

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 $\sqrt{+}$, $\sqrt{}$, $\sqrt{-}$ 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

CURRENT POSITION & RESEARCH AREA	RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY	QUALITY OF PROPOSED RESEARCH	RESEARCH AREA/STRATEGIC VALUE TO DEPARTMENT	TEACHING POTENTIAL	POTENTIAL TO SUPPORT DEI ACTIVITIES
YES / NO	Weight 25%	Weight 25%	Weight 20%	Weight 20%	Weight 10%
What is their current position? What is their research area? Do they fit the job ad?	✓- = <5 publications ✓ = 5-10 publications, several first author, several in top-tier journals ✓+ = >10 publications, 4 first author pubs in top-tier journals	✓- = poorly contextualized, uninteresting, or poorly explained ✓ = clearly contextualized, feasible, interesting ✓+ = especially innovative or novel, breaks new ground	✓- = limited or no potential research interactions with faculty, students, and/or courses ✓ = Positive interactions with 1-3 other faculty OR very good fit with strategic area ✓+ = 4+ potential collaborators and addresses strategic needs	✓- = no teaching experience ✓ = basic TA experience or equivalent ✓+ = TA experience plus teaching award or head TA experience or other evidence of above-average teaching potential	✓- = no evidence of past experience ✓ = evidence of some past experience ✓+ = evidence of exceptional past experience (type of evidence considered exceptional may depend on department's needs)

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

CURRENT POSITION & RESEARCH	TEACHING AREA	EVIDENCE OF TEACHING INTEREST	TEACHING POTENTIAL	STUDENT ADVISING & MENTORING	TEACHING INCLUSIVENESS
Yes or No					
What is their current position? What is their research area? Do they fit the job ad?	√- = Teaching and research background not well aligned with teaching needs. √= Can likely teach many/most of the expected courses. √+ = Can teach in expected areas and beyond	Have they won teaching awards, participated in teaching development opportunities, or possibly contributed to scholarly work on teaching?	Is their evidence that the candidate will be an effective and creative teacher? Sources of Evidence: Teaching statement, teaching evaluations (but use carefully and with caution), teaching awards, letters of rec, sample course materials.	Have they worked with or mentored students outside the classroom? Ex.: Independent study Ex.: Supervised students in lab or other setting	Is DEI mentioned as a value in their teaching statement? Do they give details in terms of how they work to achieve inclusiveness in their teaching, advising, or mentoring of students? Other sources of evidence: Letters of rec, sample materials.

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.