

## Screening Committee Internal Process and Minimum Qualifications Screening

The discussions at Executive Board about screening committees has included what happens once you're on a screening committee. The pool of candidates that you will be asked to screen will very likely have a wide range of suitability or "fitness" for the job requirements and it is also very likely that you will have a difference of opinion with other committee members on a particular candidate. You may even have a difference of opinion with how Human Resources (HR) did its initial minimum qualifications screening.

You will be asked to rank the candidates' applications with a range of 0 to 4:

- 0 means the candidate does not meet the minimum qualifications in your opinion or something else in their packet is a big red flag for you;
- 1 means you could maybe recommend the candidate for being interviewed but you have reservations;
- 3 means the candidate is a good candidate that you would recommend without reservation for an interview; and
- 4 means the candidate is an excellent candidate with superb experience and qualifications who should definitely be interviewed.

The ranking of 2 is purposely omitted to more easily distinguish the candidates the committee wants to interview from those that are not the worth the committee's time to interview.

*Usually* there is agreement on a candidate getting a 3 or 4 by all of the screening committee members and another candidate getting a 0 or 1 by everyone on the committee but *sometimes* you might see something(s) in a candidate's application packet missed by the rest of the committee that caused you to give a candidate a 0 or 1 while the other members gave the person a 3 or 4 or vice versa. Your screening committee should have time for you to explain your contrary ranking and have a discussion. Sometimes in those discussions the rest of the screening committee comes around to your view, sometimes you find that you misunderstood the worrisome thing in the application packet and come to agree with the rest of the screening committee, and sometimes you'll just have to agree to disagree. Humans are making the decisions, not a computer algorithm.

For the applications to which you rate a 0, you might wonder how they made it through the HR initial screening. You should be aware that HR is going to be as inclusive as possible and, therefore, don't assume that HR's initial screening is going to agree with how you'd do it. If an application is a zero ranking, give it a zero. If your concern goes the other way—you think some persons were unjustly excluded from applying, then be sure to talk with HR about the process. It's even okay to talk with HR about your concerns of a particular candidate, who you rated a zero but is still being moved forward by the rest of the committee. HR management is part of the confidentiality loop.

The explanation and commentary above comes after sharing the substance of various drafts of a resolution about HR screening of minimum qualifications vs. desirable qualifications and language in job postings in several meetings with Vice-Chancellor of Human Resources Dena Rhoades, Vice-President Billie Jo Rice, and President Zav Dadabhoy. The drafts of those resolutions and the admin responses are given in the supporting documents for the November 17th meeting, so the Senate is made aware of these discussions.