Our goal is to find talent wherever it may be, from all sectors of society and from across the globe. A fair and inclusive search for talent should yield a more diverse and competitive pool of applicants.

**Contact your search officer**
- The search officer will be able to tell you if the demographics of your applicant pool reflect the PhD pipeline of available talent. If it does not, work with ODOF to widen the applicant pool.

**Keep the search committee INSULATED from the rest of the department for initial review**
- It is vital that the search committee be able to deliberate independently of other members of the department, including the department chair. The department chair can, however, serve as a resource to the committee more generally. If there are technical matters in a file that require the evaluator to consult with someone outside of the committee, they may do so if they withhold any identifying information about the applicant or about the pool of applicants. If insulation becomes a challenge, contact ODOF right away.

**Develop your process for evaluation**
- Consider reading letters of recommendation after you have developed your long list of top applicants so that you are focused on the candidate’s written work more than their advisor’s standing in the field or other factors outside of the written work.
- **Develop consistent criteria for selection** that help you find the best talent in the pool. These may include the publication record, evaluations of the quality of dissertation chapters, and other indicators of talent. Use the same criteria when discussing all files. *Ask committee members (and the members of the department) to use the same criteria when discussing the files—it helps to keep the criteria visible while reading the files and when discussing the final short-list with the entire faculty.*
- Develop a process for reconsidering candidates that may have fallen just outside of the long list of top applicants, perhaps because their universities are not the usual sources of talent.
- **First, share the long list of top applicants with your search officer.** Compare the demographics of the long list to those of the applicant pool. If the applicant pool is notably more diverse, the search officer and search chair should go back and make sure that talented diverse candidates have not been overlooked. The search officer is encouraged to consult with Oliver Avens for junior searches and Toni Turano for open ranked and senior searches.
- When bringing forth additional candidates to consider for the long list, no reference to their demographic characteristics should be made and the additions should be based on the quality of their work and their potential to contribute to their field or subfield. *The final short list of up to 4 finalists must be approved by ODOF before making any invitation for a campus visit.*
- After there is a short-list of finalists, talk with the department chair and meet with the entire department to deliberate widely about those files.
CANDIDATE DOSSIER EVALUATION FORM

Candidate’s Name: ____________________________
Reviewer Name: ______________________________

Research Quality
Rank based on originality, contributions, and possibility of being a leader in the (sub)field. Include work that is not yet published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 - Outstanding</th>
<th>4 – Very Good</th>
<th>3 – Similar to Others</th>
<th>2 – Not Very Good</th>
<th>1 – Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

Research Quantity
Rank based on indicators of productivity, impact factor of journals, and reputation of book press (if there’s a contract).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 - Outstanding</th>
<th>4 – Higher than the Median</th>
<th>3 – Similar to Others</th>
<th>2 – Low</th>
<th>1 – Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

Teaching/Advising Potential
Rank based on teaching statement and syllabi/course materials, looking especially for red flags.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 - Outstanding</th>
<th>4 – Very Good</th>
<th>3 – OK</th>
<th>2 – Not Very Good</th>
<th>1 – Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

On the basis of the above, we should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Invite</th>
<th>Invite if at all Possible</th>
<th>Maybe Invite</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>