**Appendix I: Criteria and Scoring Procedure for Ranking applications for the CRC 150 Smart and Sustainable Cities and Communities**

- The tables below are meant to structure assessment of reasoning about the applications, according to criteria.
    - Each of the four criteria below is scored on 6 point scale.
    - The points are then added in a weighted sum, to give a total score expressed on a 24 point scale (4 criteria x 6 points each)
    - Filling in the table by qualitatively assessing candidates on sub-criteria helps structure assessment and scoring of the candidate.
- The criteria and sub-criteria are drawn from the ones the CRC 150 competition uses to assess our LOI.
    - The Quality of Institutional Support criterion is modified to assess the prospects an LOI with regard to high quality support.
    - Additions, in italics, customize the sub-criteria for CU, Montreal, and the Smart Sustainable Cities Area.
    - For the final scoring and ranking, teaching ability, as indicated by our limited materials, and as suggested by the interview, was taken into account as a factor relevant to Potential and Diversity (vis-à-vis educating and supervising future generations of researchers).

**Research/Academic Merit (30%)**

| Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion) | N/A | Modest | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The quality of the nominee's research track record, as measured through bibliometric evidence or other measures of research productivity and impact. | | | | | |
| The candidate is a top-tier, internationally based researcher whose accomplishments have made a major impact in their fields (as appropriate based on career stage). | | | | | |
| *Quality and promise of the candidate's research program, vis-à-vis contributions to research on Smart and Sustainable Cities and Communities at Concordia, in Montreal, and in Canada* | | | | | |
| *Research program, method and outputs are viable for movement to the Concordia/ Montreal context* | | | | | |

**Prospects for Quality of the Institutional Support (20%)**

| Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion) | N/A | Modest | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Opportunities for collaboration with other researchers working in the same or related areas at *Concordia, in Montreal or the broader region, within Canada and abroad—including NGOs and municipal initiatives*. | | | | | |
| Prospects for the sustainability, including retention, of the chairholder beyond the period of the award. | | | | | |
| *Fit of candidate's research program with CU strategic directions, research clusters, and existing units and centres (giving consideration to issues of transdisciplinarity), as indicator of prospects re. institutional support.* | | | | | |

**Diversity (20%)**

| Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion) | N/A | Modest | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Candidate's prospects re. CU's quality of recruitment and outreach strategy in terms of demonstrated commitment to equity, diversity and inclusion of individuals from the four designated groups (women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal Peoples, and persons with disabilities) | | | | | |
| Candidate's prospects regarding the quality and extent of the institution's commitment to ensuring that the opportunities of the chairholder's research program will be made available to individuals from the four designated groups, *in connection with CU units, centres, programs, and municipal and regional initiatives regarding women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal Peoples, and persons with disabilities*. | | | | | |

**Potential (30%)—the potential contribution of the research chair in enhancing the research landscape in Canada, such as:**

| Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion) | N/A | Modest | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Filling a gap within existing expertise, in Canada | | | | | |
| Building research capacity in new fields or increasing critical mass in existing areas, in Canada | | | | | |
| Likelihood that the work of the proposed chair will advance Canada's reputation as a global centre for science, research and innovation excellence | | | | | |
| Potential for the proposed chair's expertise to create social and economic advantages for Canada | | | | | |

## Sample Candidate Evaluation Tool

| Please rate the candidate on each of the following: | Excellent | Good | Neutral | Fair | Poor | Unable to judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potential/Evidence: scholarly impact | | | | | | |
| Potential/Evidence: research productivity | | | | | | |
| Potential/Evidence: research funding | | | | | | |
| Record on diversity-related research | | | | | | |
| Record on diversity-related teaching | | | | | | |
| Ability to make positive contribution to department's climate | | | | | | |
| Potential/Demonstrated ability: attract and supervise graduate students | | | | | | |
| Potential/Demonstrated ability: teach and supervise undergraduates | | | | | | |
| Potential/Demonstrated ability: conscientious university community member | | | | | | |

# Candidate Evaluation Worksheet
## Position # 6728, Assistant Professor in Applied Optics
### Department of Physics and Optical Science

**Candidate Name** (Last, First): _____

| CANDIDATE HAS MET THE FOLLOWING MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| **Ph.D. in Optical Science, Optical Engineering, or closely related field (a, b, e)** <br><br> Degree(s): | | |
| **Other requirements or experience required in job advertisement (a, b, c, d, e):** <br><br> ● Specialization in geometrical optics, optical design, optical fabrication, or optical metrology <br><br> ● Significant record of research and publication <br><br> ● Strong commitment to teaching at undergraduate and graduate levels | | |

