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Who is an applicant?

• OFCCP Internet Applicant Rule – 4 criteria:
  1. submits interest via internet or other means
  2. is considered by the contractor
  3. has Basic Qualifications for the position as of time of application
  4. does not withdraw

• In event of audit, OFCCP compares Internet Applicant data against labor force data (availability data)
Applicant Review Protocols

• Protocols define who is considered an Applicant
• They must be consistent and uniformly applied. Examples:
  • **System protocol:** UC Recruit tracks incomplete applicants as a review date approaches and sends an email notice alerting them to upcoming deadlines.
  • **Dept protocol:** after the initial review against Basic Quals, search committee members divide up applications and assign scores
• Applicants who do not meet application and qualification requirements by a review date are not and should not be reviewed. Demographic survey data from such applicants are not included in the applicant pool.
**UC Recruit: The search cycle**

- **Search Plan:** Units create and submit search plans after search authorization.

- **Collect applications:** 14/30 days min until IRD; often longer.

- **Review applications:** Search Committee evaluates complete/on-time applications using pre-defined steps, criteria.

- **Shortlist Report:** On-campus (or equivalent) interviews for shortlisted applicants—senate requires report.

- **Search Report:** Department proposes candidate(s) for hire.

- **Fully approved Search Report:** Authorization to department to submit appointment case.

**Non-senate shortlists**
Applicant Processing

• Initial sort against Basic Qualifications
• Which Complete, on-time applicants Meet Basic Qualifications (objective, non-comparative, relevant, and verifiable criteria)?
  • NOT a qualitative assessment
  • based on application materials alone, e.g. degree requirement
  • essential for accurate diversity reporting

\textbf{ON time + MEETS BASIC QUALS = QUALIFIED APPLICANT}
Scenario 1: should she bother to apply?

• Assistant Professor search
  • IRD: Feb 17

• Basic Qualifications:  
  • PhD in Jedi & Ewok Studies or related field by appt start date of 7/1/22

• Applicant writes to say she will have completed all requirement for PhD as of June, but her institution confers degrees in August.

• Will she be considered if she applies by the IRD? Should she bother to apply?

(Not a recommended BQ!)
Scenario 1 – cont’d

• Applicant should not be discouraged from applying. Applicant determines if her skill set and qualifications match those described in the search.

• Make clear that her application will be reviewed and assessed on the qualifications as stated in the advertisement.

• Refrain from providing special guidance/tips on how to apply. May be perceived as providing special treatment or extra info to a potential applicant that isn’t available to others.

• The committee should not deviate from the stated basic qualifications at any point during a search to accommodate an applicant's qualifications.
Applicant Processing
How do make it easier yet keep it fair?
Set filters & columns in workspace ribbon

See UC Recruit Saving Workspaces
https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/recruit/
Application you are currently viewing stays highlighted so you don’t lose your place when they go back to the Applicants list
**UC Recruit: Applicant processing – how to make eval easier?**

**Bulk downloads** of selected applicant files

Document downloads used to require one at a time from each application individually. Bulk Download of applicant files solves this issue.

- Allows users to download **one document type at a time** from **multiple applications** in one action from the applicant list
- Does not download reference letters

Some campuses have piloted reviewing programs that require committees to start their review by viewing only a single document type across all applicants in the pool.
UC Recruit: Applicant processing – how to make eval easier?
Bulk downloads of selected applicant files
UC Recruit: Applicant processing – how to make eval easier?

Bulk downloads of selected applicant files

Use with caution.

When the selected applications are within a review date that has not yet passed, a warning will pop up to indicate that the data downloaded may change.
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Scenario 2: Add review date upon request?

• Applicant writes the Search Committee Chair on Feb 8 to say they cannot meet the Feb 17 primary consideration deadline but would like to be considered

• The position has a placement goal for females and the Chair notices that this person appears to have a female name

• Should the Chair respond to the candidate by saying that the department will add a review date of Feb 22?
Scenario 2: Add review date upon request?

**Yes** – In the interest of increasing diversity the department should do everything it can to consider females including adding a review date.

**No** – This is special treatment for one applicant. Other potential applicants were not aware that this was possible and may not have thought to ask for an extension.
Scenario 2: Add review date upon request?

**Yes** — In the interest of increasing diversity the department should do everything it can to consider females including adding a review date.

**No** — This is special treatment for one applicant. Other potential applicants were not aware that this was possible and may not have thought to ask for an extension.
More on Review Dates

- Substantive review of applicants should not begin until after IRD
  - e.g. Feb 17 IRD → start review Feb 18
- Applicants may change out their materials on or before IRD
- New completed applications may come in up to the IRD
- Sorting against Basic Qualifications not yet completed
Scenario 3: Technical Difficulties

• Applicant writes the Department Analyst on Feb 18 to say she had technical difficulties with the system that prevented her from completing her application by the Feb 17 IRD deadline.

• Should the Analyst respond to the candidate by saying that the department will consider her application since she had technical issues?
Scenario 3: Technical Difficulties

• Maybe the applicant started the application at 11:55pm on Feb 17? Check the applicant log:

  ![Application Log](image)

• If department grants this exception to this one applicant, it must give the same consideration to any other applicants who also applied a day late.

• *Not generally recommended unless a system outage is confirmed!*
Department User Roles

- Department Analyst can:
  - See all applicants, Complete or Not Complete, on-time or outside of review window, assess Basic Qualifications, change applicant statuses, assign disposition reasons, send bulk applicant emails, hide applicants, modify applicant materials

- Chair, Editor can:
  - See Completed applicants up to the latest review date, assess Basic Qualifications, change applicant statuses, assign disposition reasons, send bulk applicant emails, hide applicants, modify applicant materials

- Reviewers can:
  - See non-hidden, Completed applicants up to the latest review date, enter personal notes, public comments, and flags

- Only the Department Analyst can publish the Search Plan, process and submit Reports, and Conclude the recruitment.
UC Recruit: Applicant Statuses

- **Not Complete**
  - Required documentation not yet submitted

- **Complete**
  - Required documentation has been submitted (or analyst has manually completed the applicant)

- **Serious Consideration**
  - Applicant should be considered for the shortlist (Long Shortlist)

- **Recommend for Interview**
  - Applicant recommended for interview (Shortlist Report)

**a final applicant status**
UC Recruit: Applicant Statuses, cont’d

• Interviewed**
  • Applicant has been interviewed

• Soft Offer Extended
  • A verbal or informal offer has been made to the applicant, even if it lacked some offer details

• Declined Soft Offer**
  • Applicant declined a verbal or informal offer based on the details they were given

**a final applicant status
UC Recruit: Applicant Statuses, cont’d

- **Proposed Candidate**
  - Applicant recommended for appointment (Search Report)

- **Declined Soft Offer after proposed candidate**
  - The applicant declined a verbal or informal offer based on the details they were given

- **Offered**
  - Approvals have been obtained and a formal offer has been made to the applicant

- **Accepted Offer**
  - Approvals have been obtained and a formal offer has been accepted by the applicant

**a final applicant status**
UC Recruit: Applicant Statuses, cont’d

- **Declined Offer**
  - Approvals have been obtained and a formal offer has been declined by the applicant

- **Hired**
  - Applicant entered in payroll system in searched title

- **Withdrawn**
  - Applicant has withdrawn themselves from consideration
  - Applicants may withdraw from consideration at any point. If withdrawn after Recommended for Interview status or later, applicant’s name will continue to show up on the Shortlist.

**a final applicant status**
Applicant Processing

• Does it matter when applicant statuses are marked in the system?
  • Yes, applicant review conducted within system in approx. real time is recommended

• Why?
  • Efficient workflow for department analysts
  • Online system – over-reliance on applicant downloads not recommended
  • Fair hiring practices are documented, e.g. timestamps and activity logs
  • OEO reports grab recruitment & applicant information as of “real time”
Beware of Hidden Applicants!

• Applicants may be hidden because they:
  • did not apply inside a review date
  • are incomplete
  • have been hidden by the Department Analyst, Chair or Editor
Beware of Hidden Applicants!

• MBQ and applicant statuses cannot be set on hidden applicants
• However, dept analysts can still view them
• Not Complete and Late applicants should NOT be evaluated at all. Do not download these applicant files and share them with the committee
• Search Committees do not see these applicants in any case, but other system users do, and the system logs any reviewing activity
Applicants who should not be considered

• Applicants may be visible yet still should not be considered by the committee, because:
  • They withdrew from consideration
  • Basic Qualifications have not been assessed/marked
    • Search Committee should be working out of the “Qualified” pool
Review of Qualified Applicants Flowchart - the substantive review
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A few words about reference letters

- Applicants should never handle or submit their own letters
- Letters sent directly from references not listed in application should not be shared with committee
- Per UC Recruit functionality, letters from previous applications might be reused—however, references make the choice

Search committee members, department chairs, deans, should not write letters of reference for applicants to searches in which they are engaged in the recruitment, selection and review of candidates.

