letters of recommendation, will be independently evaluated by a minimum of two committee members. The committee members will recommend that each candidate be either: a) eliminated from further consideration (rationale to be provided), or b) slated for further evaluation (rationale to be provided). The full committee will meet to review these evaluations and may request further input from department faculty, and will then further assess candidates who have made the first "cut" using the agreed-upon evaluation criteria. After discussion, the committee will narrow down the applicant pool to a short list of candidates. The short list will include those candidates to be invited for interviews as well as those who have a good potential to be interviewed. Department faculty will then be invited to consider the list of candidates and to vote on which individuals to invite for interviews.

3. Contributions to Diversity and the Recruitment Interim Report

For General Campus and SIO recruitments, a Recruitment Interim Report is to be approved <u>before any candidate is invited to campus</u>. The purpose of the report is to identify those candidates on the short list who have job skills and/or experience in diversity-type activities that could be used to enhance the diversity of the campus. To assist the faculty equity advisor and the dean in assessing candidates with this skill set, please list in the space below all candidates on the short list (i.e., those candidates to be invited for interviews as well as those who have a good potential to be interviewed), indicate those who are definitely proposed for an interview, rank each candidate on a scale of 1(low) to 5(high) for contributions (or potential contributions) to diversity, and provide an explanation for the ranking. Candidates' personal statements or C.V.s may be attached as supporting documentation.

1.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

2.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

3.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

4.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

For additional candidates, please use the pages following the signature block.

If you have a Digital ID, you may use it in the signature box below. If you do not, please print and sign the form.
Forward the document to your department staff involved in this recruitment effort.

SEARCH CHAIR SIGNATURE: _____   **DATE:** _____

SEARCH CHAIR NAME (print): _____

5.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

6.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

7.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

8.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

9.   Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

10. Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

11. Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking:

12. Name of Candidate:
     Proposed for interview?
     Ranking for contributions to diversity [1 (low) to 5 (high)]:
     Explanation for the ranking: