

**REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION AND  
FEEDBACK WITH SCS CANDIDATES  
DURING THE SELECTION AND  
RECRUITMENT PROCESS**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. Acknowledgement</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Context</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Objectives</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Nature and Scope</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>5. Criteria</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>6. Observations &amp; Findings</b>	
SCS Competition Communications .....	10
Feedback provided to candidates post sift.....	11
Feedback provided to candidates post interview.....	12
SCS Competition Evaluations.....	13
Other Issues.....	14
<b>7. Recommendations</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>8. Annexes</b>	
Annex A: Terms of Reference.....	18
Annex B: Extract of the Regulatory Audit Framework Part 2.....	21
Annex C: Recruitment Practices in Other Organisations.....	22
Annex D: Survey Results .....	24

## **1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

- 1.1. The Civil Service Commissioners (Commissioners) would like to thank the staff of Corporate Human Resources (CHR) and HR Connect for their co-operation, assistance and positive response during this review. In addition, the Commissioners are grateful to candidates, panel members and Departmental Officials who provided survey responses and/or agreed to speak with the Review Team.
  
- 1.2. Commissioners would like to thank all the organisations who shared their recruitment policies and practices with the Review Team. This included: Public Appointments Service (ROI), the Northern Ireland Housing Executive, the Northern Health and Social Care Trust, Bombardier Aerospace, Belfast City Council and Grafton Recruitment.

## **2. CONTEXT**

- 2.1. Under Article 4(4) of the Civil Service Commissioners (Northern Ireland) Order 1999 Commissioners have a duty to audit recruitment policies and practices followed in making appointments to situations in the Northern Ireland Civil Service (NICS) to establish whether the Recruitment Code is being observed.
- 2.2. The purpose of the Review of Communication and Feedback with Senior Civil Service (SCS) candidates during the Selection & Recruitment process is to provide Commissioners with an assessment of the extent to which communication and feedback during the process promotes confidence in the NICS and is consistent with upholding the Merit Principle.
- 2.3. Commissioners are committed to the concept of a principle-based Recruitment Code. The revised Code was published in April 2012 and Section 5 sets out the requirements of the Code and how the Recruitment Principles are to be applied. The review looked for evidence that the communication and feedback practices employed are carried out in accordance with the Commissioners' Recruitment Code.
- 2.4. The Commissioners' Regulatory Audit Framework and Guidance document was used to develop compliance questions based on the key performance questions and indicators. These questions were used by the Review Team to assess the degree to which the requirements of the Code are being met.
- 2.5. In undertaking this review it has been noted that, following the Desk Top Review in 2013, CHR agreed to the re-assessment of NICS resourcing in their Action Plan. As this work includes revisiting the provision of feedback and competition evaluations, the anticipated outcomes may have implications for the recommendations made in this report.

2.6. The Terms of Reference for this review are set out in **Annex A**.

### 3. OBJECTIVES

3.1. The objectives of the Feedback review were to:

- assess the extent to which:
  - (a) candidates receive clear, purposeful, meaningful and timely feedback at all relevant stages of the appointments process;
  - (b) candidates consider recruitment related feedback to be fair, open, timely and effective;
  - (c) feedback is equally accessible to both internal and external candidates and all Section 75 groups;
  - (d) learning drawn from comments / enquiries / complaints in relation to the selection & recruitment process is applied for the purpose of improvement by the NICS and its partners.
- use the findings from 3.1 above to assess the extent to which feedback communication during the appointments process promotes confidence in the NICS recruitment process;
- identify good practice in recruitment related feedback in private and public sector organisations;
- bring to the attention of Commissioners and the relevant Department where evidence would indicate that policies, procedures or practices are insufficient to meet requirements of the Code; and
- produce a report detailing the findings of the Communication and Feedback review for publication on Commissioners' website.

## 4. Nature and Scope

- 4.1 It was planned originally that the review would focus on 3 SCS competitions from different Departments relating to the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012. The timeframe selected ensured that the merit lists of competitions under review were closed and no further appointments would be made from them.
- 4.2 Following the initial assessment of the 2012 competition list provided by Corporate Human Resources (CHR) it became apparent that in order to obtain a meaningful amount of data the review would need to focus on 4 rather than 3 competitions.
- 4.3 The SCS competitions selected include a professional (specialist) post and more generic senior civil service posts with a mix of Grade 3 and Grade 5 level appointments.
- 4.4 The following 2012 competitions were assessed as part of the review:
- Chief Executive of the NIEA & Head of Environment Group (DOE);
  - Chief Executive HSENI (DETI);
  - Director of Development (DSD); and
  - Chief Nursing Officer (DHSSPS).
- 4.5 The review assessed feedback to and from the candidates, from the point at which candidate applications were received by HR Connect to post-competition evaluation. It also reviewed the handling of post competition evaluations provided by the selection panel.
- 4.6 The Review Team sought access to all records and such information as was considered necessary to carry out the Review. Given the nature of this review, the team engaged directly with the candidates. One hundred and twenty one candidates were asked to complete a questionnaire in relation to the communications and feedback they

received as part of the NICS selection and recruitment process. Thirty seven questionnaires were returned completed.

- 4.7 In addition, a number of candidates volunteered to be interviewed in person or by telephone. The Review Team spoke directly with 12 of the candidates.
- 4.8 Twelve private and public sector organisations were approached in relation to their communication and feedback policy and practice. Seven organisations responded, providing details of how they provide communication and feedback with candidates during the selection and recruitment process. A summary of findings is recorded at **Annex C**.
- 4.9 The policy and practice in relation to communication and feedback during selection and recruitment are uniform across the NICS. It should be noted that the sample size of candidates who contribute to the review was relatively low; nevertheless, for the purposes of this Review, the findings were considered relevant and merited consideration.
- 4.10 The Review Team comprised two members of staff from the Office of the Civil Service Commissioners supported by a Link Commissioner. Both members of the Review Team had received audit training provided by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountability. The role of the Link Commissioner was to provide oversight of the process.

## 5 Criteria

- 5.1 The Recruitment Code, together with the key performance questions and associated key performance indicators contained in the Regulatory Audit Framework and Guidance, formed the basis for the development of the approach adopted for the review. The indicators which relate specifically to Communication and Feedback are to be found in **Annex B**.
- 5.2 Drawing on Commissioners' core Recruitment Principles, the team used the following framework to underpin the process of reviewing and reporting on Communication and Feedback during the selection and recruitment process:

<b>MERIT</b> What evidence is there that communication with candidates reflects and supports the Merit Principle?
<b>FIT FOR PURPOSE</b> What evidence is there that there is effective communication between all those involved in the process?
<b>FAIR</b> To what extent is there fair, effective and timely communication with candidates at all stages of the process?
<b>OPEN AND TRANSPARENT</b> What evidence is there that communication with candidates is comprehensive, accurate and helpful?

- 5.3 As well as documentary evidence provided through HR Connect, evidence was gathered from all those involved in the process including Corporate HR, the selection panel members, the Departments and the candidates themselves. Where files were incomplete or unavailable, the team provided additional opportunities for HR Connect or Corporate HR to clarify issues and to obtain the necessary information, where available.

## **6 OBERSERVATIONS & FINDINGS**

### **SCS Competition Communications**

- 6.1 All communication to and from candidates during the selection and recruitment process is provided through HR Connect. Routine communications are generated using standard templates, non routine communications are drafted by the HR Connect recruiter.
- 6.2 At least 85% of candidates who responded to the survey found communications with HR Connect during the recruitment process adequate, appropriate and timely. Desk based assessment of policy and practice found communications to be equally accessible to internal and external candidates and all of the equality categories under Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998.
- 6.3 Although generally content with communications some candidates and one panel member expressed disappointment with the nature and quality of the letter issued to unsuccessful candidates following the interview stages of the competition. Views expressed by candidates and panel members included that, in recognition of the amount of time candidates devote to the application process, it would be helpful if the letter to inform the candidates they are unsuccessful reflected some appreciation and acknowledgement of the effort made by candidates in participating in the competition.
- 6.4 A number of candidates who were placed on merit lists contacted HR Connect following the competition to request their place on the list. Survey comments include the suggestion that candidates should automatically receive their place on the merit list in the initial results letter.

## **Feedback provided to candidates post sift**

- 6.5 The NICS post sift feedback process provides the candidate with the panel members explanation of the specific weakness in their evidence under a failed criterion. This feedback is included in the letter to inform the candidate they have not been successful at this stage of the competition. The information is provided automatically without having been requested by the candidate. If required, candidates may seek further clarification on this feedback from the panel. Post sift feedback is equally accessible to all of the equality categories under Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998.
- 6.6 Of the candidates surveyed 72%, found post sift feedback to be timely and 50% considered it to be fair. In terms of its effectiveness almost 60% of candidates considered the feedback at this stage to be closed and ineffective.
- 6.7 Comments from candidates indicate that the wording used by panels in providing feedback is very generic and does not provide learning for future applications. One candidate explained this in the following way - should the same or a similar post come up again, she is unaware as to how her application should change in order for her to progress further on the next occasion.
- 6.8 Panel members surveyed considered, that when applied correctly, this process delivered adequate and meaningful feedback to candidates. However, one Department official added that greater consistency was required in the detail provided by panels in the initial feedback and to requests for follow up information. A view was expressed that where one panel may provide good, detailed feedback which fully explains to candidates why they have not passed the sift, other panels do not.

## **Feedback provided to candidates post interview**

- 6.9 The NICS release photocopies of the Candidate Interview Assessment Booklet (CIAB) in response to a request for feedback following the interview stage of the competition. This booklet allows the candidate to review the notes made by each panel member during the interview, the score awarded in relation to each criterion and the panel member's justification for each score. Post interview feedback is equally accessible to all of the equality categories under Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998.
- 6.10 NICS recruitment policy states that all feedback must be in writing and managed by HR Connect and that panel members must not provide feedback, informal or otherwise, to candidates
- 6.11 Of the candidates surveyed 79% found the post interview feedback to be fair or very fair, 67% considered it timely and 64% considered it to be open. In terms of the effectiveness of the feedback as a tool for improvement, 25% of candidates considered it effective, 17% partially effective and 58% ineffective.
- 6.12 A number of the candidates interviewed during the review had applied for more than one Senior Civil Service (SCS) competition. Their remarks reflect post interview feedback received following these competitions as well as the competition under review.
- 6.13 They report that often the feedback provided in the justification box of the CIAB is simply a statement (good, adequate, poor) of the evidence presented by the candidate. The statement failed to identify the strengths or weaknesses in the evidence or make recommendations in the areas that required improvement. The CIAB did not provide feedback in relation to overall interview performance of the candidate.

- 6.14 Candidates also stated that it was difficult to interpret the feedback provided without sight of the questions asked and on occasion the handwriting on the CIAB was difficult to read or illegible.
- 6.15 Panel members and Departments surveyed considered the post interview feedback process to be both open and effective. One panel member suggested that the information recorded in the CIAB would be more useful if panels expanded upon their justification for an allocated score. They noted, however, that the limited space in the justification box did not lend itself to this. One Department official noted that, like post sift feedback, the effectiveness of the post interview feedback was dependant on the panel and that there was inconsistency in the quality of comments recorded in the justification boxes.
- 6.16 Contrary to NICS policy [6.10] the internal candidates surveyed and the panel members spoken to report either receiving or providing informal face to face or telephone feedback following a competition. Candidates judged face to face feedback as highly effective for improving performance at subsequent interviews. This level of feedback is not made available to external candidates.

### **SCS Competition Evaluations**

- 6.17 The chairperson of the panel is asked to complete a competition evaluation report form after each competition. This records comments on every stage of the competition including the management of the competition by HR Connect. Corporate Human Resources (CHR) and the HR Connect recruiter are responsible for processing the information, including any learning points from this form. The recruiter will decide on the appropriate follow up action within HR Connect, for example identify and circulate lessons learnt to other HR Connect recruiters. CHR request copies of the completed evaluation forms in order to progress learning at corporate level.

- 6.18 A 10% sample of candidates, across all competitions, are surveyed by HR Connect.
- 6.19 Of the four competitions under review, two competition evaluation forms completed by the chair of the panel were available. It was reported that on occasion these forms are overlooked by the chair of the panel. The issues raised on the forms range from quite minor issues, for example as the quality of photocopying, to significant policy questions such as whether or not panels can use information provided in support of one criteria to evidence a different criteria. There are no written procedures for the processing of post competition evaluations and the handling of these issues is not recorded or tracked by CHR. Consequently there is no evidence available that learning from these evaluation forms is implemented.
- 6.20 HR Connect report an extremely low return rate from the candidate surveys issued and they consider that little value has been gained from this process so far. There were no candidate surveys available for the four competitions under review. Of the competitions reviewed there was a record of one candidate who contacted HR Connect after her interview to raise an issue about which she had concerns. This was not presented as a complaint. The issue was investigated quickly by HR Connect and a response addressing the matter was sent to the candidate the day after she contacted them.

### **Other issues**

- 6.21 During the course of the Review candidates raised a number of issues which fall outside the scope of the Review of Communication and Feedback but merit inclusion / comment.
- 6.22 A number of external candidates and two of the panel members report that, in their view, external candidates may be at a significant disadvantage when applying for senior posts in the NICS. This was based

on the fact that many internal candidates would have knowledge of the competency based selection process and experience of participating as panel members, and this was considered an advantage when participating in SCS competitions. They described other barriers to external candidates such as the use of NICS language and terminology e.g. SRO or 'stakeholder engagement'. They also considered internal candidates from an employing department would be viewed as having particular advantage in light of the inside knowledge of the post and very relevant information on which to evidence competencies.

- 6.23 A number of candidates considered the use of competency based interviewing as limiting the mix of individuals recruited into Civil Service posts. It was described as an impersonal process that used narrow questioning which took insufficient account of individuals and their attributes and strengths as a whole. It was considered as a process designed to recruit only individuals who would fit a certain 'mould'.
- 6.24 Some candidates reported inconsistency between competitions in the assessment of similar evidence provided for identical criteria at the sift stage. One candidate claims to have provided identical evidence to two different panels assessing the same criteria but in different competitions. In one of these competitions he was failed under the criteria while in the second competition, the panel accepted the evidence as satisfactory under the same criteria.

## **7 Recommendations**

Commissioners are committed to ensuring that the Recruitment Code Principles are being applied in the selection and recruitment processes throughout the NICS. In light of the evidence gathered during this Communication and Feedback Review, the following recommendations are made:

**Recommendation 1:** CHR should take steps to ensure that more meaningful feedback is provided to candidates post interview as required by Section 4.9 of the Recruitment Code. [6.13]

**Recommendation 2:** CHR should address the inconsistency between the quality and content of feedback provided by panels to candidates post interview. [6.15]

**Recommendation 3:** CHR should address the issue of informal feedback currently available to a number of internal candidates which is not available to candidates outside the NICS. [6.16]

**Recommendation 4:** CHR should review the current system of post competition evaluation from candidates and panel members. Where appropriate information from these evaluations should be used as part of a quality assurance and improvement programme. Consideration should be given to the development of a system to track and record follow up actions and any learning implemented from these surveys. [6.19, 6.20]

**Recommendation 5:** CHR should take steps to ensure that written comments in the CIAB justification boxes are in a format that is understood by candidates. [6.14]

**Recommendation 6:** CHR should include, in the template letter to candidates placed on a merit list, their position on the list and the fact that being placed on the merit list is not a guarantee of a posting [6.4].

**Recommendation 7:** CHR should review template letters to reflect appreciation and acknowledgement of the effort made by candidates in participating in the selection process. [6.3]

## REVIEW OF FEEDBACK WITH SCS CANDIDATES DURING THE SELECTION & RECRUITMENT PROCESS: TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Introduction

1. Under Article 4(4) of the Civil Service Commissioners (Northern Ireland) Order 1999 Commissioners have a duty to conduct independent audits of NI Civil Service recruitment policies, procedures and practices in order to provide assurances to the people of NI that these are in line with the principles of the Recruitment Code.

### Purpose

2. The purpose of the Review of Feedback with SCS candidates during the Selection & Recruitment process is to provide Commissioners with an assessment of the extent to which feedback during the NICS selection & recruitment process promotes confidence in the NICS. The review will look at feedback provided to and received from SCS candidates in 3 competitions run in 3 different NICS Departments. The review will determine whether the practices employed are consistent with upholding the Merit Principle. The Review of Feedback with SCS Candidates during the Selection and Recruitment Process is taken forward in the context of Section 8 - Communication, in the Regulatory Audit Framework Part 2.

