



Evaluate the Candidate

1. **Review the position description/announcement** – it should articulate the education, qualifications and skills needed to perform the job

2. **Develop selection criteria** - criteria should be directly tied to the job description. Ensure that selection criteria is:
 - measurable
 - demonstrable
 - job related
 - necessary to perform the job successfully
 - aligned with the departments' needs
 - include something to assess a candidates' ability to work successfully in a diverse environment

Note: selection criteria may not include factors such as race, color, national origin, age marital status, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, religion, height, weight, veterans status & Monitor “fit” - candidates who fit in often mirror existing workforce & skill set

3. **Promote consistency** - to promote consistency in interpretation and application. The committee is encouraged to:
 - Take time to discuss and refine perceptions of the criteria.
 - Take time to prioritize evaluation criteria establishing consistency regarding the weight or importance of each criteria (i.e., “An excellent research record,” What are the indicators of “an excellent research record”? “Ph.D. in _____ or related field,” What is considered a “related field?” Ability to work effectively with students, faculty and staff from historically underrepresented populations,” How will this “ability” be measured?

4. **Discuss unconscious bias & assumptions** - to help reduce evaluation errors and biases:
 - Review the research to become bias aware
 - It helps to consciously take steps to:
 - i. question conclusions
 - ii. suspend judgments about candidates based on the institutions from which they come until you have more information about the candidate
 - iii. invite and pay attention to different perspectives (they reflect the benefit of a diverse committee)
 - iv. schedule adequate time to evaluate each candidate (at least 20 minutes)
 - v. schedule adequate time (30-45 minutes between interviews)

5. **Interview and evaluate** – The key aim of the interview is to determine whether candidates possess the knowledge, skills and abilities to perform in the position and allow the candidates to determine whether DU offers the opportunities, environment and collegial relationships they need to achieve professional growth/ success.

- create an evaluation rubric – helps develop consistency, clarity on how preferred qualifications will be measured and what constitutes a strong candidate
- discuss questions to “steer clear” aka, inappropriate questions
- have a set of questions & rating sheet printed out for each candidate
- evaluate each candidates entire application – avoid leaning too heavily on only one element (i.e., prestige of the degree-granting institution, letters of recommendation)
- evaluate candidates on each criteria individually as opposed to a holistic assessment of candidates
- apply criteria consistently to all applicants.
- question unconscious bias – Which may be particularly active during recruitment and evaluation phases
- complete the evaluation at the close of each interview
- Be able to defend the decision to eliminate or advance a candidate
- If a candidate is known to one or more of the committee members the following may be helpful:
 - i. The member who knows the candidate should disclose this to the committee immediately.
 - ii. If the member feels that their knowledge of the candidate will compromise their ability to act as a fair and effective evaluator, he or she should share the concern with the committee and consider abstaining from evaluation of the candidate or if necessary, step down from the search committee.
 - iii. if the committee member believes in their ability to act fairly and effectively in evaluating all candidates, it is best to refrain from sharing details about their knowledge of the candidate unless and until that candidate makes it to the short list.
 - iv. If the known candidate does make it to the short list, it is appropriate for the committee member to share their prior knowledge as long as it is first-hand knowledge that is relevant to the candidate’s ability to carry out the responsibilities of the position.

6. **Campus Visit**

- During less formal components of the campus visit (meals, transitions from one interview to the next) remember that the same guidelines for in/appropriate topics are as relevant as they are during formal interviews.
- As is important for all candidates, underrepresented candidates should be made clear that we are interested in the candidate’s scholarship, experience and skills rather than on their demographic characteristics.



- Candidates should be asked the same interview questions (probing questions in follow-up to a response is acceptable), be provided the same opportunities to share their scholarly and teaching credentials and generally receive the same high degree of welcome and attention during their visit. However, when hosting underrepresented candidates, consider scheduling opportunities for them to meet with individuals who can speak to the experience of underrepresented faculty/staff. Since an underrepresented candidate may have less opportunity to meet with potential colleagues who share their research/job interests and needs, consider making such opportunities available to candidates. Building in opportunities for underrepresented candidates to gather information about aspects of the campus and/or community that help them gauge whether the University of Denver is a good fit for them can be extremely beneficial.
- Keep in mind that positive or negative interaction with candidates can have far reaching impacts on the reputation of the University of Denver as a welcoming, respectful and scholarly institution. Now more than ever, social media makes it easy to share one's experience as a candidate on any campus (see Academic Jobs Wiki for an example of the ways in which faculty candidates can have a significant impact on the reputation of an institution).

References

Fine, E., J. Handelsman (2012). *Research on bias and assumptions*. Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI).

Jaschick, S. (2010). *Too nice to land a job*.

Madera, J.M., Hebl, M.R., Martin, R.C. (2009). *Gender and letters of recommendation for academia: Agentive and communal differences*. Journal of Applied Psychology.

Moody, J. (2010). *Faculty Diversity: Rising Above Cognitive Errors*.

Moody, J. (2012). *Faculty Diversity: Removing the Barriers*.

Pinker, S. (2002). *The Blank Slate*. Inside Higher Education.

Smith, D., Turner, C.S., Osei-Kofi, N., Richards, S. (2004). *Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Hiring Diverse Faculty*.

Swail, Watson S. (2002). *Higher Education and the New Demographics: Question for Policy*.

Trix & Psenka. (2003). *Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty*. Discourse & Society.

Van Der Werf, M., Sabatier, G. (2009). *The College of 2020: Students*. Chronicle Research Services.