

EXAMPLES

ASSESSMENT REPORT OF SPECIAL MEASURES APPLICANTS FOUND UNSUITABLE UNDER A PRIORITY PREFERENCE SPECIAL MEASURES RECRUITMENT PLAN

Agency		Work Unit	
Job Title		Designation	

SELECTION PANEL

	Name	Position	Contact Number
Chair:			
Member:			
Member:			

Required attachments:

1. Job Description
2. Copies of applications and any information submitted by the applicants found unsuitable
3. Any notes of referee discussions, referee reports etc
4. Copies of any information considered by the panel in making their decision, panel notes etc

Details of the Assessment of Special Measures Applicants

#	<u>APPLICANT NAME</u>	<u>Summary of the steps taken to assess the applicant and the reasons why panel concluded the Applicant did not meet one or more of the essential selection criteria at the level required for the position</u>
1	Susan Brown	Having assessed Ms Brown's written application the panel decided to contact two of her most relevant nominated referees to seek more information about her skills and experience. The referees confirmed Ms Brown's claims in relation to high-level and effective stakeholder engagement but, although both spoke about her good written skills, neither was able to confirm her claims to experience in providing high-level policy advice. This confirmed the panel's preliminary conclusion based on Ms Brown's resume that, although some of her roles had a policy component, she had not held any high-level policy positions and therefore did not meet Selection Criterion 1 and must be considered unsuitable.
2	Anne White	Selection Criterion 1 for this role requires applicants to be a registered nurse, and Ms Jones stated in her application that she is an enrolled nurse with no nursing experience in the last five years. Ms Jones therefore does not meet Selection Criterion 1 and the panel found her unsuitable.

3	James Grey	<p>The panel considered Mr Smith's application and resume and noted that his entire work history and his actual work experience has been in the electrical industry, and that any training he has done has been vocational training in that area, specifically in relation to electrical systems.</p> <p>He has no tertiary qualifications in areas related to this job (Selection Criterion 2) and his training experience is not at the level expected to meet Criterion 1.</p> <p>The panel has concluded that he does not meet Selection Criteria 2 and 3 due to his never having working in a statutory complaint handling environment and also, on the basis of his resume, it is likely his training history does not equate to that contemplated in Selection Criterion 1.</p> <p>The panel considered it was not necessary to consult referees because it was clear from Mr Smith's resume that he did not have the necessary qualification, or experience to the level required.</p>
4	Julie Black	<p>The panel found the information in Ms Black's resume relating to her experience with records management systems, required by Selection Criterion 4, to be unclear. As Ms Black appeared to have some good claims to the position, the panel decided to contact her to clarify her experience. They phoned Ms Black as a group and told her that, because the job was a short-term contract position, the successful applicant would need to have the extensive experience called for in Selection Criterion 4 in order to become proficient in the agency's system within a reasonably brief period. Ms Black told the panel that, although she had worked in records management, she had not done so at a senior level, and had not been required to have full knowledge of the system used in her workplace. On this basis the panel concluded that Ms Black did not meet Selection Criterion 4 and had to be found unsuitable.</p>
5	Tom Green	<p>Mr Green's resume showed that he had many years' experience in HR and had recently completed his Cert IV in Training and Assessment. However, so far he had not actually carried out any workplace training, and therefore he did not meet Selection Criterion 1 which requires extensive experience as a workplace trainer. This meant he had to be found unsuitable for the position, and the panel did not assess him against the remaining criteria.</p>

 Panel Chair Name

Date: _____

 Panel Member Name

Date: _____

 Panel Member Name

Date: _____

HUMAN RESOURCES APPROVAL (optional depending on each Agency's process)

APPROVED / NOT APPROVED

Name of HR Officer

Date

HR Comments

REVIEW OF PANEL'S FINDING OF UNSUITABILITY

Note: This document and attachments must be emailed to psab@nt.gov.au (Public Sector Appeals & Grievance Reviews) for review. The review will be completed within a maximum of 5 days. Upon completion of review, if the selection panel's decision of unsuitability is approved, the selection panel may proceed to assess the remaining non-Special Measures applicants.

PUBLIC SECTOR APPEALS & GRIEVANCE REVIEW FINDING

APPROVED / NOT APPROVED

PSA&GR Officer

Date:

PSA&GR REASONS FOR DECISION AND COMMENTS: