

Tenure-Track Faculty Hiring Manual for DEOs

Forming the Search Committee

The first step after a faculty search has been authorized by the College is to form a search committee (minimum of three members). The members of the search committee (including the chair of the committee) will be included as part of the initial workflow submitted with the job ad (see below). The search committee should be made up of a group of faculty members from the department, but can include faculty members from other departments as well, depending on the nature of the search (e.g., cluster hires). The search committee members will have access to all applicants through the Jobs@UIOWA website.

Writing and Posting the Job Ad

The next step is to write and post the job ad. The job ad should start by clearly identifying the position, including the relevant department, the specific area (if any), and the start date. Importantly, the job ad must describe the required and desirable qualifications for the position. However, the qualifications can be described in narrative form, rather than as a bulleted list. Special care should be taken with devising the required and desirable qualifications for the position, as these must be used later when rating applicants for approval to interview. The applicant rating codes you will encounter at that point are as follows:

- 1 – Met all required and desirable qualifications
- 2 – Met all required, and some desirable qualifications
- 3 – Met all required, but none of the desirable qualifications
- 4 – Did not meet required qualifications

The process of obtaining College and EOD approval for the final set of interviewees will be more straightforward later if the applicant *ratings* generally match up with applicant *rankings*. In particular, if a department wishes to interview a lower-rated candidate over a higher-rated candidate, additional explanation will be required in the Request to Interview letter provided to the College and EOD. Ideally, the candidates you wish to interview will have met all required and desirable qualifications. Therefore, it is important to define carefully the set of characteristics that an ideal candidate would possess (and others would not).

Required qualifications. Think of this in terms of whether you would hire someone who was missing X qualification (e.g., a PhD in X or related field, independent teaching experience). Generally speaking, required qualifications should be basic enough that all viable candidates will meet them.

Desirable qualifications. Think of this in terms of bonus qualifications that are especially likely to put candidates on the short list (e.g., outstanding program of research/scholarship/creative work, funding from external agencies, particular sub-area of research). It is important that the desirable qualifications include things that are likely to discriminate the excellent candidates

from the good candidates. Excellent candidates are ones that meet all required and desirable qualifications.

The job ad should list the date when the review of applicants will begin (this is like the deadline except that you can look at applicants that come in later), and instructions for applying. You may also provide information about the department and the University that might be helpful in attracting excellent applicants. The EOD tagline about commitment to diversity must be included at the bottom of the ad as well.

Here is a [link](#) to example ads in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the arts.

Once the job ad is finalized, it must be submitted to the College through workflow. As part of the request, you must list all the places you plan to advertise the position. Take special care to include advertising venues that will attract a broad and diverse pool of applicants. CLAS's approval of the ad should take no more than 2 business days, unless there is an error or problem. Once the ad is approved, you may post the ad at the venues listed. Faculty can also share the ad with colleagues or on relevant list serves.

Request to Interview (Pre interview report (PIR))

Once a set of candidates has been selected by the department for interviews, you will submit a "Request to Interview" through workflow. The request to interview will include the "Pre-Interview Worksheet" and a letter justifying the set of applicants selected for interviews. The departmental administrator will obtain the pre-interview worksheet from the manage applicants section of jobs@uiowa in Self-Service (see here for an example). The applicants will be prepopulated on the worksheet, and will need to be rated according to the rating codes described above. The required and desired qualification should be listed at the top of the worksheet under "Qualifications" for easy reference. Candidates that you wish to interview will typically be rated as a "1" (met all required and desirable qualifications), and others as a "2" or below. If more candidates are rated as "1" than can be interviewed, it is important to provide the rationale for why you chose the subset you did over the others. Candidates rated "2" and occasionally even "3" can be interviewed, but if there are viable candidates rated as "1", it is important to make a very strong case not only for interviewing them, but also for why you are bypassing higher rated candidates in favor of lower-rated ones. It is also very helpful to add "Notes" about each candidate, giving some brief information about area of interest and strengths or weaknesses. The ratings worksheet will also ask for other information such as the "Years of Related Experience." How years of related experience are counted is up to the department (e.g., counting from beginning of graduate school vs. counting from finishing PhD), but the same counting procedure should be applied to all applicants. The "Type of Applicant" is not relevant for faculty searches unless the applicant is already a UI employee. Your departmental administrator will also note on the workflow form whether the candidates selected for interviews have their terminal degree. Candidates who have not finished their terminal degree but who will complete it before their appointment begins should be marked "Yes."

The letter justifying the applicants selected for interviews should include the following information:

- 1) A short description of the position and the applicant pool, along with information about what characteristics set the applicants selected for interviews apart from the rest of the pool.
- 2) A paragraph describing each candidate selected for interviewing. This should include basic bio information and a description of accomplishments (why this candidate is particularly appealing).
- 3) If any higher rated applicants were passed over, a description of why they were not selected for interviewing.
- 4) If there are any applicants with veteran status (denoted with an American flag icon on the application), they should receive a separate paragraph regardless of interview status.

Here is a [link](#) to example request to interview letters in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the arts.

Both the letter and pre-interview worksheet will be attached to the workflow request to interview. You may let Dean Curto and his assistant know that you have submitted the request to interview through workflow. The College should take no more than 2-3 business days total to approve the request, unless there is an error or a problem. If there is a problem with the submission, the workflow should be sent back to the department within 1-2 days, with instructions about how to fix the problem.

As soon as Dean Curto approves the request to interview in workflow, DEOs may contact candidates to schedule interviews.