Real, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest should be disclosed, mitigated and documented as appropriate.
Interviews: Consistency is Key!

• Use interview questions consistently across candidates—focus on skills, abilities, qualifications, experience, behaviors relevant to the job

• Interview format offered should be same for all interviews—not Zoom for some candidates and phone for others

• Interview panel attendees should be consistent

• Opportunities for meeting one-on-one with faculty, deans, graduate students should be offered equitably to the extent possible

• Guidance for COVID-19 interview procedures is available at: https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/recruit/
Documentation Requirements

• How much detail needed in UC Recruit?
  • “Tell the story” of the search—a person w/o knowledge about higher ed recruiting/hiring should be able to understand

• How is this activity tracked in UC Recruit?
  • Applicant Statuses, Disposition Reasons & Comments, Applicant Evaluation Sheets, Search Process Summary, Conclusion

• Applicant Evaluation Sheets– sample at:
  https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/content/sample.applicant.evaluation.sheet-COVID-19.docx

See Reports and Concluding a Recruitment at
https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/recruit/
Disposition Reasons

• A critical part of recordkeeping!
  • Helps tell the story of why a candidate was or was not selected
  • Eliminate doubt of discrimination and help save staff & faculty members time

• Federal contractors and subcontractors are required to disposition candidates and keep a clear record of where each applicant fell out of the hiring process if they are not hired.

80 On-time Complete Applicants

63 Qualified

3 Interviewed

etc.
Disposition Reasons

• Dept analyst, search committee chair, or faculty editor assigns to **Qualified** and **Unqualified** applicants. Located via Applicants list or on Disposition tab

• Assign any time after a review date, for the Shortlist Report or Search Report, or both

• Before submitting a Search Report, Disposition Reasons (and related comments) should be assigned to Qualified and Unqualified applicants not moving forward

• Second choice candidates should be marked as "Alternate for position“ w/comments and/or documentation in Search Process Summary

• Proposed Candidate is not assigned a Disposition Reason
UC Recruit: Applicant statuses, cont’d

Condensed version of applicant review process, applicant statuses

UC Recruit Resources page:
https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/content/applicant_statuses_workflow.pdf
Pooled Recruitments

... and review dates!
UC Recruit: Pooled recruitment review windows

Example: Open 2/15/21 – IRD 3/19/21 – Final 5/31/21

- **Initial Review Date 3/19/21**
  - Primary Consideration (IRD)
  - Review completed applications from 2/15/21 up to and including 3/19/21

- **Add’l Review Date 4/22/21**
  - Primary Consideration (IRD) applicants
  - AND
  - complete applicants on or before 4/22/21

- **Add’l Review Date 5/10/21**
  - Primary Consideration (IRD) applicants
  - AND
  - 4/22/21 complete applicants
  - AND
  - complete applicants on or before 5/10/21

**Discussion:**
What about applications between 5/11/21 and 5/31/21?
Pooled Recruitment Search Reports

• Each Search Report must be processed serially (one at a time)
  • if multiple candidates are being proposed in the same search report, then the position (and PI for research titles) must be exactly the same

• Live updating - avoid making ANY changes to the recruitment unless asked by an approver
  • e.g. do not add additional review dates or review new applications until current Report is approved
Scenario 4: Add Additional Review Date?

• The initial review date has passed and there are 40 completed applications in the recruitment.
• The search committee wants to add a review date.
• Should your department add a review date?
Scenario 4: Add Additional Review Date?

**Yes** – If the applicant pool is inadequate, does not contain enough qualified candidates for the shortlist, hiring need arises in pooled search or another legitimate business reason.

