

CoE Faculty Candidate Evaluation Best Practices in the Age of Interfolio

Dr. Joyce Yen, Director, ADVANCE Center for Institutional Change

Dr. Eve Riskin, CoE Associate Dean for Diversity and Access;
Faculty Director, ADVANCE Center for Institutional Change;
Professor of ECE

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
Dispositioning

Skype Interview



Evaluation Criteria
Dispositioning

On-Campus Interview



Evaluation Criteria
Dispositioning

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:
 - <http://www.uw.edu/diversity/faculty-advancement/handbook/assessment/>

Being Explicit about Evaluation

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

System 1	Low	Med	High	Unable to judge		
System 2	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Unable to judge	
System 3	1	2	3	4	5	Unable to judge

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

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Unable to Judge
Demonstrated commitment or potential to advance meaningful demographic diversity of unit	Explicitly discusses personal experiences in the field related to meaningful demographic diversity attributes, particularly those from historically URG in the field	Recognizes different and unequal experiences in the field of indiv. from different demographic backgrounds, particularly those from traditionally URGs in the field	Recognizes different and unequal experiences in the field of indivs. from different demographic backgrounds	Demonstrated limited or no awareness of different and unequal experiences of indivs. from different demographic backgrounds	No relevant information provided
Evidence of engagement with diversity and inclusion (D&I) issues	Offers multidimensional approach to D&I issues (research, training, service, teaching, etc.) – addressed in multiple candidate statements Demonstrated track record of ongoing, active engagement and leadership in advancing D&I in the field	Expresses clear awareness of D&I issues in the field. Has occasionally participated in D&I activities and efforts (e.g., tutor, mentor, outreach)	Demonstrates some familiarity with D&I issues in the field. Expresses basic commitment to D&I. Indicates intention to address D&I in the future.	Demonstrates limited or no awareness of D&I issues (such as barriers for historically URGs) in the field Minimal exposure to D&I efforts.	

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