Request to Hire (Search and selection summary (SSS))

Once the department has selected the top candidate for the position, the DEO may reach out by phone to this candidate to inform him/her that the department intends to make him/her a job offer and that the department will seek approval from the College and the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity to make an offer. For candidates requiring a non-standard startup package (e.g., lab sciences), the DEO should inform the candidate that the first step in pursuing an offer is to get his/her detailed startup request. For candidates requiring only a standard startup package (e.g., most hires in humanities), the DEO should inform the candidate that he/she will be working with the College to put together the formal job offer. This will help make it clear that informing the candidate of the department's hope to make an offer is **not** a formal job offer, but rather the first step in making a formal job offer. It is important that this initial information is communicated verbally rather than in writing (e.g., email) and that you are careful NOT to suggest that an offer is definitely forthcoming until CLAS approval is received. Of

course, DEOs in the sciences will communicate subsequently via email with candidates about startup request information.

The department administrator should request the draft offer letter template and startup template (if relevant) from the College (note that there are specific templates for the Sciences and Arts & Humanities). The request to hire will be submitted through workflow and will include the draft offer letter and a “justification to hire” letter from the DEO, along with the three letters of reference. The draft offer letter should append a “startup summary” for candidates with non-standard startup. The justification to hire letter should rank the candidates interviewed and include faculty vote tallies in support of candidates. The letter should briefly summarize each candidate’s qualifications and departmental visit. The letter should make clear whether any of the candidates did not rise above threshold based on the interview and therefore are not to be considered further. If the department wishes to move to candidate #2 if candidate #1 turns down the job offer, then the DEO letter must also make clear that there were two highly qualified candidates, even though one was ranked #1 and the other was ranked #2. There must be evidence of strong faculty support in the form of vote tallies supporting making an offer to the second candidate if the first candidate turns down the offer.

Here is a [link](#) to example justification to hire letters in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the arts.

Once the request to hire is submitted through workflow, approval at the College should take no more than 2-3 business days, unless there are questions or problems. It is a good idea to make sure that Dean Curto and his assistant know that the request to hire has been submitted through workflow. If there is a problem with the submission, the workflow should be sent back to the department within 1-2 days, with instructions about how to fix the problem. Once the College has approved the request to hire, they will send it on to EOD through workflow. Typically, EOD will process the request to hire within 3-4 days. Once you receive approval from EOD, you may send the formal offer letter to the candidate via email.

Should the #1 candidate turn you down and you have made a strong case in the justification to hire letter for making an offer to the #2 candidate, you should contact Dean Curto via email for permission to go to the second candidate. If a strong case has already been made in the justification to hire letter and the College did not indicate concerns about moving on to #2 in response to the initial justification to hire, a quick turnaround is expected (1 business day). If you receive permission to move ahead, repeat the steps above involving contacting the candidate and putting together the offer letter.

Requesting a Waiver to Interview and a Waiver to Hire (see [examples](#) below)

Occasionally, a department will be in a situation where only a single candidate is being considered for an interview (e.g., an opportunity hire or spousal hire). This will require a “waiver to interview” and a “waiver to hire” (if the department desires to go ahead with the interview and hire) from EOD. A waiver to interview requires information from the DEO

justifying the waiver. This information provided by the DEO is used by Dean Curto to compose a letter from the College to EOD requesting the waiver to interview. The DEO should start with a description of the candidate's bio and accomplishments (as in a typical request to interview letter). In addition, the DEO must address the following three points:

- 1) Centrality of the area of research to the department. In this section, the DEO should describe why the candidate is a good fit for the department, particularly in terms of the department's strategic hiring plan. The DEO can also provide information about how the candidate adds to the diversity of the department (if appropriate).
- 2) Departmental support for the candidate. In this section, the DEO should describe the level of departmental support for interviewing the candidate. Candidates should only be put forward if there is strong support (unanimous or near-unanimous) from the department.
- 3) How the candidate would fare in a national search. In this section the DEO should describe the department's assessment of whether the candidate would emerge as a finalist in a national search. Candidates should only be put forward if they would be considered very strong in a national search.

Once Dean Curto receives this information along with an updated CV from the candidate, he will compose the waiver to interview letter to EOD. Once EOD has approved the waiver, you may contact the candidate to invite him/her for an interview.

Should your department desire to make an offer to the candidate after the interview, the College will need to submit a "waiver to hire" to EOD. A waiver to hire also requires information from the DEO justifying the waiver. This information provided by the DEO is used by Dean Curto to compose a letter from the College to EOD requesting the waiver to hire. The DEO should briefly summarize the candidate's qualifications and departmental visit (as in a typical request to hire letter). In addition, the DEO must address the same three points as in the request for the waiver to interview:

- 1) Centrality of the area of research to the department.
- 2) Departmental support for the candidate.
- 3) How the candidate would fare in a national search.

Once Dean Curto receives this information along with an updated CV, a draft offer letter, and three letters of reference, he will compose the waiver to hire letter to EOD. Once EOD has approved the waiver, you may contact the candidate to let him/her know that the department intends to make him/her a job offer (following the steps outlined above in regular hires).

Examples #1—Search Ad—Development: The Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences at the University of Iowa invites applications for a tenure-track faculty position in Developmental Science to begin in the academic year 2017. We invite applications from candidates with outstanding research records and exceptional promise who work within any sub-area of developmental science, including developmental cognitive or affective neuroscience. We are especially interested in candidates who work at the intersection of biological and psychological processes underlying development in typical or atypical human populations. Candidates must hold a PhD and have an established record of high-quality research. Candidates are expected to show strong promise of an externally funded program of research in developmental science. In addition to maintaining an ongoing successful program of research, the faculty member holding this position is expected to teach courses (graduate and undergraduate) in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences. The appointment is expected to be at the rank of Assistant Professor and requires that the PhD be received by August 17, 2017. The review of applicants will begin on October 10, 2016 and will continue until the position is filled.

The Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences is experiencing a period of vigorous growth and enhancement, including construction of a new building containing laboratory, teaching, and office space. The DeLTA Center (Development and Learning from Theory to Application; <https://deltacenter.uiowa.edu/>) at the University Iowa also brings together a vibrant community of researchers interested in all aspects of typical and atypical development. There are also extensive opportunities for collaboration with developmental researchers across many other departments on campus, including the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (e.g., Biology, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Computer Science), the Carver College of Medicine (e.g., Psychiatry, Pediatrics, Neurosurgery, Pediatric Neurology), the College of Education, and the College of Public Health. There are also state-of-the-art MRI, fMRI, and fNIRS facilities at the University of Iowa, including a research-dedicated 3T scanner and a new 7T scanner, along with state-of-the-art, high-throughput genetic analysis facilities.

To apply, please visit the electronic submission website at <http://jobs.uiowa.edu> and refer to requisition #69238. Materials should be submitted electronically, including a letter of interest, curriculum vitae, copies of selected scholarly papers, research statement, and email contact information for three letters of recommendation. Informal inquiries about the position can be directed to jodie-plumert@uiowa.edu (Chair of Psychological & Brain Sciences).

The Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences and the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences are strongly committed to diversity; the strategic plans of the University and College reflect this commitment. All qualified applicants are encouraged to apply and will receive consideration for employment free from discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information, religion, associational preference, status as a qualified individual with a disability, or status as a protected veteran. The University of Iowa is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

Example #2—Search Ads—Arts: The University of Iowa, Department is seeking an artist-level performer and teacher of . Primary responsibilities include teaching, recruiting, mentoring, and advising undergraduate and graduate students. Additionally, the successful candidate will teach courses in (list courses they will teach). Other duties will include coordinating and coaching, and may include teaching appreciation or other supporting courses, as needed by the *Department*, and commensurate with the candidate's expertise. The successful candidate is expected to maintain ongoing creative/scholarly activity and performance visibility in the region, nation, and in the international arena.

The chosen candidate will work effectively with faculty colleagues, actively engage in recruitment activities, serve on various Department and University committees, and perform other duties as assigned.

Required Qualifications: Master's degree. Evidence of outstanding performance ability, and a record of significant performing experience and successful studio teaching.

Desirable Qualifications: Doctorate or equivalent professional experience, with excellent record of teaching and recruitment at the university level and with a national/international career as a performer.

Appointment: begins (date).

Salary: commensurate with experience and qualifications.

The University of Iowa has a historic commitment to the arts. The (information about your department) The Iowa City/Coralville area has a population of about 75,000 and is a cultural center with a cosmopolitan atmosphere. Its public schools, libraries, and health care facilities are rated as outstanding.

The Department and the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences are strongly committed to diversity; the strategic plans of the University and College reflect this commitment. All qualified applicants are encouraged to apply and will receive consideration for employment free from discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information, religion, associational preference, status as a qualified individual with a disability, or status as a protected veteran. The University of Iowa is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

Application: To apply for this position, go to <http://jobs.uiowa.edu> and refer to requisition #XXXXX. Applications should include a complete vita, a letter of interest and contact information for three letters of recommendation which will be uploaded to the online application. Attach unedited recordings of contrasting works in live performance with dates, include at least one video recording. Include selected examples of core solo repertoire, and if desired, representative examples of other areas. A link is acceptable.

Deadline: Screening will begin October 20, 2014 and will continue until the position is filled.

Example #3—Search Ad—Digital Media: The Department of Theatre Arts and the Department of Dance are searching for an Assistant Professor of Digital Media in Performance. We are seeking an established creative artist who specializes in producing theatrical fusions that integrate digital media with live and recorded performance. This faculty member will collaborate on new performances and media-based works utilizing digital media and is expected to have a strong interest in using digital tools to foster interactions between performers and audience members. The inclusion of other digital tools such as motion capture, sensors, and/or animation is highly desirable. The University of Iowa has been a leader in the development of new work for the stage and has a history of integrating digital technologies into production. The transformative integration of digital media, performance, and/or the stage represents the next wave in theatrical and choreographic collaborations between visual arts and performance. This new position will serve to expand the long tradition of innovation in the creation of new works at the University of Iowa.

The successful candidate will join the newly formed Public Digital Arts Faculty Cluster Initiative and will work closely with existing U of I faculty and staff who form the core of this ambitious program to foster creativity and interdisciplinary collaboration through public digital arts. Participation in the cluster is an important component of faculty performance evaluation.

Responsibilities:

The faculty member will offer new courses and learning opportunities for dance and theatre students in camera techniques, video capture, editing, intermedia performance, and scripted direction, staging and choreography for the camera. Work in these areas will complement courses in theory/practice of dance, performance and media, choreography for camera, and acting for camera. This faculty member will collaborate as a media director, media artist, and/or choreographer in at least one major production in The Department of Theatre Arts or The Department of Dance each year. Responsibilities will also include participation in undergraduate student advising, supervision of graduate student projects, and fulfilling departmental and university service assignments. Additionally, continuing an active record of professional creative work outside of the university is required.

Required Qualifications:

The candidate must have an MFA in Film Production, Media Production, or equivalent professional experience. The candidate must demonstrate a significant pattern of professional work in the area of digital media in performance. The ability to teach digital video editing techniques as well as expertise in After Effects, Cinema 4D, or equivalent motion graphics software is required. Demonstrated effectiveness teaching at the college-level, in relevant areas, is required.

Desirable qualifications:

Expertise in advanced film production, television production, or experimental media production is desirable. Demonstrated expertise in motion capture, animation, mixed-reality, and related digital technologies is also desirable. Evidence of professional work in the areas of theatre and/or dance is highly desirable.

Submission:

Candidates should submit applications online at <http://jobs.uiowa.edu/>. Search requisition number **xxxxx**. Screening of applications begins December 1, 2015, and will continue until the position is filled. Candidates should include a letter of application, a complete CV, statements describing their creative practice and teaching philosophy, and the names, email, and addresses of three references. Candidates should include a link to their website or equivalent online presence, providing digital documentation of recent work.