Rate candidate on each item below using the following scale and specified sources of information for each judgment in parenthesis (see key below):

| *__KEY SOURCES OF INFORMATION:__ | **a.** cover letter; **b.** CV; **c.** description of research plans; **d.** statement of teaching experience and philosophy; **e.** transcripts; **f.** reference letters |
|---|---|

| 1. DIVERSITY INITIATIVES | Not Qualified (0) | Qualified (1) | Exceptional (2) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Commitment to inclusiveness (a, b, d, f):** <br><br> • Candidate states in cover letter how he/she envisions contributing to Department's educational mission <br><br> *Topics discussed in cover letter:* | | | |

| 2. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES/RESEARCH | Not Qualified (0) | Qualified (1) | Exceptional (2) |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Demonstrated strong academic record (a, b, f) | | | |
| b. Program of research in alignment with Departmental mission and goals (a, b, c, f) | | | |
| c. Evidence of publication record (articles, chapters, other) (a, b, c, f) <br><br> _____ Published       _____ In press | | | |
| d. Demonstrated achievement in original research and scholarship (a, b, c, f) | | | |
| e. Demonstrated success in securing extramural funds for research (a, b, c, f) <br><br> Amount of funding to date: _____ <br><br> Funding Sources *(circle all that apply)*:     Federal     State     Local     Foundation     Other | | | |

| 3. TEACHING | Not Qualified (0) | Qualified (1) | Exceptional (2) |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Prior teaching experience at the undergraduate and graduate level (a, b, d, f) <br><br> *Course(s) taught:* | | | |
| **OVERALL ASSESSMENT** <br> (Comments) | | | |

Department of

Candidate Evaluation Worksheet: _____

– Stage 1 Application Review

**(Position)**

**Candidate Name (Last, First):**_____**Reviewer's Initials _____**

| | | Criteria | Rating | Score | Comments/Source (a = cover letter; b=CV;c=teaching statement; d=research agenda; e=scholarly publication; f=transcript) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Required qualifications* | 1 | **Earned doctorate in XXXX or a related field from an accredited university** | ☐Yes ☐No ☐ABD<br>__ Reading (20 pts.)<br>___Appropriately Related ____ (15 pts.)<br>___ Unrelated (0 pts.)) (field) | | |
| | 2 | **Two years of successful elementary teaching experience (K-6; K-3 preferred)** | ☐Yes (circle: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 ) ☐No (0 pts.)<br>( K-3 preferred)<br>**Preferred K-3 (20 pts)**<br>**Elementary K-6 (10 pts)** | | |
| | 3 | **Demonstrated experience with reading assessments and data-driven instruction for students who struggle with reading** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 4 | **Demonstrated experience working with diverse student populations** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 5 | **Cover letter relates the applicant's ability to enhance our students' reading education and help College attain goal related to working with diverse students in urban settings.** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 6 | **Teaching statement addresses the responsibilities of the position.** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 7 | **Research agenda addresses the responsibilities of the position** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 8 | **Demonstrated experience presenting at state or national conferences** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 9 | **Demonstrated experience in or potential for grant proposal development** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 10 | **Demonstrated experience or research in early literacy/urban education** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 11 | **Demonstrated experience conducting research and writing for scholarly publications** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 12 | **Demonstrated experience teaching at the college or university level.** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 13 | **Demonstrated successful teaching at the college or university level via teaching evaluations/reviews** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |
| | 14 | **Demonstrated commitment to professional service (e.g. mentoring doctoral students)** | 5 4 3 2 1 0<br>Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Very Poor None | | |

Adapted from rubric created by: Created by ALM 2014 for asst. prof position

| Application Evaluation | POSITION: | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **University of Lethbridge** | | | | |
| EVALUATOR/ Date: | CANDIDATE: | | | |

| Position Criteria | Weight | Rating | Score | Comments/Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Recognized Teaching Ability** | | | | |
| ▪ Degree status / from: | | | | |
| ▪ Areas of specialization | | | | |
| ▪ Graduate teaching | | | | |
| ▪ Graduate supervision (e.g. masters & doctoral cmtes) | | | | |
| ▪ Evidence of additional work with graduate students | | | | |
| ▪ Undergraduate teaching | | | | |
| ▪ Experience with distributed learning | | | | |
| ▪ Content, knowledge, skill valid in recognized field | | | | |
| ▪ Pedagogic effectiveness | | | | |
| ▪ Inclusive material / non-discriminatory language | | | | |
| ▪ Articulated, valid & fair means of assessing achievement | | | | |
| ▪ Innovative, creative development of course materials | | | | |
| ▪ Use of technologies to improve teaching & learning | | | | |
| ▪ Contributions to curriculum development | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| **Research, Scholarship or Creative Work** | | | | |
| ▪ Evidence of activity (appropriate for stage of career?) | | | | |
| ▪ Collaboration | | | | |
| ▪ Has presented and disseminated work | | | | |
|    Conferences, meetings (note if internationally) | | | | |
| ▪ Record of grants for basic or applied research | | | | |
|    Nationally recognized agencies | | | | |
|    Foundations | | | | |
|    Other non-refereed agencies/foundations | | | | |
| ▪ Published in refereed journals | | | | |
| ▪ Published in professional journals | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| **THRESHOLD CRITERIA TOTAL** | | | | |
| **Additional Criteria** | | | | |
| ▪ Sensitivity to broad range of perspectives | | | | |
| ▪ Sensitive & respectful of diversity & equity | | | | |
| ▪ Evidence of departmental activities & admin. duties | | | | |
| ▪ Evidence of service to community | | | | |
| ▪ Adds to the diversity of the department | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| ▪ | | | | |
| **ADDITIONAL CRITIERIA TOTAL** | | | | |

**1**=significantly below requirements, **2**=below requirements, **3**=meets requirements, **4**=exceeds requirements, **5**=significantly exceeds requirements, **NA**=not provided in application pkg.

Notes

| Interview Evaluation | | POSITION: | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EVALUATOR/ Date: | | CANDIDATE: | | | | |

| Questions | Criteria Sought | Weight | Rating | Score | Comments/Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teaching**<br>▪ What is your philosophy of education and how is it manifested in your teaching? | ▪ Scholarly competence, pedagogic effectiveness | | | | |
| ▪ What has been the most difficult part of team teaching for you & how did you cope with it? | ▪ Team player, works cooperatively<br>▪ Diplomatic, problem solving skills<br>▪ Demonstrated teaching experience | | | | |
| ▪ What innovative approaches do you employ in teaching? | ▪ Understands different learning styles & variety of methods and technology to support them | | | | |
| **Working with students**<br>▪ Give examples of challenges you've had with students in your teaching experience and how you handled them. | ▪ Accessible, responsible, fair, sensitive and respectful, patient, approachable. Listening skills | | | | |
| ▪ Tell us about when you've acted as a mentor. What did you do? What were the results? | ▪ Good rapport with students. Can motivate and inspire. Sensitive to needs of students | | | | |
| **Research Agenda – current & future**<br>▪ What direction would you like your research to take and what plans do you have for taking it there? | ▪ Integrity, originality, quality<br>▪ Collaborative<br>▪ Strong commitment | | | | |
| ▪ What opportunities do you see in our Dept. for cooperating in research with specific colleagues? | ▪ Scholarly competence, interest in collaboration. Respective of fields of study | | | | |
| ▪ Tell us about some of the opportunities you've created in your research for students. | ▪ Shares information, ability to give effective feedback.<br>▪ Integrity | | | | |
| ▪ How has your research informed your own teaching? | ▪ Responsive to change | | | | |
| **THRESHOLD CRITERIA TOTAL** | | | | | |
| **Additional Criteria**<br>▪ What are your expectations of the Dept.? | ▪ Reas**ona**ble | | | | |
| ▪ How do you see your involvement with the community and how would this be enacted? | ▪ Sensitive & respectful of diversity & equity | | | | |
| ▪ Where do you see yourself in 5 years? | ▪ Forward thinking | | | | |
| ▪ Tell us about the types of collaborative efforts you have been involved. | ▪ | | | | |
| **ADDITIONAL CRITIERIA TOTAL** | | | | | |
| **1**=significantly below criteria, **2**=below criteria, **3**=meets criteria, **4**=exceeds criteria, **5**=significantly exceeds criteria. | | | | | |

Notes

## Candidate Evaluation Template

The following offers a method for department faculty to provide evaluations of job candidates. It is meant to be a template for departments that they can modify as necessary for their own uses. The proposed questions are designed for junior faculty candidates; however, alternate language is suggested in parentheses for senior faculty candidates.

