



OFFICE FOR ACCESS AND EQUITY

Sample Appointment Justification

For illustration purposes only

Proposed Appointee

Describe how the proposed appointee's qualifications, including skills, experiences, references, and performance during the interview, make them the best-qualified individual for the position. Explain why the appointee is better qualified/performed better in the interview relative to the other finalists - two to three sentences for the selected finalist.

Krystal Light is external to the University but has many experiences managing professional staff, mentoring and coaching new and existing personnel, providing project management vision, and leading many high-profile projects to successful completion. The appointee has been promoted several times during their career to positions with increasing responsibility and has reported to and worked directly with varying levels of stakeholders. The appointee has worked with companies that had no procedures and helped create them, to companies that have very structured project procedures and has helped improve them. The appointee will require some short-term mentoring to become familiar with the department and the University; however, there is strong confidence in their management, management, and leadership skills.

Interview Date (s):

Round 1: Date

Round 2: Date

Finalist: Date

Proposed Start Date:

Date

Non-Selected Finalist

For each finalist that did not receive an offer, please provide the interview date and a statement describing the reason(s) they were not selected to receive an offer at this time, such as specific skills, experiences, performance during the interview, references, etc. that made them less qualified in comparison to the proposed appointee. Please avoid vague statements such as "not a good fit" - state why each finalist came up short compared to the proposed appointee - one to two sentences for each non-selected finalist.

Thomas Sunflower - Interviewed Date (R1); Date (R2); and Date (Finalist).

Tom has been employed with the University for over twenty years in a number of different jobs. Knowledge of the University, working with a number of university personnel throughout his career, and being a current employee made Tom an ideal candidate for this position. Tom interviewed well and was very prepared. However, concerns that were highlighted during the second round of interviews included: 1) limited experience managing staff, 2) limited (or inconsistent) success leading existing projects (delayed deliverables and missed deadlines), 3) difficulty leading groups and cultivating productive communications. This position's leadership and management responsibilities were a stretch based on Tom's current duties.

Frank Space – Interviewed Date (R1); Date (R2); and Date (Finalist).

Frank is a comparable candidate however; he has fewer years of experience than the leading two candidates. Despite his level of experience, his marketing and website management expertise is impressive. Frank did not demonstrate motivation for career growth, and his experience in related work roles was subpar.

Non-Selected Semi-Finalist Summary:

Non-Selected Semi-Finalist Summary Instructions: For each semi-finalist (first round candidates) that did not advance in the search, please provide the interview date and a statement describing the reason(s) they were not selected as a finalist, such as specific skills, experiences, performance during the interview, references, etc. that made them less qualified in comparison to those selected as finalists. Please avoid vague statements such as "not a good fit". Include one statement for each non-selected semi-finalist. If there were no semi-finalists, enter N/A.

The committee screened 12 candidates that met the minimum qualifications identified in the position announcement. After further review for preferred qualifications, ten candidates were chosen for phone interviews (Round 1) held on [Date, and Date]. Based on the phone interview evaluations, the committee advanced six candidates to Round 2. The candidate pool maintained diversity from initial screening (Round 1) through Round 2.

The search committee interviewed Jim Jones on [Date], Greg Stone on [Date], Jane Adams [Date], Darla Greg [Date], and Jennifer Abby on [Date]. Dan Cook was invited to interview on [Date] but withdrew from the search.

Darla provided basic answers in the committee interviews, and Greg's interview performance was very weak. Darla's teaching experience beyond her doctoral university experience was impressive, but she lacked experience teaching in diverse populations, which is a requirement and a significant factor regarding her suitability for teaching our students; Jennifer showed some weaknesses during the job talks.

After carefully deliberating and weighing all factors, the search committee did not advance Darla, Greg or Jennifer to the final round.

