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INITIAL PAPER SCREENING WORKSHEET
FOR MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Applicant Name: ____________________________ Initials of Rater: ______________
Position: ____________________________ Date of Screening: ____________

Preliminary Screens
A. Ph.D. or Equivalent in appropriate discipline(s) in hand YES NO (IF NO, STOP RATING)
B. Specialization(s) within the discipline YES NO (IF NO, STOP RATING)
C. Two Years Teach Experience at the College level YES NO (IF NO, STOP RATING)

Academic and Professional Preparation
1. Evidence of teaching ability
2. Teaching experience with multi-cultural, international, female students
3. Research, articles, etc.
4. Participation in professional activities
5. Other activities (including special assignments, awards and fellowships)

Other Comments: (e.g., evidence of good fit for the department) ______________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

*NA = Not Applicable/Not Available

(California State University at Chico, Packet 2)
APPLICANT RATING SHEET

_____ 1. Ph.D. in _____________________

_____ 2. Teaching –

_____ 3a. Research Experience – Articles
   _____ 10 or more 4 pts
   _____ 9 – 5 3 pts
   _____ 4 – 2 2 pts
   _____ 1 or less 1 pt

_____ 3b. Research – Papers Presented
   _____ 10 or more 4 pts
   _____ 9 – 5 3 pts
   _____ 4 – 2 2 pts
   _____ 1 or less 1 pt

_____ 4. Contribute to Department (Please Comment. Include comments on potential contributions to UT Arlington’s goal of a Tier One institution).

(University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, 2000, p. 49)
STUDENT REACTIONS TO CANDIDATE’S INSTRUCTION

Your thoughtful answers to these questions will provide helpful information to your visiting instructor.

| Describe the frequency of the instructor’s teaching procedures, using the following code: |
| 1—Hardly Ever  2 – Occasionally  3 – Sometimes  4 – Frequently  5 – Almost Always |

The Instructor:
1. Promoted teacher-student discussion (as opposed to mere responses to questions).
2. Found ways to help students answer their own questions.
3. Encouraged students to express themselves freely and openly.
4. Seemed enthusiastic about the subject matter.
5. Changed approaches to meet new situations.
6. Spoke with expressiveness and variety in tone of voice.
7. Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter.
8. Made presentations which were dry and dull.
9. Encouraged student comments even when they turned out to be incorrect or irrelevant.
10. Summarized material in a manner which aided retention.
11. Related material to real life situations.
12. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.

For the following questions indicate how descriptive each statement is by blackening the proper space.

1– Definitely False
2—More False than True
3—In Between
4—More True than False
5—Definitely True

13. Overall, I rate this INSTRUCTOR an excellent teacher.
14. Overall, I LEARNED A GREAT DEAL in this lecture.
FORM TO EVALUATE CANDIDATES
DURING THE CAMPUS VISIT

Evaluator ___________________________________________________________

NAME: __________________________________________________ FIELD: _______________________

PRESENT INSTITUTION OR BUSINESS: ______________________________________________________

PRESENT POSITION: ______________________________________________________________________

TEACHING

   Experience
   Teaching Quality
   Comments

RESEARCH

   Experience
   Publications
   Comments

Potential Contributions to UT Arlington’s goal for Tier One status

OTHER COMMENTS (Grades, awards, schools, etc.)

INITIAL EVALUATION

   _____ High (Should be a semi-finalist)
   _____ Medium (may be a semi-finalist)
   _____ Low (should not be semi-finalist)
   _____ Does (not meet requirements)

(University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, 2000, p. 47)
GUIDELINES FOR CHECKING REFERENCES

General Considerations

1. The purpose of reference checks is to gather additional information about the candidates as a basis for narrowing the list to a small group that the committee will invite to off-campus or telephone interviews.

2. Reference checks should be limited to the top 8-10 candidates. Of course, the committee could decide to add to the list at a later time.

3. Regardless of previous authorization, the candidate’s permission should be obtained by the Chair (or an assigned member of the committee) just before the calls are to be initiated to the references. This will provide an opportunity to explain to the candidate the status of the search, and for the candidate to raise questions he/she may have about the university or the search process.

4. Calls should be made only to those references provided by the candidate unless the candidate voluntarily authorizes going beyond the list.

