

Extracts from Cases

The selection criteria were drawn up after the interview board had access to the candidates' CVs which ... contrary to BoM Handbook at Appendix D.

(Murray, 2005)

I asked the chairperson of the selection board for both the records of the criteria for assessment of applications and of interviews. I was informed that none had been kept.

(Nix, 1999)

In a significant number of cases, even where a result is not in itself discriminatory, respondents have not been able to show that they operated an interview process free of discrimination - often there is no record of the criteria for marking, no record of the actual marks given and no record of the questions asked by the interview board.

(Equality Officer, 2002)

I note that the respondent did not retain any notes ... Furthermore each of the assessment board members did not mark the individual candidates for the vacant position. In the past I, my colleagues and the Labour Court, have all consistently referred to practice as being disturbing.

(2005)

I note the DES handbook in relation to the Constitution of Boards and Rules of Procedure (Appendix D thereof) states that in the selection for appointment to a permanent teaching post, the 'following factors shall be taken into account ... though not exclusively nor necessarily in this order

- Professional qualifications
- Teaching experience and reports on competence
- Other relevant experience
- Reference

... In the case in issue, references were not considered as a criterion for assessment

(2005)

Interview board members and were marked by consensus thereby lacking transparency ... That the selection process fell short of the standards of transparency, objectivity, fairness and good practice that could reasonably be expected in the circumstances ...

it is clear that the criteria Qualifications/Experience is an objective one and the marking of applicants under this heading should reflect the qualifications and experience they have attained in their careers

(2005)

...the five assessment criteria were drawn up on the day of the interview after the interview board had access to the candidates' CV's which again is contrary to the Board of Management Handbook at Appendix D ...

(Murray, 2005)

....the candidates were not marked individually by the assessors and were marked by consensus after each interview ...

(Murray, 2005)

The third person on the interview board when asked at the hearing the factors she took into account when agreeing the consensus mark said that she was guided by the Principal ... The Chairperson of the interview board said he was guided by the Principal ...

(Murray, 2005)

... without the questions being clearly set out it is difficult to see how the criteria adopted by the interview board members were assessed by them. In terms of the criteria, many were subjective and it was unclear what was being assessed under each criteria and how marks were awarded.

(Delaney, 2004)