

General Disciplines

SELECTION PLAN – please note, this is provided as an **EXAMPLE ONLY**. It is not meant to be copied and pasted exactly as detailed here.

What is a Selection Plan?

A Selection Plan, along with Selection Criteria, are part of the **Selection Process** tab in UC Recruit. The Selection Plan is not applicant-facing. It is an internal plan describing the details of how the recruitment will be conducted, outlining the search's "roadmap." It may contain, as applicable, how the committee plans to:

- evaluate candidates against Basic Qualifications once the Initial review date passes
- arrive at a long-shortlist and/or shortlist of candidates
- conduct shortlist interviews and/or campus visits
- describe and upload evaluation rubrics to be used, interview questions, etc.
- conduct reference checks
- identify and manage any potential conflicts of interest
- conduct committee meetings/deliberations/voting
- extend soft offers
- etc...

Example of a Selection Plan

After the initial Review date deadline, the AP analyst will conduct a first-pass review of complete applicants, marking as Qualified those that meet Basic Qualifications. Applicants who do not meet the BQs will be marked as Unqualified and dispositioned.

Each applicant who meets Basic Qualifications will be independently reviewed by [two faculty] assigned by the Search Chair. Applicants will be compared against the Selection Criteria. Scores will be compiled on [a Google Sheet] and search committee members will not see other members' ratings. Using standardized rubrics (uploaded to Documentation) each search committee member will end up with a ranked list of candidates. Once all applicants have been evaluated by [two members] of the committee, the compiled Google Form data and the average of the two assigned scores will then be evaluated by the committee as a whole. Referencing the scores, the committee will narrow down the applicant pool to a long-shortlist. Scores will be used to provide initial rankings; however, any committee member may argue to support any of the candidates whose scores fall below a target value in the committee-wide discussions. Top candidates will be selected for the next phase and will be marked by the department AP analyst in the system as *Recommend for preliminary interview*.

A [30-45 minute] Zoom interview, attended by the entire Committee, will be scheduled with the top [5-7] candidates from the initial review. See separate list of preliminary interview questions. All candidates will be asked the same set of questions and will be given time to ask the committee any questions they may have.

Based on the screening interviews, the Committee will establish a priority list of the top three candidates. In order to identify the shortlist candidates for an in-person interview, the Search Committee will update their evaluation rubrics with notes from the interviews and rank the candidates [1-7, with 1] as the highest score. The committee will convene to discuss candidate rankings. Scores will

then be tallied to identify those to recommend for on-campus interviews. The department AP analyst will update the candidates' statuses in UC Recruit to *Recommended for interview* and will submit the shortlist in UC Recruit for approval. Any associated documentation used to arrive at the shortlist will be uploaded as a Shortlist Report Document for inclusion in the record.

Once the shortlist has been approved in UC Recruit, the Search Committee will invite candidates to campus for in-person interviews. Visits will include [job talk, seminar, meetings with department faculty and dean, etc]. All candidates will be offered the same opportunities during their visit.

Faculty and students will be asked for feedback on the candidates based on a set of pre-determined criteria for evaluation, such as their teaching effectiveness. Feedback will be collected via [Google survey form/evaluation rubric/etc], and the [aggregated feedback/evaluation forms] will be uploaded to the Documentation section for inclusion in the Search Report.

The Committee members will rank all the finalists to generate an initial rank order. The Committee will then meet and discuss each finalist individually to determine a consensus ranking and a top candidate for a soft offer will be selected. Should the committee fail to reach consensus on a final candidate, they will attempt further discussion to reach agreement but this does not occur, the Committee would then consider the next best ranked candidate.

If this step does not yield a finalist, the Committee may go back to the pool of qualified applicants and start the process again, if timing is appropriate and the dean is in agreement.

A summary of the Search and the outcome of the interviews and evaluation process will be presented to the department at a faculty meeting. The Committee will explain why the top candidate was selected. Following discussion and standard meeting protocols including a motion to accept the recommendation with a second motion, a vote on whether to recommend that the Dean extend a soft offer to the top candidate will be taken by secret ballot.

If the vote for the proposed candidate is positive, the department AP analyst will change the finalist's status to *Soft Offer Extended*. A Search report using APO's Search Report Guidelines https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/content/Search_Report_Guidelines.pdf will be prepared and the candidate's status will be changed to *Proposed Candidate* if negotiations are proceeding positively. A Search Report will be submitted for approval via UC Recruit. If the Proposed Candidate is from another UC location, the department will work with its APO Sr. Analyst for required notifications and deadline waivers, as applicable.

If the candidate drops out during this process, department will return to their ranked list of shortlisted candidates to determine whether appropriate to propose an alternate. If so, a second Search Report will be prepared and submitted.

The department will submit an appointment case to generate a formal offer to the final candidate via AP Folio concurrently with the submission of Search Report via UC Recruit.

If the initial round of interviews is unsuccessful and there is adequate time before the final date of the search, the Committee may consider adding a Review date and collecting additional applications. Any such applications would be reviewed in the same way as the first round of applications. If the Committee does not strongly support any candidate, or if all selected candidates decline an offer, the Search will conclude for the current year.

Conflicts of Interest

Each member of the Search Committee will examine the Qualified applicants list and promptly report to the Committee Chair the identity of any applicant who may present a real or perceived conflict of interest, and the nature and extent of the conflict. Sources of conflict include:

- Significant personal relations—either positive or negative—that might affect the member's ability to participate objectively in the comparison of the qualifications of that candidate with other candidates.
- Business or commercial relations
- Mentoring or mentee relations (current or former student or postdoc)
- Professional relations, including current or former co-producers of academic work. Not all such professional relations present significant conflict of interest. Factors such as the closeness and timing of the collaboration are material (for instance, distant co-authorship on a paper or volume with many co-authors may be innocuous; so may be collaboration over five years ago with no further contact).

The Committee will review all COI. Whenever the nature and extent of the COI (or appearance of COI) is deemed significant, the Committee Chair will refrain from assigning reviews of the conflicting applicants to conflicted members. Members will voluntarily recuse themselves from reviewing or participating in discussion of applicants with whom they have such a COI. They will recuse themselves from voting in any round in which their vote may affect the outcome for an applicant with whom they have a COI.

If a COI candidate ends up on the shortlist, the nature and extent of the COI, and measures implemented to address it, will be disclosed to the entire faculty before their vote and included in the Shortlist report to the Dean.

If a candidate lists as one of their references a member of the Search Committee with whom there is no preexisting COI, that committee member may choose to either serve as a reference or as a reviewer/voter for that candidate, but not both.

Search Committee members will disregard letters of reference from members of the UCSB faculty at large on behalf of an applicant.