

Tips for Reviewing Applicants

THINGS TO KNOW

- Consistent process and criteria are the best safeguards against bias.
- Hiring decisions become more proportionate when women or minority candidates are at least 25% of the pool or of the long-short list.
- Be aware of potential bias in materials. Statistically, postdoctoral letters of recommendation for female applicants are often shorter and include more about educational and personal attainments rather than research accomplishments.

WHILE REVIEWING

- Review the criteria checklist and be sure you understand the guidance for each criterion.
- Take the perspective of finding the candidates who will make the biggest contributions to the unit rather than on sub-unit or personal interests.
- Take sufficient time. Research-based recommendation is 15-20 minutes/candidate to review each candidate's entire package.
- Use the checklist consistently to ensure all candidates are reviewed in the same way.
- Share results with the committee chair/support for compilation-doing it independently ensures reviewers aren't swayed by the opinions of others.

DECIDING ON THE SHORT LIST

- When reviewing long-short list possibilities, start with the position of including interesting people for discussion rather than excluding.
- Be sure all committee members are heard and all viewpoints considered.
- Take sufficient time for discussion of each potentially competitive candidate.
- Be sure there are solid business reasons for including or excluding each candidate based on the criteria and that all candidates have been reviewed consistently.

USING AN EVALUATION FORM

- Develop an evaluation form based on the program application description.
- As a committee *determine the prioritization* of the major elements. See the Sample Form below.
- All applicants who are not selected, even those who are not minimally qualified, should be dispositioned and should receive communication regarding the status of their application at designated points.
- See the example form on page 2.

Example Evaluation Form

Adapted from WISELI materials and from U. Michigan ADVANCE Candidate Evaluation Tool

Based on the CIRES Visiting Fellows Program job advertisement.

Applicant's Name				
I=Inadequate; A=Adequate; G=Good; E=Excellent				
Eligibility: Yes/No				
	I	A	G	E
1. Transcripts				
2. Research proposal quality				
3. Prior collaborations and affiliations with CIRES/NOAA/CU				
4. Letters of recommendation				
5. Collaborator input				
Particular strengths this applicant offers:				
Concerns this applicant presents:				