The Departments and the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences are strongly committed to diversity; the strategic plans of the University and College reflect this commitment. All qualified applicants are encouraged to apply and will receive consideration for employment free from discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information, religion, associational preference, status as a qualified individual with a disability, or status as a protected veteran. The University of Iowa is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

December 1

Begin reviewing applicants

December 20

Finalize Recommendations for Skype Interviews

January 19-22

Conduct Skype Interviews and identify three candidates

February 1-17

Conduct on-site Interviews

Example #1—Request to Interview:

Dear Raul,

I am writing on behalf of the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences to request permission to interview three candidates for our advertised position in Developmental Science in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences.

With a pool of 88 applicants, there was an unprecedented number of very strong candidates, many of whom had accumulated postdoctoral experience. The committee engaged in an exhaustive evaluation of the candidates who were judged to be the most competitive. Necessarily, the distinction between candidates was based on the consideration of numerous factors that contribute to the applicants' prospects for being a world-class researcher, an outstanding instructor, an exemplary university citizen, and fitting well with our Department's research culture and scientific tradition. We gave a rating of "1" to three applicants in this very strong pool. Although we gave a rating of "2" to many applicants in the pool, none of these applicants rose to the level of the top three candidates. There were also several applicants who received a rating of "4" because their research was primarily in other areas of psychology.

The three that we are requesting to interview were uniformly outstanding in terms of their research record (all have numerous high-profile publications in the best journals in the field), the importance of their research, their ability to conduct research independently, and their prospects for obtaining external funding. All three have strong records of teaching and instruction. All three received very strong letters in which the recommenders rated them as equivalent to or better than prominent faculty at top institutions. Finally, all three have research and teaching interests that would add a great deal to the Department, bridging existing research strengths within the department and making strong connections to the Carver College of Medicine and the College of Education. Consequently, all three would likely thrive in our academic environment.

The candidates we are requesting to interview (in alphabetical order) include:

[Name] (PhD., [area], University of X, date) is a developmental cognitive neuroscientist investigating how the environment shapes the development of academic skills. Dr. X is currently a research scientist at X. She previously completed postdoctoral fellowships at X in [date] and at the University of X in [date]. Her work uses a multi-level approach, linking variation in parent characteristics (e.g., education and SES) and behavior (e.g. verbal input) to child behavior (academic performance in language and mathematics) and neurocognition (fMRI activation), in both typical and atypical populations (children with and without neonatal brain injury). By combining behavior and neuroimaging, she is identifying commonalities and differences in processing and performance over development and over individuals. This program of research is an excellent fit for the Developmental Science area of Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences. She currently has 18 journal publications (11 first author), including 11 publications in the last 2 years. Her first-authored work appears in high quality journals, including

Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, Developmental Science, Developmental Psychology, and Developmental Neuropsychology. Dr. X has won an award for her teaching. Her letters are very strong and uniformly praise her intellect, her conscientiousness and her creativity.

[Name] (PhD, [area], University of X, date). Dr. X is currently a postdoctoral fellow in X at X. His graduate research addressed brain network dynamics of inhibitory control in children and adolescents using behavioral and neurophysiological (e.g., fMRI, EEG) methods. His postdoctoral research is focusing on the thalamocortical system and brain network dynamics involved in attention and working memory; this postdoctoral research is supported by an NIH National Research Service Award. He has an outstanding publication record that includes eight journal publications, six of which are first-authored contributions in such first-tier journals as *The Journal of Neuroscience* (2), *Cerebral Cortex*, *PLOS Biology*, and *NeuroImage* (2). His letters are uniformly glowing in their descriptions of his intelligence, methodological sophistication, creativity, and independence. He would bring important new ideas and methods to our department while also building on existing strengths in human brain imaging and developmental neuroscience.

[Name] (Ph.D., [area], University of X, date). Dr. X did a two-year postdoctoral fellowship in the Department of X at X and is currently an Assistant Research Psychologist at X. Dr. X has been testing the hypothesis that written text contains a different constellation of more complex grammatical constructions than spoken language, and that some portion of children's spoken grammatical development may come from reading. She combines careful analyses of corpora of both written text and spoken language with estimates of individual children's exposure to text, and precise behavioral methods in language to show the complex input-driven nature of development. She has published seven first-author publications, including four top-tier journal publications (*Psychological Science*, *JEP:General*, *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, and *Language and Speech*), two refereed conference proceedings, and one chapter. Two additional papers are under review. Her work opens the door to investigation of and intervention into language development throughout the school years and into adulthood. Her glowing letters highlight her creativity, intelligence, and steep trajectory. Her work would build important links with the College of Education and further strengthen the DeLTA Center.

Please let me know if I can provide any further information about these candidates or about our interview request.

Example #1—Justification to hire:

Dear Raul,

I am writing on behalf of the faculty of the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences to request permission to extend an offer of a faculty position to **[Name]** for our advertised position in Developmental Science. As noted in our ad for this position, we were especially interested in candidates who work at the intersection of biological and psychological processes underlying development in typical or atypical human populations. The search committee for this position included Mark Blumberg (chair), Bob McMurray, Jodie Plumert, Susan Wagner Cook, and Molly Nikolas. The search committee met independently prior to the faculty meeting to discuss the candidates, but the final decisions about the candidates were made by the full faculty in Psychological and Brain Sciences.

Below, I summarize the faculty deliberations about the three candidates we interviewed.