**No** – If the intention is to “catch” one particular candidate.
Additional Review Dates: Best Practices

• Generally best to set at least 2 weeks out
  • Allows time to conduct additional outreach/advertising
• Check with your AP or College analyst
  • What is the new proposed date?
  • What is the justification for addition of new review date?
• Check with EODP for advice about outreach/advertising
Pooled Recruitment Management

• Adding Review Dates after IRD
  • Appropriate to add review date if not enough viable candidates in pool of applicants OR add’l hiring need after IRD
  • Set as public rather than private, so applicants see next review date

• Complete applicants since Open date are considered and reassessed in subsequent review pools unless:
  • Did not Meet Basic Qualifications
  • Marked as Meets Basic Qualifications, but were permanently de-selected

https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/content/review_guidelines_for_lecturer_research_title_pools.pdf
Reports
Shortlists and Search Reports
Shortlist Reports (Senate only)
What to submit for Shortlist

• Completed on-time applicants marked Qualified/Unqualified
• Shortlisted candidates marked “Recommend for Interview”
• “Actual Search & Recruitment Efforts” completed
Shortlist – Tips

- Do not download and share or otherwise “encourage” committee review of hidden applicants (e.g. applicants outside review window)
- Mark shortlisted applicants “Recommend for Interview”
- Unqualified applicants should get Disposition Reasons as should any Qualified applicants who are permanently deselected
- Respond to approver questions promptly & be aware that Shortlists do not live update
- Upload the EEO recommendation memo once available
- For problems or changes after submission, check with EODP, help@aait.ucsb.edu, AP office
Shortlist: what if changes are needed?

• Shortlists DO NOT live update. But what if you need to make changes?
• FIRST: Contact help@ap.ucsb.edu or your AP Analyst
• **DO NOT** create and submit a new report if one is already in progress
• Step-by-step and FAQ here: https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/recruit/reports/faq/index.cfm
• Need to cancel an approval request altogether?
Search Reports

• Use the Search Report checklist from Resources for Department analysts → UC Recruit page → Reports

• Do not process unqualified applicants or those outside review window

• Qualified & Unqualified applicants get Disposition Reasons, but not Proposed Candidate(s)

• Upload Actual Search Efforts*, Ad Evidences, Interview Materials, Search Process Summary

• Process Search Report for the correct review date

• Respond to change requests promptly and resolve via Request Changes**

* If not already provided
** Comment entered on approval page not enough
How are Search Report & Appt linked?

- **Search Report**
  - *Proposed Candidate in UC Recruit*

- **Appointment**
  - *in AP Folio (for most titles, though not all)*

**Recruitment** first in UC Recruit
Status updates & Recruitment Conclusion Flowchart in UC Recruit

- Search Report
  - Proposed Candidate
    - APPROVED
- Appointment Case
- Offered
- Accepted Offer
  - ENTERED in PAYROLL?
    - YES
    - Final status: Hired
    - Conclude Recruitment
    - WAIT
    - NO
  - NO
  - Declined Offer
    - ACCEPT?
      - NO
      - Offered
      - Repeat with alternates, if applicable
    - YES
Recruitment Conclusion

• Must be done upon completion of recruitment

• Search Outcome Statuses:
  • Candidates Hired
    • Update candidate status to “Hired”
    • Add employment information: appt start date, employee ID
  • No Candidates Hired
  • No Candidate Proposed
  • Canceled
  • Other

• UC Data Retention policy dictates “shredding” of data
## AP Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lia Cabello</td>
<td>Faculty and ACs: SOSC, HFA, Academic Programs, GGSE, CCS</td>
<td>x 5979 <a href="mailto:lia.cabello@ucsb.edu">lia.cabello@ucsb.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Lázaro</td>
<td>Faculty and ACs: MLPS, Engineering, ORUs, Bren, Library</td>
<td>x 5728 <a href="mailto:mslaza@ucsb.edu">mslaza@ucsb.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Kettmann</td>
<td>Researchers, Project Scientists, Specialists</td>
<td>x 5048 <a href="mailto:joanna.kettmann@ucsb.edu">joanna.kettmann@ucsb.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Ko</td>
<td>Postdoctoral scholars, academic student titles</td>
<td>x 4441 <a href="mailto:billy.ko@ucsb.edu">billy.ko@ucsb.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helly Kwee</td>
<td>Academic recruitment, AP training, general AP policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More Resource and Contacts

- AAIT: help@aait.ucsb.edu
- https://ap.ucsb.edu/resources.for.department.analysts/recruit/
  - UC Recruit Resources pages for help guides, tools, templates, FAQs
Questions?