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 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 ~5 other measurable qualifications for a successful candidate. This list should be generated via committee discussion and should take into consideration departmental discussions surrounding the position in question.
3. Discuss measurement metrics and a rating scale (numerical or a ✓+, ✓, ✓- system) as well as how you wish to weight the different criteria.
4. Sample evaluation tools can be found below. Committees should view these as conversation starters to help them come up with a tool that best fits the needs of their search.
   - 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. If the search is open rank, search committees may require different evaluation criteria for each rank.
6. Each committee member should use this tool to evaluate each 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 to be sent to the dean.
## SAMPLE EVALUATION TOOL. T/TT STEM FACULTY SEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT POSITION &amp; RESEARCH AREA</th>
<th>RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY</th>
<th>QUALITY OF PROPOSED RESEARCH</th>
<th>RESEARCH AREA/STRATEGIC VALUE TO DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TEACHING POTENTIAL</th>
<th>POTENTIAL TO SUPPORT DEI ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES / NO</td>
<td>Weight 25%</td>
<td>Weight 25%</td>
<td>Weight 20%</td>
<td>Weight 20%</td>
<td>Weight 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ - = &lt;5 publications</td>
<td>✓ = 5-10 publications, several first author, several in top-tier journals</td>
<td>✓ = poorly contextualized, uninteresting, or poorly explained</td>
<td>✓ = limited or no potential research interactions with faculty, students, and/or courses</td>
<td>✓ = no teaching experience</td>
<td>✓ = no evidence of past experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ = &gt;10 publications, 4 first author pubs in top-tier journals</td>
<td>✓ = clearly contextualized, feasible, interesting</td>
<td>✓ = Positive interactions with 1-3 other faculty OR very good fit with strategic area</td>
<td>✓ = basic TA experience or equivalent</td>
<td>✓ = evidence of some past experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓+ = especially innovative or novel, breaks new ground</td>
<td>✓ = 4+ potential collaborators and addresses strategic needs</td>
<td>✓+ = TA experience plus teaching award or head TA experience or other evidence of above-average teaching potential</td>
<td>✓+ = TA experience plus teaching award or head TA experience or other evidence of above-average teaching potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Important:
This purpose of this example is to help committees think about how to develop and measure criteria. Committees should utilize aspects that they find helpful but should modifying the format, criteria, weightings, and so forth as they see fit.
### SAMPLE EVALUATION TOOL. TEACHING-FOCUSED CT FACULTY SEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT POSITION &amp; RESEARCH</th>
<th>TEACHING AREA</th>
<th>EVIDENCE OF TEACHING INTEREST</th>
<th>TEACHING POTENTIAL</th>
<th>STUDENT ADVISING &amp; MENTORING</th>
<th>TEACHING INCLUSIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is their current position?</td>
<td>What is their research area?</td>
<td>Do they fit the job ad?</td>
<td>√ - Teaching and research background not well aligned with teaching needs.</td>
<td>✓ = Can likely teach many/most of the expected courses.</td>
<td>✓+ = Can teach in expected areas and beyond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important:** This purpose of this example is to help committees think about how to develop and measure criteria. Committees should utilize aspects that they find helpful but should modifying the format, criteria, weightings, and so forth as they see fit.