[Name] (PhD. [area], University of X, date) is a developmental cognitive neuroscientist investigating how the environment shapes the development of academic skills. Dr. X is currently a research scientist at the University of X. She previously completed postdoctoral fellowships at X in [date] and at the University of X in [date]. Her work uses a multi-level approach, linking variation in parent characteristics (e.g., education and SES) and behavior (e.g. verbal input) to child behavior (academic performance in language and mathematics) and neurocognition (fMRI activation), in both typical and atypical populations (children with and without neonatal brain injury). She currently has 18 journal publications (11 first author), including 11 publications in the last two years. Her first-authored work appears in top-tier journals. Dr. X has also won an award for her teaching. She gave an outstanding job talk, providing a conceptually rich developmental framework for her work and skillfully leading the audience through multiple studies. Faculty also had outstanding individual meetings with her. The faculty were particularly impressed with the questions she's asking about the link between SES and academic achievement, and with the very strong developmental framework for her work. Her work spans multiple methods, bringing together both behavioral and neuroimaging techniques. The search committee and the full faculty viewed her program of research as an excellent fit for the Developmental Science area of Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences. **[Name] was rated our top candidate and the faculty voted 18-6 to extend an offer to her for the Developmental Science position.**

[Name] (PhD, [area], University of X, date). Dr. X is currently a postdoctoral fellow in X at X. His graduate research addressed brain network dynamics of inhibitory control in adolescents using behavioral and neurophysiological (e.g., fMRI, EEG) methods. His postdoctoral research is focusing on the thalamocortical system and brain network dynamics involved in attention and working memory; this postdoctoral research is supported by an NIH National Research Service Award. He has an outstanding publication record that includes eight journal publications, six of which are first-authored contributions in first-tier journals. X also gave an outstanding talk, particularly in terms of leading the audience through complicated neuroimaging methods and

analyses. The faculty were very impressed with the sophistication of his neuroimaging methods and his understanding of brain systems. However, based on his job talk to the department and individual meetings with faculty, it became clear that he did not have a strong developmental background. Both the search committee and the full faculty had serious concerns about whether he was the right person for this particular position, despite his considerable strengths in human neuroscience. Much of his current work focused on cognitive control in adults, and there was concern about whether he could teach basic developmental courses, such as Introduction to Developmental Science. **For these reasons, the faculty voted 20-2 to not consider [Name] further for the Developmental Science faculty position.**

[Name] (Ph.D., [area], University of X, date). Dr. X did a two-year postdoctoral fellowship in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences at X and is currently an Assistant Research Psychologist at X. Dr. X has been testing the hypothesis that written text contains a different constellation of more complex grammatical constructions than spoken language, and that some portion of children's spoken grammatical development may come from reading. She combines careful analyses of corpora of both written text and spoken language with estimates of individual children's exposure to text, and precise behavioral methods in language to show the complex input-driven nature of development. She has published seven first-author publications, including four top-tier journal publications, two refereed conference proceedings, and one chapter. However, there were concerns about various aspects of her performance during the interview. The faculty felt that her job talk was underwhelming, and didn't adequately highlight the importance or complexity of the work. Her ideas for future work also appeared quite narrow and lacked theoretical depth. The consensus was that she did not rise above threshold for a job offer.

In sum, we are requesting to make an offer to [first name, last name] as our top-ranked candidate for this position. Please let me know if I can provide any further information about these candidates or about our request to hire X.

Example #2—Justification to hire:

Dear Name,

Please accept this letter as justification and recommendation from the search committee for the Assistant Professor position. The committee members are (List chair and committee members names) The search committee conducted Skype interviews with eight approved candidates on Saturday, December 13, 201x. The interviews were each 20 minutes in length, and each candidate was asked the same questions about their teaching philosophy and methodology, their experience with and strategies for recruitment, and their performing experiences and plans for the future. Each candidate was given time at the end to ask questions of the committee.

From the eight Skype interviews the committee decided not invite (name candidates) for on-campus interviews. Although they were accomplished artists and teachers, they did not clearly articulate artistic ideas for their scholarly work and had limited strategies for recruitment.

The four candidates invited for on-campus interviews were (in order of appearance) (list names of candidates). They distinguished themselves from the others with passionate enthusiasm for pedagogy and excellent recruitment strategies.

All four candidates met with the search committee, presented a recital, read a chamber music work with the faculty ensemble, taught a master class to an undergraduate and a graduate student. They also conducted a class to our students.

[First and last name's] recital was uninspiring and the programming was limited. In her master class she had difficulty expressing her ideas in a clear and concise manner. This also showed in her class, which was somewhat disorganized as well.

During the chamber music ensemble reading, she had difficulties with blending and leadership.

[First and last name] presented an excellent recital with a diverse program however several times throughout the recital his playing was mechanical and lacked passion and enthusiasm.

The reading with the ensemble was good but the committee felt that he didn't blend very well with the other members of the ensemble. His class was by far the weakest of all finalists. He constantly spoke over the students heads and lectured on even the most banal detail. His class was entirely abstract with no practical advice.

There were two candidates who distinguished themselves in the interview process. Both [first and last name] and [first and last name] displayed excellent musicianship and technique in the recital performance. We were impressed with their consummate musicianship, effective communication skills, sense of humor and energy. Their recitals were beautifully executed, the repertoire diverse and musicianship presented at a very high level. As ensemble players, they

both executed their parts with confidence and led the ensemble effectively when it was required. Their energy and passion were apparent.

The committee had reservations about [first and last name's] class. This class was well run, however his actual style is less than ideal for our students. His style favors a XXX, where the player must "bring the pitch up." At times this can create bad habits especially with inexperienced players. This style is not typically employed in the US and as such would not sufficiently prepare our students for graduate, orchestral, or job auditions and interviews. [First last name's] style of XXX is much more in line with what is expected in the US. It must be stated how important this is in the field of XXX playing.

The committee met to discuss the ranking of the candidates. It was apparent from the beginning of the deliberation that the committee was not impressed and would not recommend [Name] and [Name] for the position.

