

## Appendix C. Tips for Creating Evaluation Tools for Faculty Searches

Successful search processes begin with fair evaluation of candidates based on their qualifications for the position, rather than falling back on personal preferences or biases. This document provides tips for creating evaluation tools to support fair and consistent evaluations of all applicants.

*The committee will need to submit information on this step in Talent Link as part of the hiring process.*

An evaluation tool lists *no more than six* agreed upon qualifications for the position.

- Related in part to different hiring priorities, evaluation tools will differ greatly from search to search.
- The committee may want different evaluations tools for different stages of the search process (creation of the semi-finalist pool, finalist pool, etc.)

Here are some steps for committees to follow in the creation of such tools:

1. Start by specifying ‘required’ qualifications. A candidate lacking such qualifications will receive no further consideration. Some examples...
  - Degree and area of specialization requirements.
  - Post-doc experience, rank, etc.
2. Create a list of ~ five *desired* qualifications and methods of measurement. The examples below can be used to get the conversation started. Committees should make adjustments to fit their hiring needs.
  - Past research productivity. Measured in terms of...
    - Number of publications. Possibly also expectations surrounding co-authorship.
    - Journal quality.
    - One’s evaluation of the published research itself.
  - Research potential. Broadly measured in terms of quality and creativity of research program.
    - Has the candidate clearly communicated a coherent and feasible vision for future research?
    - Is the proposed research creative, innovative, or novel?
    - Is it appropriate in scope – i.e., not too broad with potential to grow over time?
  - Ability to secure grant funding.
    - Does the candidate have past success or experience writing grants?
    - Does the proposed research align priorities of relevant funding agencies?
  - Ability to contribute to graduate and/or undergraduate programs.
    - Alignment between research area and/or past teaching experience with departmental teaching priorities. Be specific and discuss the relative importance of different priorities.
    - Amount of past teaching experience and/or experiences related to teaching.
    - Clear and careful communication of teaching goals, approaches to meeting those goals, and interest in teaching and mentoring.
  - Ability to collaborate with relevant units across campus. Measured in terms of...
    - Alignment between research area and the unit(s) in question.
    - Past collaborations or plans for future collaborations with scholars in relevant area(s).

- Ability to contribute to departmental priorities surrounding diversity or departmental climate.
    - How this criterion is measured will depend on the specific priorities.
3. Discuss the relative weight or importance of various evaluation criteria.
  4. Establish a common numerical or descriptive (e.g., exceeds expectations, meets expectations, not acceptable) evaluation scale.
    - If numerical, committees should avoid the temptation to simply add up the numbers and, thus, rank candidates in terms of an overall numerical score. ***The purpose of the evaluation tool is not to rank candidates in numerical order but to keep committee members focused on agreed upon evaluation criteria, rather than falling back on personal preferences or biases.***
  5. Create a common evaluation tool. It is up to the committee to determine the exact format (rubric, spreadsheet, something else).
  6. Each committee member should use this tool to evaluate each and every candidate.
    - Don't simply record your numerical or descriptive rating.
    - Keep careful notes to explain or justify the rating you have given.  
*Careful notes support not only fair and consistent evaluation, but also help expedite committee decision and required justification of the committee's decisions in Talent Link.*
  7. To avoid "group think" and the possibility of overlooking an excellent but unique candidate, search committee members should not share their impressions with others until each has evaluated all candidates.