5. Each candidate should be assigned to one member of the committee. Some members may be assigned more than one candidate if there are more candidates than committee members. Committee members should call a minimum of three references for each candidate assigned.

6. Review the candidate’s file carefully before making these calls, since it is important that you be able to convey to the reference overall familiarity with the candidate’s on-paper credentials in the course of the conversation.

7. The search committee should develop a list of 5-10 questions that are matched to the search criteria, providing the opportunity to evaluate the candidate against the standards established for this search.

8. Notes should be made on the substance of the calls for the purpose of accurately sharing results with the committee. It is important, though, that reports be made orally at the next meeting, for nuances are often difficult to capture on paper. Unless the committee specifically decides before the reference checking begins that these notes be shared, they should be regarded as reminders to the reference checker and not as part of the committee’s file on the candidate.
QUESTIONS FOR CHECKING REFERENCES

Candidate Name _________________________________ Date ______________________

Reference called _______________________________ Phone Number ________________

This is __________________________. I am a member of the (name of position) Search Committee at the University of Texas at Arlington. _____________________ is on the list of candidates from whom we will be making our final selection. ______________________ has given us permission to contact references. Would you be willing to comment on his/her suitability for such a position? We would prefer that you keep _________________________ candidacy confidential.

1. What has been your relationship to the candidate and how long have you known him/her?

2. How would you view the candidate’s qualifications in terms of the role a (name of position) should assume?

3. How well does he/she work with faculty and people from outside their immediate organization?

4. How well does he/she interact with students?

5. Is he/she a self-starter? Please describe 1 or 2 projects where he/she was a member of a team effort? How did he/she interact with the others on the “team”?

6. How would you describe his/her personality and his/her temperament? (Is he/she a loner? Does he/she lose his/her temper easily? How does he/she get along with others in the office, etc.?)?

7. What do you consider to be his/her greatest strengths? What areas do you have reservations about?

8. What is it about this candidate that you hope I don’t ask?

9. UT Arlington is an academically demanding student-centered university with a strong commitment to diversity. Would this candidate be a good fit for our institution?

10. On a scale of 1 to 10 (1-loser & 10-outstanding), how would you evaluate this person’s professional performance ( ) and their character ( )?

11. How would you judge the candidate’s administrative abilities?

12. How would you judge the candidate’s academic qualities?

13. How would you judge the candidate as a leader?
14. What substantive accomplishments are generally attributed to the candidate?

15. How does the candidate’s constituency view him/her?

16. Do you know of any qualities, incidents or experiences that might make the candidate unsuitable for this position?

17. If the reference is a current or previous supervisor: Would you hire this person again? Why or why not?

(University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, 2000, p. 62)
CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATING WRITTEN RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Does the referee state relationship to the candidate?  _____  _____
2. Is specific knowledge of the candidate’s subject matter background mentioned?  _____  _____
3. Is the matter of quality of research and publications mentioned?  _____  _____
4. Are the candidate’s duties in current position noted?  _____  _____
5. Does referee state how well candidate performs his/her duties?  _____  _____
6. Are interpersonal relationship abilities noted?  _____  _____
7. Are administrative skills mentioned?  _____  _____
8. Is there a reference to entry level of the candidate?  _____  _____
9. Is the question of the candidate’s initiative mentioned?  _____  _____
10. Are specific instances of excellent performance documented?  _____  _____
11. Does any part of the letter raise additional questions about the candidate’s skills, abilities, knowledge or judgment?  _____  _____
12. Are there negative comments that are echoed in other letters of reference?  _____  _____
13. Are there positive remarks similar to those written by other referees for this candidate?  _____  _____
14. Do there seem to be any hidden messages (covert warnings)?  _____  _____
15. Are any personality traits described?  _____  _____
16. Are student-professor or superior- subordinate relations mentioned?  _____  _____
## FACULTY FEEDBACK ON SEARCH POOL FORM

Search Code Number: _____________________________

Title/Rank: _____________________________

Candidate Name: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidentiality of the review of these documents is essential. The reviewer agrees to provide feedback comments based on *Job Description* and *Job Advertisement* related criteria only.

Print Name __________________________ Signature __________________________

Title __________________________ Date of Review __________________________