The committee felt very strongly about both [first and last name] and [first and last name] and felt either one would be a great asset to the (Department). After much deliberation, a vote was cast and [first and last name] came out ahead four votes to one. Thus, the committee ranked the candidates as follows:

1. Name
2. Name

We recommend that [first and last name] be offered a contract for the Assistant Professor position. Should [first and last name] not accept the offer, the committee recommends that the position be offered to [first and last name].

Thank you for considering this request. Please let me know if you need anything further.

Sincerely,

(NAME)

Search Committee Chair

Example #1—Waiver Request:

Dear Dean Djalali and Executive Dean Curto,

We are writing to request a waiver to hire Dr. X, a [ethnic group], as a target of opportunity hire, with a joint appointment (50/50) between History and GWSS. In separate meetings, the faculty of the History Department and the Department of Gender, Women's, and Sexuality Studies voted unanimously and enthusiastically to extend an offer to Dr. X for a tenure-track joint appointment in our two departments.

GWSS faculty attended Dr. X's talk, attended a dinner and a lunch with the candidate. At our meeting of November 30, **faculty were unanimous in their assessment that Dr. X would rise to the top of national search**, given the high quality of her research, her teaching expertise and interests, and her vision of graduate and undergraduate education, which includes a focus on public engagement. Faculty were unanimously impressed with the quality of her research and the importance of her work centering Chicanas in the story of the birth control and reproductive justice movements in 20th century El Paso. They found in Dr. X's talk evidence of a confident, engaging, dynamic and thoughtful colleague and teacher of the highest caliber. Her ideas for revising and reconfiguring her dissertation into her first book, and her discussion of her second book, provided substantial evidence of a scholar with an important, long-term research trajectory.

GWSS faculty were also particularly impressed with how well Dr. X's teaching and research interests corresponded with our strategic needs. Faculty noted that X's teaching experience (as an Adjunct Instructor in X at X) as well as her desire to teach in areas of Chicana/o history, women's health and reproduction, and the history of people of color in the U.S. coincides exceedingly well with our curricular needs in light of our new Minor in Gender, Health, and Health Care Equity and our new major in Social Justice. As we noted in our 2015 self-study, our highest priorities are to continue expanding opportunities for public engagement and our ties with other CLAS units; X's expertise, her graduate certificate in Women's and Gender Studies, and her history degree presents an excellent opportunity for a productive joint appointment with History. Indeed, her areas of expertise fit entirely within our noted areas of strengths as indicated in our self-study: our research interests in gender's intersection with sexuality, class, age, race, ethnicity, and globalization; our research and curricular emphasis on social justice; our commitment to scholarship and teaching that is intersectional and transnational; our emphasis on critiquing representations of gender and sexuality; and our strong presence (now confirmed by the new minor) in the area of health and the body. Dr. X's research interest in reproductive health would also advance one of the top recommendations from the department's external departmental review in 2015: to develop our programming in the area of sexuality studies. Faculty were excited by the number of ways in which her research intersected with our current strengths while filling important needs in the area of racial and ethnic diversity and health studies. As a [ethnic group], Dr. X would advance the department's goal of enhancing our faculty diversity as well as faculty diversity in the college; she also meets one of our hiring goals (as noted in our self-study) to recruit a faculty member whose theoretical interests interest with health disparities. Indeed, Dr. X's research places her at the forefront of scholarship on Chicanas and the history of reproductive health. Lastly, we noted that Dr. X's curricular contributions would allow us to increase our department's contributions

to the new Diversity and Inclusion category of the General Education requirements. **Our vote to extend an offer was enthusiastically unanimous.**

The History Department faculty, after reading Dr. X's dissertation, attending her talk, and meeting with her individually and over a series of meals, offered a similarly very positive assessment of the quality of her research and the likelihood of her successful path to tenure. Noting her training at one of the top X programs in the country, we found in her training at a top program and in her dissertation abundant evidence of an unusually skilled researcher and graceful writer, **clear evidence that she would have risen to the top of a national search** in the areas of Chicana/o history, the history of women, and the history of medicine. Faculty described her research as "captivating," her dissertation as "fantastic," groundbreaking," and "extremely well-written." Several faculty commented on her impressive ability to plumb organizational records for evidence of the voice and agency of Chicanas seeking reproductive choices and health care; others appreciated her important work collecting and assessing oral histories of women (now aged) who had been employed in or helped organize the clinics X studies. Yet another faculty member praised her methodological intervention that challenged how historians assess "silence" in the archives; Dr. X made the important point that silence should not necessarily be equated with powerlessness, an observation of considerable importance for any scholar working in the history of under-represented people.

During her visit, history faculty admired the confidence, knowledge, agility, and warmth that characterized her "terrific" research talk; we found in her presentation abundant evidence of impressive teacher. Similarly, a representative from the graduate students who met with Dr. X reported that students were deeply impressed by her research and her talk; they observed that she would not only provide important advice and mentoring to current graduate students working in Latino history but would also help the department attract graduate students interested in working in this area (including Latina/o students). History faculty were also unanimously impressed that Dr. X would have a smooth and successful path to tenure, based on the evidence of excellence in her work to date. **Furthermore, faculty were in agreement that Dr. X would help us address our strategic needs.** Faculty were in agreement that Dr. X presents us with an excellent opportunity to advance the diversity of our faculty [as noted in our 2013 Departmental Study, one of our highest priorities was to make "concerted and strategically effective efforts" to recruit and retain faculty members (and graduate students) of color"], while building on several of the department's current strengths as well as addressing a critical area of student interest in the study of the history of the U.S.-Mexican border. Finally, we consider her initiative in co-founding and curating what has become the major blog for X to enrich our aims of deepening our profile in public history and giving graduate students new opportunities to develop skills and have mentorship in this area. **The faculty voted unanimously to request a waiver to extend an offer to Dr. X.**

Example #2—Waiver Request:

Dear Dean Djalali and Dean Curto:

The History Department would like to request a waiver from the normal search process in order to recruit Dr. [first name and last name], an outstanding historian of twentieth-century African American history, women's history, and nationalism. The Department is unanimous and enthusiastic about its support for recruiting Dr. X, who as an African-American belongs to an underrepresented group. I am attaching her CV to this letter.

