Selection report template

# General information

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position title** |  | **Position number** |  |
| **Classification level** |  | **Employment type** |  |
| **Date advertised** |  | **Date closed** |  |

# Recruitment outcome

|  |
| --- |
| **Suitable and recommended applicant/s:** |
| **Other suitable applicants (if applicable):** |

Unsuitable applicants and applicants who withdrew are listed in the assessment matrix.

# Assessors

Assessors are responsible for ensuring confidentiality throughout the selection process, and the assessment methods and recruitment decision are free from bias and nepotism.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lead assessor name** |  | **Position** |  |
| **Assessor name** |  | **Position** |  |

*Insert or remove rows/columns as required.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Were any potential, perceived or actual conflicts of interest identified?**  Yes  No |
| **If yes, what was the conflict and how was it managed?**  *Examples:*   * *Sally (lead assessor) declared a professional relationship with Bronwyn (applicant) as the applicant’s line manager and referee. To mitigate the perception of bias, the assessor prepared their referee report for the applicant before shortlisting, informed the other assessors of the conflict, and only commented on the applicant’s performance after the other assessors had shared their views.* * *Seamus (assessor) declared a familial relationship with Polly (applicant) who is their sister-in-law. To mitigate the perception of nepotism, they informed the other assessors of the conflict and removed themself from the selection process.* |

# Selection process

|  |
| --- |
| **Overview:**  *Example:*   * *15 applications received and individually reviewed by assessors.* * *8 March: Assessors met and agreed on shortlist of 3 applicants by scoring them against work related criteria 1 and 3.* * *10 March: Lead assessor notified shortlisted applicants and advised referees would be contacted before interview.* * *14 March: Shortlisted applicants attended individual 30 minute interviews at agency’s office in West Perth. Applicants emailed work related task 48 hours before interviews. No pre-reading time was given and no modifications were required. Assessors used probing questions when needed and all applicants had time to ask questions.* * *On completion of interviews, assessors discussed each applicant’s interview performance, agreed on a score for each applicant against remaining work related criteria (2, 4, 5 and 6) and marked them as suitable or unsuitable.* * *Two applicants found suitable and assessors reviewed referee reports before agreeing on final status of suitable or suitable and recommended for each.* |

# Declaration

Requirements of the Employment Standard, other relevant Commissioner’s Instructions and agency policy were followed at all stages of selection process.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lead assessor signature** |  | **Date** |  |
| **Assessor signature** |  | **Date** |  |

*Insert or remove rows/columns as required.*

# Human resources assessment

Compliance check completed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** |  | **Signature** |  |
| **Position title** |  | **Date** |  |

# Delegated authority approval

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** |  | **Signature** |  |
| **Position title** |  | **Date** |  |

# Appendix A: Criteria scoring

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Description** |
| Exceeds criteria (EC) | * Identified and linked all relevant issues * Identified necessary skills; provided examples of a high standard * Displayed high levels of initiative and/or innovation * Identified significant opportunities * Achieved outcomes to a high standard |
| Demonstrates criteria (DC) | * Identified and linked some relevant issues * Identified necessary skills; provided examples * Displayed initiative and/or innovation * Identified opportunities * Achieved relevant outcomes |
| Does not demonstrate criteria (NDC) | * Identified unsatisfactory or no relevant issues * Provided unsatisfactory or no specific examples * Displayed little or no initiative and/or innovation * Did not identify opportunities * Achieved few or no outcomes |
| Not applicable (N/A) |  |

# Appendix B: Assessment matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position title** |  | **Position number** |  | Classification level |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name (ID)** | **Shortlist** | | **Interview** | | **Criteria scores** | | | | | | **Status** |
| *Example:*  *Bronwyn (1234)* | Progress to interview: | *Yes* | Conduct reference check: | *Yes* | *EC* | *DC* | *EC* | *DC* | *DC* | *DC* | *Suitable* |
| **Comments:**  *Written application demonstrated experience providing high level advice on complex human resource management matters (C1) and leading and delivering projects in a dynamic environment (C3) that exceeded the criteria. At interview, response to work related task demonstrated ability to proactively identify strategic improvements to policy and procedures (C2), use of their diverse experience and background to work well with and lead others (C4), operate within bounds of organisational processes and public policy constraints (C5), and present information persuasively (C6). Two referee reports reviewed after interview and no issues raised. Assessed as suitable but not recommended due to highly competitive field and recommended applicant exceeded all 6 criteria.* | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name (ID)** | **Shortlist** | | **Interview** | | **Criteria scores** | | | | | | **Status** |
| *Example:*  *Polly (5678)* | Progress to interview: | *No* | Conduct reference check: | *N/A* | *DC* | *N/A* | *DC* | *N/A* | *N/A* | *N/A* | *Not suitable* |
| **Comments:**  *Written application demonstrated experience providing high level advice on complex human resource management matters (C1); and leading and delivering projects in a dynamic environment (C3). Not progressed to interview for assessment of remaining criteria (2, 4, 5 and 6) due a highly competitive field.* | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name (ID)** | **Shortlist** | | **Interview** | | **Criteria scores** | | | | | | **Status** |
|  | Progress to interview: | Select | Conduct reference check: | Select | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | Select |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name (ID)** | **Shortlist** | | **Interview** | | **Criteria scores** | | | | | | **Status** |
|  | Progress to interview: | Select | Conduct reference check: | Select | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | Select |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name (ID)** | **Shortlist** | | **Interview** | | **Criteria scores** | | | | | | **Status** |
|  | Progress to interview: | Select | Conduct reference check: | Select | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | Select |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name (ID)** | **Shortlist** | | **Interview** | | **Criteria scores** | | | | | | **Status** |
|  | Progress to interview: | Select | Conduct reference check: | Select | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | Select |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | | | | | |