



## NARRATIVE SEARCH SUMMARY - Outline

**Date:**

**Search Committee:** (List names)

**Position Title:**

**Department:**

### SELECTION PROCESS

**Date:**

Discussed the search with Human Resources.

**Date:**

The Search Committee met to review the charge to the committee. The (Department Head/Area Vice President) indicated that the committee was to recommend (one) or (2-3) candidate(s) for consideration along with a list of strengths and weaknesses (of each candidate). The committee members were given access to Interview Exchange for viewing applicant materials online. A list of minimum skills and ability was chosen for the committee to use when screening applications.

**Date:**

Since the position was posted for over ten days and after verifying the diversity of the pool of candidates with AA/EO officer, the position was closed. There were \_\_\_ total applicants.

**Date:**

Using emails to communicate, the committee determined the list of interview questions. The search chair forwarded the list to the AA/EO officer for approval.

**Date:**

The committee reviewed applicants. In the meeting, it was decided that \_\_\_ candidates be given further consideration. To narrow the list of candidates, the initial interviews were done by Zoom the week of \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_.

**Date:**

In a follow-up meeting the search committee discussed the first-round Zoom interviews. Of the \_\_\_ (total number interviewed), \_\_\_ candidates were very good. However, there were \_\_\_ candidates who exceeded qualifications regarding vision, goals, and experience. They were:

1. Candidate #1
2. Candidate #2
3. Candidate #3
4. Candidate #4

The committee recorded pros/cons and strengths/weaknesses of each candidate for future reference. The second round interviews were scheduled for the finalists. Interviews took place during the week of \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_.

### CAMPUS INTERVIEWS

**Date:**

**Candidate #1**

\_\_\_\_\_ has worked at \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ years in several jobs. This knowledge of the university, working with various personnel throughout \_\_\_\_\_'s career and being a current employee made \_\_\_\_\_ a good candidate for this position. 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. The leadership



and management responsibilities of this position were thought to be stretch based on candidate \_\_\_\_\_'s current performance.

**Date:**

**Candidate #2, #3 & #4 (As above)**

**REFERENCE CHECKS**

**Candidate # 1, #2 and #4**

It took one attempt to reach references for these three finalists. All responses were very positive and cooperative, and extremely favorable. It was obvious that the candidates were held in high regard.

**Candidate # 3**

It took several attempts to reach #3's references. During the conversations, two were hesitant to expand their answers and the third seemed disinterested but was cooperative in answering our questions.

**RECOMMENDATION (Please confirm with the hiring authority the number of finalists to be presented for consideration).**

After deliberating the interviews notes, rating forms, application materials and references the committee recommends candidates #1 and #4 (or candidate #\_ if charged with presenting top candidate). Both are very strong candidates. Should neither accept the position, the committee would recommend the position be re-advertised.