Dr. X earned her PhD in [date] from X and is currently a X in the X and in the Department of X at X. She is currently revising her dissertation into a book entitled [*name of book*]. One article from this research is currently in the publication pipeline; another has recently been accepted for publication. In addition, she is co-author of an edited volume, [*name of book*] which is slated for submission in the spring. This is an exceptionally high level of productivity for such a junior scholar.

The department is enormously impressed with Dr. X's research. Thanks to exceptional archival sleuthing, Dr. X reconstructs a forgotten world of activism following the 1927 deportation of Marcus Garvey, the charismatic leader of Black nationalism. Led by working poor women, a now-decentralized Black nationalist movement continued its work in locations ranging from Chicago to Mississippi. Lacking the resources to travel overseas, these women maintained a sense of membership in a larger global movement by contact with people of African descent in the Caribbean, Latin America, and Liberia, and developed a surprising relationship with a Philippine-Japanese activist during World War II. This was not a fringe movement: it presented petitions of tens of thousands of signatures to President Roosevelt, and attracted the negative attentions not only of the FBI but of many other streams of African American activism. Dr. X does not shy from the difficult task of evaluating a movement that not only allied with a Japanese activist during the war but also with white supremacists (on the grounds that white supremacists and Black nationalists alike wished to see African Americans "return" to Africa). This is a complex and controversial history, and Dr. X handles it with expertise and sensitivity. As a result, she offers several important and original interventions into the history of these decades: she features the important leadership of women in black nationalist movements; she demonstrates the continued popular draw of nationalist and emigrationist movements in decades where earlier historians failed to uncover those movements; and she reveals the political leadership of working poor people even during the Great Depression. Well-documented, compellingly written, and original in its claims, this is a project that will have a substantial impact on US, African American, and US women's history.

Although [university] does not require teaching of its PhD students, Dr. X sought out opportunities to teach at X. She has thus accumulated experience teaching courses on African American history, Women's History, and the History of Civil Rights and Black Power. With a BA from X, Dr. X has a genuine commitment to public education and a good understanding of the student body at a major public university.

The History Department hosted Dr. X for a visit in early December. During that time she gave a fluent and sophisticated public presentation of her research, which elicited lively discussion among attendees from many departments. In addition to meeting with faculty and graduate students from the History Department, Dr. X also met with faculty from GWSS and AAS, both of which have expressed their enthusiasm about having her cross-list classes and join Iowa's intellectual community.

Since the resignation of Kevin Mumford in 2012, we have lacked coverage of twentieth-century African American history – a vitally important field for both teaching and research, and one that is high on our list of hiring priorities. In an open national search, Dr. X would surely rise to the top group of finalists – or, more likely, establish herself as the front-runner.

Because Dr. X is currently a finalist at other institutions, I hope we will be able to move quickly in getting an offer to her. Please let me know if there's anything I can do to help.

Example #3—Waiver Request to interview:

Request for waiver to interview [first name, last name] in the Department of X

[Name] (PhD, [area], University of X, date) is a cognitive neuroscientist who uses neuroimaging techniques to study cognitive control in adults and adolescents. Dr. X is currently a postdoctoral fellow in X at X. His graduate research addressed brain network dynamics of inhibitory control in adolescents using behavioral and neurophysiological (e.g., fMRI, MEG, EEG) methods. His postdoctoral research is focusing on the thalamocortical system and brain network dynamics involved in attention and working memory. This postdoctoral research is supported by a prestigious individual NIH F32 Postdoctoral National Research Service Award (NRSA). He has an outstanding publication record that includes eight journal publications, six of which are first-authored contributions in such top-tier journals as *The Journal of Neuroscience* (2), *Cerebral Cortex*, *PLOS Biology*, and *NeuroImage* (2). His letters are uniformly glowing in their descriptions of his intelligence, methodological sophistication, creativity, and independence. He also served as an instructor for an undergraduate [name of course] at the University of X, and has had extensive experience mentoring undergraduate students in research.

1) Centrality of area of research to the department

Dr. X is an excellent fit for the Department of X. The Department has made human and animal neuroscience the central focus of its long-term faculty hiring plan, in keeping with the direction of the field and neuroscience initiatives within the University. In fact, all faculty hires in the Department over the last three years have been in the area of neuroscience. Dr. X would clearly add to this emerging strength in the Department by bringing new ideas and cutting-edge methods in the area of human neuroscience. He would make an outstanding addition to our

emerging group of excellent recent hires in human cognitive neuroscience, including Professors [name], [name], and [name]; these faculty, in particular, view Dr. X as someone whose presence at Iowa will elevate everyone's research. Also, Dr. X's interests and expertise in brain rhythms would complement other faculty in [department name] and in the newly formed Neuroscience Institute.

Dr. X would add to the racial and ethnic diversity of [department name] as an [ethnic group]; he is a legal permanent resident of the U.S. It should be noted that women are highly underrepresented in the field of neuroscience, making it relatively difficult to hire female candidates. Nevertheless, arising from our developmental search, we are now attempting to recruit an outstanding female neuroscientist from the University of X. The Department has and will continue to work to identify outstanding female candidates for future targeted hiring opportunities through the Neuroscience Institute.

2) Support for the candidate

There is overwhelming support for interviewing Dr. X for a faculty position in the [department name] through the Neuroscience Institute. Critically, [name], the incoming Director of the Neuroscience Institute, enthusiastically endorses this request for a waiver to interview. As part of the Department's recent faculty search in developmental science, Dr. X was selected as one of the three finalists. At the interview, however, it became clear that whereas his expertise in neuroscience was extremely strong, his background in developmental science was relatively weak. However, because the faculty uniformly felt that Dr. X would make a great addition as a cognitive neuroscientist, they voted overwhelmingly to pursue an alternative position for him through the Neuroscience Institute.