Candidate's Name: _____

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

☐ Read candidate's CV      ☐ Read candidate's letters of recommendation      ☐ Met with candidate

☐ Read candidate's scholarship      ☐ Attended candidate's job talk      ☐ Attended lunch or dinner with candidate

☐ Other (please explain): _____

_____

_____

_____

Please comment on the candidate's scholarship as reflected in the job talk:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please comment on the candidate's teaching ability as reflected in the job talk:

_____

_____

_____

Please rate the candidate on each of the following:

| | excellent | good | neutral | fair | poor | unable to judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potential for (evidence of) scholarly impact | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Potential for (evidence of) research productivity | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Potential for (evidence of) research funding | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Potential for (evidence of) collaboration | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Fit with department's priorities | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Ability to make positive contribution to department's climate | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Potential (demonstrated ability) to attract and supervise diverse graduate students | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Potential (demonstrated ability) to teach and supervise diverse undergraduates | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Potential (demonstrated ability) to be a conscientious university community member | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other comments?

_____

Sample Evaluation Rubric

**Candidate:**
**Reviewer:**
**Evaluation Criteria:** Ranking suggestion: High/ Med/ Low – plus specific comments.

| Ranking | **Research Topic** (Departmental needs, anthropological breadth, interdisciplinary, scholarly productivity, quality of publications, methodological expertise and breadth) | **Geographical Area** (Departmental needs) | **Record on Diversity** (Mentoring, pedagogy, activism, recruitment, community action, research on issues related to diversity, social inequalities and social justice) | **Teaching Content** (Departmental needs, syllabi content, methodological approaches, understudied communities) | **Teaching/Mentoring Skills** (Teaching evaluations, experience working with underrepresented students) | **Collaboration and Citizenship** (Department, interdisciplinary community) | **Outside Letters** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **High** | | | | | | | |
| **Medium** | | | | | | | |
| **Low** | | | | | | | |

# RESOURCES

## Sample Form F

### Evaluation of faculty applicants

**Please note that this form is intended as a sample only.
You may choose to use, modify, or ignore it according to your needs**

**CAUTION:** If completed forms such as this are shared publicly in search committee meetings, they become part of the official record and are subject to disclosure should someone file a Public Records request. (see pp. 9, 20–21).

If individual search committee members use or adapt a form such as this as a means of taking private notes to remind them of their evaluation of each applicant and do not share the document publicly, it does not become part of the public record.

**Applicant's Name** _____

**Reviewers Name** (If form is shared in committee)_____

**I = Inadequate; A = Adequate; G = Good; E = Excellent**

|  | I | A | G | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Educational background/PhD in relevant area of study** | | | | |
| **Postdoctoral experience** | | | | |
| **Teaching experience** | | | | |
| **Research experience** | | | | |
| **Creativity or innovation of research** | | | | |
| **Publication history** | | | | |
| **Service contributions** | | | | |
| **Experience working with or teaching diverse groups including women and members of underrepresented minority groups** | | | | |
| **Meets departmental needs** | | | | |
| **Recommendation letters** | | | | |

**Particular strengths this applicant offers:**

**Concerns this applicant presents:**

# RESOURCES

## Sample Form G

### Review of final candidates - Feedback

**Please note that this form is intended as a sample only.**
**You may choose to use, modify, or ignore it according to your needs**

**Reviewer's Name** _____

**Candidate's Name** _____

**I = Inadequate; A = Adequate; G = Good; E = Excellent; n/a = did not attend**

|  | I | A | G | E | n/a |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reviewed candidate's cover letter and curriculum vitae/résumé |  |  |  |  |  |
| Read candidate's research/teaching statement/philosophy |  |  |  |  |  |
| Read candidate's scholarship/selected publications |  |  |  |  |  |
| Read candidate's letters of recommendation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Met individually with candidate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attended a group meeting with candidate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attended candidate's research presentation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observed candidate's teaching demonstration, or attended discussion regarding teaching pedagogy |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attended a meal with candidate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spoke with candidate at a reception |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |

**Particular strengths this applicant offers:**

**Concerns this applicant presents:**

Note: This form is adapted from the University of Michigan ADVANCE Candidate Evaluation Tool (www.umich.edu/%7Eadvproj/CandidateEvaluationTool.doc).