

# **Full-time Faculty Recruitment Process**

## **Fall 2024**

All faculty and academic administrative searches are conducted using PeopleAdmin, Hofstra's HRIS software. The protocol below, based on best practices and peer-reviewed literature, is designed to actively build exceptionally qualified and diverse pools of candidates. All prospective candidates are required to apply for positions (including submission of all materials) through the PeopleAdmin portal.

### **INITIAL STEPS**

1. Each search should begin with a meeting of the Provost (and/or their designee), the Dean, and the search committee. The goals of this meeting are to discuss the job advertisement, the affirmative steps the committee will take to recruit and evaluate a highly qualified and diverse applicant pool and the overall search process, including timeline.
2. Every member of a faculty search committee is expected to attend (on a biannual basis) a search committee workshop to learn about the best practices for conducting successful searches and avoiding the negative effects of implicit bias, cognitive shortcuts, etc. Workshops are regularly scheduled by the Vice President for Equity and Inclusion and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies.
3. The search committee chair, in consultation with the Dean's Office, will ensure that the following materials are submitted for approval to the Department Chair, then Dean, and then Provost.
  - a. The composition of the search committee
  - b. The full text of the position advertisement using the template from the Provost's Office. The job advertisement must include a close or review by date.
  - c. A list of advertising venues, which may include journals, newspapers, websites, listservs, etc. to ensure broad distribution. It is the responsibility of the search committee chair and department chair to identify venues to advertise that are most likely to enhance the diversity of applicant pool. All positions will be posted on the Hofstra applicant portal/career opportunities webpage as well as Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC), IMDiversity, Inside Higher Education and HigherEd jobs.
  - d. A copy of two rating sheets/rubrics: one to assess the initial applicant pool (semi finalist round) and a second to evaluate interviewees (finalist round). Criteria should be derived from the key elements of the job advertisement. Sample rating sheets are attached.
  - e. Description of the affirmative steps the search committee intends to take to build a diverse and highly qualified candidate pool.

Adapted with permission from University of Delaware ADVANCE Institute. <https://sites.udel.edu/advance/>

### **CANDIDATE SELECTION AND INTERVIEW STAGES**

1. Selection of semi-finalists or finalists may occur only after the close/review by date announced in the position advertisement. Committees are expected to use the rating sheet/rubric to conduct an initial assessment of the applicant pool.
2. Search committees are encouraged to conduct two rounds of interviews, beginning with a preliminary interview with a semi-finalist pool by video conference, and then moving to a smaller group (typically 3) of on-campus finalists. Committees are expected to use the rating sheet/rubric specifically to evaluate candidates being interviewed, based upon the qualifications listed in the job advertisement.
3. Once semi-finalists are identified, the list of semi-finalists, along with a brief narrative summarizing the qualifications of each candidate selected aligned with the rubric developed, will be reviewed by the Department Chair and Dean. The Provost (or their designee) will also receive reports detailing the candidate pool demographics (provided through PeopleAdmin) and search committee comments. The list of semi-finalists must be approved by the Department Chair and Dean prior to commencing interviews. The search committee may be asked to reassess the pool based on the Department Chair's, and/or Dean's feedback.
4. The list of finalists must be reviewed and approved by the Department Chair, then Dean and then Provost (and/or their designee) **prior** to the finalists being invited to campus. When submitting the finalist pool for review and approval, include this information: (1) a brief narrative summarizing the qualifications of each finalist selected aligned with the rubric; (2) description of the affirmative steps taken by the committee to create a diverse and highly qualified applicant pool.

## FINAL STEPS

1. After finalist interviews, the search committee works in consultation with the department personnel committee (DPC) to rank the finalists according to departmental standards. The committee chair then submits the committee's recommendation, finalist's CV, and PeopleAdmin application for approval to the Department Chair, then Dean, and then Provost.  
The Dean's recommendation should include all elements of the offer, e.g. start-up funding, relocation expenses, etc., which are approved by the Provost's Office before the offer is extended.
2. For each candidate interviewed, provide a brief justification about whether the person is qualified for the job. All candidate justifications should specifically refer to the qualifications stated in the job advertisement and considered in the interview process.
3. Prior to extending any offer, the DPC must confirm in writing that the committee has met and the outcome of their vote to recommend the candidate has been submitted to the Chair and the Dean's Office. The full DPC recommendation must be submitted, along with the finalist's CV, application, and original job requisition and forwarded by the Dean's Office to the Provost to obtain the appointment letter.
4. Human Resources will generate the appointment letter, which is then sent to the Dean's

Office for distribution to the candidate. To ensure timely offers, the letters will state that the appointment is contingent on the successful completion of a background check.

5. The new personnel file must include all elements outlined in FPS #1 in advance of the new faculty member's start date.

**Note: As expediency is necessary for the successful completion of searches in a highly competitive market, we have streamlined these processes to ensure timeliness.**

# HERC Search Committee Toolkit

## Prior to Candidate Interviews: Evaluation Template for Search Committee

This template offers a method for Search Committees to evaluate applicants during the initial review. It is designed to be modified by each committee for their own uses PRIOR to the start of a search and should reflect minimum requirements/selection criteria from the position posting. (Note: This template reflects an academic search. It can be modified for other types of positions by inserting the appropriate selection criteria in the rating form.)

Committee member name: \_\_\_\_\_ Applicant name: \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate which of the following are true (check all that apply):

- ☐ Read applicant CV
- ☐ Read applicant statements (research, teaching, etc.)
- ☐ Read applicant letters of recommendation
- ☐ Read applicant's scholarship (indicate what): \_\_\_\_\_

Please rate the applicant on each of the following:

	excellent	good	neutral	fair	poor	unable to judge
Evidence of research productivity						
Potential for scholarly impact / "tenurability"						
Evidence of strong background in [relevant fields]						
Evidence of [particular] perspective on [particular area]						
Evidence of teaching experience and interest (including grad mentorship)						
Potential to teach courses in core curriculum						
Potential to teach the core curriculum on [particular area] (including creation of new courses)						
Evidence of diversity in teaching, service, or research						

Recommend for continued consideration? \_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_ UNSURE

Please provide your reasons for your recommendation (use back of form if necessary):

From the Higher Education Resource Center.

Examples Only. Committees should develop their own rubrics.

**Example 1b. For Final Review of Candidates**

Criterion	Weight	1 (minimum expectation)	2	3	4 (excellent)
Teaching experience	10%	Can discuss personal teaching philosophy and how it is borne out in teaching record			Can discuss personal teaching philosophy to include a variety of experiences in teaching lower-level undergraduate courses in engineering
Course development	20%	Can speak to an example of an improvement personally made to an undergraduate course			Can speak to significant course development (such as created a course from scratch or made serious revisions to an existing course) and how that experience can be applied to courses here
Coordination with faculty and teaching assistants	30%	Can discuss any experience in team teaching and/or directing teaching assistants			Can speak to a significant amount of course coordination either in terms of years of experience or number of faculty and assistants involved; can discuss how challenges in team teaching are addressed
Familiarity with evidence-based teaching methods	20%	Can speak contemporaneously to the implementation of active learning, PBL, TBL, or other pedagogical innovation in STEM			Can thoroughly discuss examples of implementation of active learning, TBL, PBL, or other pedagogical innovation in engineering
Evidence of commitment to diversity and inclusion	20%	Can speak contemporaneously to the issues of diversity and inclusion in undergraduate STEM education			Can thoroughly discuss personal implementation of inclusive teaching methods in STEM and/or research in [XX] that include issues specific to diversity and inclusion

From the Center for Teaching Assessment and Learning, University of Delaware