Performance 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 deadline, the AP analyst will conduct an initial review of applicants, marking those that meet Basic Qualifications. Applicants who do not meet the BQs will be marked as Unqualified and dispositioned.

All committee members will review application materials from all qualified applicants, including [audio/performance] samples submitted as part of the applications, using the provided candidate evaluation tool. They will assign the candidates a score from 1 to 6 using 1=excellent, 2=good, 3=neutral, 4=fair, 5=poor, 6=unable to judge, using the following criteria:

- Potential for (Evidence of) research productivity / performance
- Potential for (Evidence of) collaboration
- Alignment with department's programmatic priorities
- Potential (Demonstrated ability) to teach and supervise undergraduates
- [etc]

The committee will determine a long-shortlist of 8-12 applicants, the analyst will mark those applicants in the system as *Recommend for preliminary interview*.

The AP analyst working with the search committee will schedule and conduct 30 minute Zoom interviews with the candidates on the long-shortlist, using the same list of interview questions for every candidate:

- a. Tell us about your teaching experience. What do you consider your greatest success with a student?
- b. Tell us about your performing experience and repertoire. How might this inform your teaching of advanced undergraduate and graduate students?

- c. What experience do you have teaching [area] by [parameters/area standards]
- d. What would you be interested in offering as classroom (lecture or seminar) courses? Can you give a specific example of such a course?
- e. In any previous professional situations, what kinds of service-oriented work have you performed (committee work, leadership, or other organization)?
- f. [etc, e.g. questions about Research/Creative Activities]
- g. Do you have any questions for the committee?

The committee will propose a shortlist of 3 candidates for on-campus interviews, update the candidates' statuses in UC Recruit to *Recommended for interview*, and submit the shortlist in UC Recruit for approval. The shortlist will also be presented to the department faculty and submitted to the Dean for approval in UC Recruit. This memo will be uploaded to UC Recruit as a Shortlist Report Document.

The 3 candidates will be invited to UCSB for campus visits. Visits will include a 30 minute [recital/performance], a 30 minute master class, a 15 minute lecture on the candidate's vision for the [area/position] within the department, a 15 minute Q&A session with undergraduate and graduate students, meetings with faculty, a meeting with the department chair, a meeting with either the [divisional] Dean or Associate Dean, and a formal interview with the committee. We will also offer each candidate a tour of the campus and the opportunity to meet with colleagues from [other departments] and elsewhere on campus. Candidate itineraries and all associated interview materials will be uploaded to the recruitment for inclusion in the Search Report.

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 will be uploaded to the Documentation section for inclusion in the Search Report.

After the campus visits are completed, the search committee will meet to discuss and rank candidates and prepare a hiring recommendation to present to the faculty.

The search committee will present its recommendation to the faculty at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. Following a positive faculty vote on the committee's recommendation, the Dean and Chair will consult on the salary and start-up prior to the Chair reaching out to the candidate regarding a proposed soft offer.

With the Dean's endorsement, the department chair will contact the top-ranked candidate to inform them of the department's recommendation. The Academic Personnel Coordinator will concurrently change the candidate status to *Soft Offer Extended* in 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.

As appropriate, the department AP analyst will change candidate's status to *Proposed Candidate* and prepare and submit a Search Report via UC Recruit using APO's Search Report Guidelines at https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/content/Search Report Guidelines.pdf. If the candidate declines, the 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.

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.