

Search Committee Forms

- Initial Paper Screening Worksheet for Minimum Qualifications
- Applicant Screening Matrix (2010 Applicant Screening Matrix.docx)
- Applicant Rating Sheet
- Candidate Rating Form (2010 Candidate Rating Form.docx)
- Student Reactions to Candidate's Instruction
- Form to Evaluate Candidates during the Campus Visit
- Guidelines for Checking References
- Questions for Checking References
- Checklist for Evaluating Written Recommendations
- Faculty Feedback

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

NA* POOR GOOD EXCELLENT

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: _____

<u>Strengths</u>	<u>Weakness</u>	<u>Comments</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

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 _____