

ATTACHMENT 2

REPORT TO DEAN WITH A RECOMMENDATION TO APPOINT _____ TO A TENURABLE POSITION IN _____ FROM THE COMMITTEE TO SEARCH FOR A CANDIDATE

Date:

Procedure Followed:

A tenurable position in _____ was advertised nationally in the Chronicle of Higher Education, and (list other publications where vacancy ads were placed). The advertised position specified, as requirements for the position, (list requirements here):

The committee evaluated only those dossiers which substantially conformed to what was asked for: (list these-- example follows): *a letter of application, description of areas and evidence for research, evidence of high quality undergraduate teaching experience, a statement of teaching philosophy, a curriculum vita, authorized transcripts of undergraduate and graduate academic work, and three letters of recommendation.*

Immediately after receiving each application, a letter of acknowledgement was sent to each applicant, together with a brochure providing information about the college, and specifying precisely what was expected from each applicant.

_____ (provide number) applications, in various stages of completion, were received. _____ (provide number) applicants were eliminated in early consideration; (provide reasons for elimination--example follows) *three of whom had not completed a doctorate in any field, nor gave any evidence of an impending degree. A fourth application was so incomplete as to suggest the applicant may have chosen not to complete the application process.*

Every member of the Search Committee read all the applications, and independently graded each applicant on a weighted scale of items specified in the job advertisement (specify the items here):

[See ATTACHMENT A]

Result of the Search Committee's Initial Ranking of the Applicants

The results of that thorough and independent scrutiny of the applications by each member of the search team produced a list of candidates with the following scores:

(Candidates and scores can be tabulated in a spreadsheet as exemplified in Attachment D)

The Selection of Three Finalists

One of the applicants appeared to be outstanding, and the top three candidates were adjudged to be clearly superior to the remaining _____ (provide number). The Academic Dean indicated that the top three candidates should be invited to an on-campus interview. In due course, (provide names of interviewed candidates here) were interviewed, presented lectures, and met students and faculty.

Results of the Departmental Student Poll

Both finalists were asked to present a lecture, based on research of their choice, to a group of unsophisticated students drawn from (describe the students for whom the lecture was provided), with the specification that faculty members would also be in attendance. After each lecture, students were asked to evaluate the candidate.

For each candidate, students received identical evaluation forms on which they could indicate a range of satisfaction with the lecture presentation, ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement.

[See ATTACHMENTS B]

Weighting the range of reactions from +5 for strong agreement, +3 for agreement, 0 for neutral, then down to -3 and -5 for disagreement and strong disagreement, produced clear and conclusive results. The scores are consistent throughout, showing a striking preference for _____ (provide candidate's name(s) here).

[See ATTACHMENT C]

On the critical question of whether the candidates should be hired, Candidate A (provide name) scored a plus ____ on a 5.0 point scale, and Candidate B (provide name) scored a ____.

Results of the Departmental Faculty Poll

The (provide name of department) faculty members were polled by the Head of the Department after each candidate had lectured and met with students and department members. The results were unanimous and unequivocal in favor of offering the position to _____ (top candidate's name).

Candidate-by-Candidate Comparison:

All arithmetic comparisons used below are functions of the evaluation system described above. The averages referred to below are derived from compiling the individual scores of the separate evaluators on specific issues (teaching, research, service, etc.) into one figure, in order to obtain a consensus figure rather than individual evaluations.

[See ATTACHMENT D]

Each candidate interviewed for the tenure-eligible position should be listed with reasons for elimination documented as illustrated in the three examples below:

Candidate A

In terms of overall score, Candidate A led the compiled ranking of candidates by a very large margin, with the second highest candidate achieving a score only 74% of that attained by Candidate A. The evidence he provided for teaching excellence, which ranked very high in terms of our expectations, was significantly above all the other candidates. He was even more impressive in terms of demonstrated service to the institutions he has worked at. He led in every individual category except for research and professional contributions, where he was second at 96% of the highest score attained.

The student evaluations of Candidate A's lecture was indicative of the accuracy of the preliminary judging of his strengths, leaving no doubt that he is a superb teacher, able to communicate the content of his research with a clarity that is a model for undergraduate education.

Candidate B

Candidate B tied with Candidate C for overall score, with 75% of that attained by Candidate A. In terms of specific categories, he ranged from second to fifth in our ranking, and because of his overall ranking, was invited to campus for a formal interview and guest lecture.

It became evident at the lecture that Candidate B's command of English was considerable below that suggested in his application documents, but more seriously, that he was not successful in being able to gear his lecture to what had been described to him as (describe students represented at lecture provided by candidate).

The student evaluations of Candidate B's teaching ranged from very negative to occasional and partially affirmative responses, with a neutral grading being the most common response.

Candidate C

Candidate C ranked fourth overall, achieving 58% of the score attained by Candidate A. In terms of demonstrated teaching ability, he was graded 5th overall. He provided very little evidence that his career encompassed much service to his academic and larger community, which is very important in our college. In research, service, and evidence for a compatible teaching philosophy, Candidate C ranked in the second half of all applicants.

Eliminated from consideration for the second round:***Candidate X***

The advertised position specified a doctorate. Candidate X had no doctorate, and was eliminated from further consideration.

Candidate Y

The advertised position specified experience in undergraduate teaching preferred. Candidate Y had no undergraduate teaching experience while the three candidates selected for interviews did. Candidate Y was eliminated from further consideration.

Candidate Z

Candidate Z submitted a very incomplete application, with no letters of recommendation, no vita and no transcripts, and was eliminated from further consideration.

Each candidate who applied for the tenure-eligible position should be listed with reasons for elimination documented as illustrated in the three examples above:

The Search Committee's recommendation to the Dean:

The Search Committee recommends to the Dean that a contract for a tenure-track position in _____ be offered to Candidate A (provide name) forthwith.