

Tip: Candidate Evaluation

These resources are provided to support best practices in candidate evaluations. The information is presented as suggestions and is not a guarantee of a successful search. Consider using the Candidate Evaluation Template to objectively evaluate the candidates. Best of luck!

Reviewing Applicants

- Spend adequate time reviewing each application. Allow 15–30 minutes to review each application to ensure that each candidate receives a thorough assessment.
- Secure reviews by more than one search committee member. Each application should be assessed by more than one search committee member to ensure a fair evaluation.
- Discuss, prior to interviewing candidates, how dimensions listed in job ad will be weighted and valued.
 - Ensure that each candidate is evaluated on all criteria listed in job ad and identified as meaningful in the search.
 - Establish evaluation criteria. The dimensions for judging applicants, as well as their relative importance, should be determined prior to reviewing applications. Choose criteria that can help predict the future success of the applicant.
 - Adhere to evaluation criteria. When assessing applications, it is important to adhere to these evaluation criteria. Using a standard evaluation form will help committees to rate criteria consistently across a pool of candidates.
- Rely on evidence. When determining whether or not a candidate meets certain criteria, refer to materials in candidate's application. Ensure that similar information is collected on all applicants. For example, if one candidate receives an unsolicited reference from a colleague, then the search committee should reach out to colleagues of other candidates to obtain references.
- Avoid elitism. Be careful of rating a candidate highly solely because of the reputation of their institution or advisor.
- Avoid premature ranking. Ensure that each application has been fully considered with respect to the different criteria that were agreed upon prior to expressing preferences for particular candidates.
- Create multiple ranking lists of candidates. Ranking candidates on each criterion and then choosing individuals who placed highly in all categories will allow for a fair construction of the candidate shortlist.

Avoiding Bias

- Do not underestimate any of the candidates when evaluating them. A non-traditional career path or gap in the resume can be the result of an unseen occurrence in the applicant's life.
- Research indicates that interviewers more fairly evaluate candidates from underrepresented and underserved groups when there is more than one person from an underrepresented group conducting the interview.
- Be sure to evaluate teaching, research, publications, community service, and non-academic work when assessing candidates. Candidates from underrepresented and underserved groups often devote more time to community service and mentoring because they have an experiential

understanding of the critical role these factors play in the success of historically marginalized groups.

- Avoid subjecting different candidates to different expectations. Women and underrepresented minorities may tend to be held to higher expectations regarding their number of publications and name recognition. An awareness of this potential bias will allow these candidates to receive proper consideration.

Encouraging Diversity

- If the pool of candidates does not include candidates from underrepresented and underserved groups consider re-opening and intensifying the search.
- To ensure that each candidate is asked about his or her demonstrated commitment to diversity, and experience working in diverse environments, designate one person to lead asking these questions; this person should (preferably) not be the only female or underrepresented minority committee member.
- Consider candidate's record of working with diverse students and diversity-related research.

These tips are based on toolkits available through the University of San Diego, Columbia University, and the University of Michigan.

Tool: Candidate Evaluation Template

The following offers a method for department faculty to provide evaluations of job candidates. It is meant to be a template for departments that they can modify as necessary for their own uses. The proposed questions are designed for junior faculty candidates; however, alternate language is suggested in parentheses for senior faculty candidates.

Candidate's Name: _____

Please indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's CV | <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's letters of recommendation | <input type="checkbox"/> Met with candidate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's scholarship | <input type="checkbox"/> Attended candidate's job talk | <input type="checkbox"/> Attended lunch or dinner with candidate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please explain): _____ | | |

Please comment on the candidate's scholarship as reflected in the job talk:

Please comment on the candidate's teaching ability as reflected in the job talk:

Please rate the candidate on each of the following:

	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor	Unable to judge
Potential for (evidence of) scholarly impact	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Potential for (evidence of) research productivity	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Potential for (evidence of) research funding	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Potential for (evidence of) collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Fit with department's priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Ability to make positive contribution to department's climate	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Potential (demonstrated ability) to attract and supervise diverse graduate students	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Potential (demonstrated ability) to teach and supervise diverse undergraduates	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Potential (demonstrated ability) to be a conscientious university community member	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Other comments?						

Source: University of Michigan