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Agenda

• Candidate evaluation processes
• Rubrics
• Diversity Statements
• Small group work time
• Discussion and Q&A
Candidate Evaluation Best Practices and Interfolio

Evaluation Stages ➔ Interfolio

- Appl’n Packet ➔ Evaluation Criteria
- Skype Interview ➔ Dispositioning
- On-Campus Interview ➔ Evaluation Criteria
- Decision ➔ Dispositioning
Candidate Evaluation Process

• Each stage (online app, Skype interview, on-campus interview) needs a process

• Process questions
  – What is being evaluated at each stage?
  – How does your evaluation rubric reflect what is being evaluated?
  – What is consistent versus variable at each stage?
  – Who participates in each stage?
  – How do you gather feedback at each stage?

• Dispositioning
Rubrics → Evaluation Criteria

• Rubrics ensure equitable evaluation
  – We are all biased
  – A system to mitigate bias and uneven evaluation
• Conversations about rubrics should take place long before any application is reviewed
• Faculty Advancement webpage has more ideas on how to determine a rubric:
Being Explicit about Evaluation

• What are you evaluating?
• What changes are necessary at each evaluation stage?
• How many levels of evaluation (3, 4, 5?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 1</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Unable to judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System 2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defining Evaluation Levels

• When are you looking at potential for ______ versus evidence of ______? 
• For those with open rank positions, how does your rubric differ based on rank of candidate?
## Example: Diversity Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrated commitment</strong></td>
<td>Explicitly discusses personal experiences in the field related to meaningful demographic diversity attributes, particularly those from historically URG in the field</td>
<td>Recognizes different and unequal experiences in the field of indv. from different demographic backgrounds, particularly those from traditionally URGs in the field</td>
<td>Recognizes different and unequal experiences in the field of indvs. from different demographic backgrounds</td>
<td>Demonstrated limited or no awareness of different and unequal experiences of indvs. from different demographic backgrounds</td>
<td>No relevant information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or potential to advance meaningful demographic diversity of unit</td>
<td><strong>Evidence of engagement with diversity and inclusion (D&amp;I) issues</strong></td>
<td>Offers multidimensional approach to D&amp;I issues (research, training, service, teaching, etc.) – addressed in multiple candidate statements</td>
<td>Expresses clear awareness of D&amp;I issues in the field. Has occasionally participated in D&amp;I activities and efforts (e.g., tutor, mentor, outreach)</td>
<td>Demonstrates some familiarity with D&amp;I issues in the field. Expresses basic commitment to D&amp;I. Indicates intention to address D&amp;I in the future.</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited or no awareness of D&amp;I issues (such as barriers for historically URGs) in the field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working on Your Rubrics

Add specificity to the generic rubric.
How will the rubric change based on stages of the evaluation process?
How will the rubric change based on the career level of the candidate?
Q&A and Discussion