3) How candidate would fare in a national search

The Department, including the neuroscience faculty, has little doubt that Dr. X would emerge as a top candidate in any search for an early career cognitive neuroscientist. As noted in his letters of reference, his work on the brain mechanisms underlying cognitive control is absolutely top-notch in terms of conceptual and technical sophistication. His focus on the role of the thalamocortical brain system in modulating cognitive control presents a novel and exciting direction for understanding failures of cognitive control. He has also developed cutting-edge techniques for analyzing magnetoencephalography (MEG) data that have been adopted by other labs. In fact, he was invited to collaborate with a researcher at X after she heard him give a talk about his analysis technique. It is also important to point out that his letter writers are among the most eminent researchers in human neuroscience; that they speak so glowingly about Dr. X speaks volumes about the quality of his work and the steepness of his trajectory. In addition to his outstanding qualifications as a cognitive neuroscience researcher, the fact that he rose to the top of a national search for a developmental science faculty position indicates that he would emerge as a top candidate for a cognitive neuroscience search at the assistant professor level. Recruiting this rising star would be a major coup for the Department, CLAS, the Neuroscience Institute, and the University.

Example #4—Waiver Request to hire:

I am writing on behalf of the faculty of the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences to request permission for a waiver to extend an offer of a faculty position to **[first name, last name]**. Dr. X received his PhD in X from the University of X in [date]. He is a cognitive neuroscientist who uses neuroimaging techniques to study cognitive control in adults and adolescents. Dr. X is currently a postdoctoral fellow in X at X. His graduate research addressed brain network dynamics of inhibitory control in adolescents using behavioral and neurophysiological (e.g., fMRI, MEG, EEG) methods. His postdoctoral research is focusing on the thalamocortical system and brain network dynamics involved in attention and working memory. This postdoctoral research is supported by a prestigious individual NIH F32 Postdoctoral National Research Service Award (NRSA). He has an outstanding publication record that includes eight journal publications, six of which are first-authored contributions in such top-tier journals as *The Journal of Neuroscience* (2), *Cerebral Cortex*, *PLOS Biology*, and *NeuroImage* (2). His letters are uniformly glowing in their descriptions of his intelligence, methodological sophistication, creativity, and independence. He also served as an instructor for an undergraduate [course name] at the University of X, and has had extensive experience mentoring undergraduate students in research. [Name] gave an outstanding talk during his visit, particularly in terms of leading the audience through complicated neuroimaging methods and analyses. The faculty were very impressed with the sophistication of his neuroimaging methods and his understanding of brain systems. [Name's] individual meetings with faculty in Psychological and Brain Sciences and in Medicine were also outstanding. There was strong consensus that he would add considerable strength in cognitive neuroscience within the department, and would serve as an important bridge between the department and the Iowa Neuroscience Institute and CCOM. The faculty were unanimous in their support for hiring Dr. X.

1. Centrality of area of research to the department

Dr. X is an excellent fit for the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences. The Department has made human and animal neuroscience the central focus of its long-term faculty hiring plan, in keeping with the direction of the field and neuroscience initiatives within the University. In fact, all faculty hires in the Department over the last three years have been in the area of neuroscience. Dr. X would clearly add to this emerging strength in the Department by bringing new ideas and cutting-edge methods in the area of human neuroscience. He would make an outstanding addition to our emerging group of excellent recent hires in human cognitive neuroscience, including Professors [name], [name], and [name]; these faculty, in particular, view Dr. X as someone whose presence at Iowa will elevate everyone's research. Also, Dr. X's interests and expertise in brain rhythms would complement other faculty in Psychological and Brain Sciences and in the newly formed Iowa Neuroscience Institute.

Dr. X would add to the racial and ethnic diversity of Psychological and Brain Sciences as a [ethnic group]; he is a legal permanent resident of the U.S. It should be noted that women are highly underrepresented in the field of neuroscience, making it relatively difficult to hire female candidates. Nevertheless, arising from our developmental search, we have successfully

recruited an outstanding female neuroscientist from X. The Department has and will continue to work to identify outstanding female candidates for future targeted hiring opportunities through the Iowa Neuroscience Institute.

2. Support for the candidate

There is unanimous support for hiring Dr. X in a faculty position in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences through the Neuroscience Institute. Critically, [name], the incoming Director of the Neuroscience Institute, enthusiastically endorses this request for a waiver to hire. The Iowa Neuroscience Institute has also committed substantial funds to support Dr. X's startup, in partnership with CLAS and Psychological and Brain Sciences.

3. How the candidate would fare in a national search

The Department, including the neuroscience faculty, has little doubt that Dr. X would emerge as a top candidate in any search for an early career cognitive neuroscientist. As noted in his letters of reference, his work on the brain mechanisms underlying cognitive control is absolutely top-notch in terms of conceptual and technical sophistication. His focus on the role of the thalamocortical brain system in modulating cognitive control presents a novel and exciting direction for understanding failures of cognitive control. He has also developed cutting-edge techniques for analyzing magnetoencephalography (MEG) data that have been adopted by other labs. In fact, he was invited to collaborate with a researcher at X after she heard him give a talk about his analysis technique. It is also important to point out that his mentors are among the most eminent researchers in human neuroscience; that they speak so glowingly about Dr. X speaks volumes about the quality of his work and the steepness of his trajectory. We have also spoken to his two primary mentors after his visit to further assess their opinion of Dr. X. Both of them clearly indicated that they hold Dr. X in very high regard and are confident that he will be highly successful as an independent researcher. Recruiting this rising star would be a major coup for the Department, CLAS, the Iowa Neuroscience Institute, and the University.