## On campus selection for [VACANCY NAME]

[DATE]

Committee members

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Function** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Programme committee

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Start** | **Finish** | **Programme** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Interview structure

*Find below an example of what you can add here*

To be able to fairly assess a candidate, we stick to a fixed structure for an interview. The chairkeeps an eye on time and directs/ cuts off committee members if needed, and informs the candidate of this at the start.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 minutes | round of introductions / settling in / explaining procedure | Chair |
| 15 minutes | Presentation by the candidate |  |
| 5 minutes | Questions for clarification linked specifically to presentation |  |
| 30 minutes  minutes | Predefined questions addressing research-education-leadership  - room for follow-up question on the same subject based on  answers given, if time allows; no change of subject |  |
| 5 minutes | Room for questions from the candidate |  |

During between interviews:

Each committee member takes a few minutes to summarize their assessment of the candidate; make notes - use score sheet guided by ALC criteria.

No discussion of the candidate between committee members (yet)

Final discussion after interview:

Rankings are collected and discussed – where do we agree or not? If not, what are the different arguments for ranking someone higher / lower?

The committee formulates the final decision for the dean.

Arguments for feedback to candidate [positive and negative] are collected [= the info on the score sheets].