### Objectives

3. The objectives of the Feedback review are to:
  - 3.1. assess the extent to which:
    - (a) candidates receive clear, purposeful, meaningful and timely feedback at all relevant stages of the appointments process;
    - (b) candidates consider recruitment related feedback to be fair, open, timely and effective;
    - (c) feedback is equally accessible to both internal and external candidates and all Section 75 groups;
    - (d) learning drawn from comments / enquiries / complaints in relation to the selection & recruitment process is applied for the purpose of improvement by the NICS and its partners.
  - 3.2. use the findings from 3.1 above to assess the extent to which feedback communication during the appointments process promotes confidence in the NICS recruitment process;
  - 3.3. identify good practice in recruitment related feedback in private and public sector organisations\*;

- 3.4. bring to the attention of Commissioners and the relevant Department where evidence would indicate that policies, procedures or practices are insufficient to meet requirements of the Code; and
- 3.5. produce a report detailing the findings of the Feedback review for each Department and a consolidated Summary Report for publication on Commissioners' website.

### **Scope**

4. This review will focus on 3 SCS competitions from different Departments relating to the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012. It will assess feedback to and from the candidates at all relevant stages of the appointment process including post-competition feedback.

### **Audit Requirements**

5. The Review Team will require access to all records and such information as considered necessary to fulfil the review responsibilities.
6. Given the nature of this review the team will also need to engage directly with the candidates themselves. It is envisaged that most of the candidates will be asked to complete a paper based questionnaire and through this a number would be identified for interview in person or by telephone.

### **Conduct of Review of Feedback with SCS candidates**

7. The review will be carried out in accordance with the Commissioners' Audit Guidance, Framework and Protocol, and in compliance with the Recruitment Code.
8. In particular Part 2 of the Audit Framework contained within the Guidance will be used to identify compliance questions based on the key performance questions and indicators. These will be used by the Review Team to assess the degree to which the requirements of the Code are being met.

### **Methodology**

9. The Review Team will comprise of two members of the Secretariat to the Civil Service Commissioners who will be supported by a Link Commissioner.
10. The evidence gathering phase of this review will follow the steps below:

- (a) Identification of NICS policy and procedure in relation to the provision of feedback to candidates
  - (b) An assessment of the standard templates used to communicate and provide feedback at the relevant stages of the process
  - (c) A review of all relevant correspondence and an assessment of its adequacy between candidates and NICS /HR Connect at each stage of the recruitment and selection process;
  - (d) An assessment of further feedback provided in cases where the candidate has requested clarification, further information or as a result of a complaint ;
  - (e) Discussion / interview with HR Connect staff involved in the provision of feedback;
  - (f) Review and discuss with HR Connect and NICS staff the analysis and assessment of candidate feedback during the selection & recruitment process;
  - (g) Seek views of CHR/DHR on the adequacy of feedback arrangements for candidates;
  - (h) Paper based assessment of candidate opinion on feedback received - this will include invitation to participate in interview;
  - (i) Candidate interviews via face to face and / or telephone, as appropriate.
11. A summary draft report will be provided for Commissioners' consideration.
  12. Draft reports will also be provided to the 3 NICS Departments involved and CHR for a factual accuracy check.
  13. Following Commissioners approval the final report will be issued to each Department and CHR respectively and a follow-up meeting will be conducted by the Link Commissioner supported by the Review Team. A consolidated overall summary report will be prepared and published on Commissioners' website.

### **Timetable**

14. The Review Team envisage the initiation meeting and review preparation work in December 2013 with a view to fieldwork, estimated at up to 12 days involving both members of the Review Team, taking place in January/February 2014. The target date for the completion of the review is April 2014.

**Extract of the Regulatory Audit Framework Part 2 - Key Performance Questions and associated Key Performance Indicators**

**8. COMMUNICATION**

**MERIT**

**What evidence is there that communication with candidates reflects and supports the Merit Principle?**

- both internal and external candidates consider recruitment related communications to be fair, open, timely and effective;
- as appropriate, communication with candidates is clear and explicit about the intention to use the merit list to make further appointments and about the reasons and process for doing so.

**FIT FOR PURPOSE**

**What evidence is there that there is effective communication between all those involved in the process?**

- panels are provided with appropriate professional HR advice and guidance at key stages of the process;
- there is a clear and shared understanding of respective roles and responsibilities;
- the requirements of the Recruitment Code are understood and applied by all;
- panel members or other key contributors are given specific opportunity to raise concerns about any aspect of a competition;
- panel members have equal and shared access to competition related information.

**FAIR**

**To what extent is there fair, effective and timely communication with candidates at all stages of the process?**

- candidates receive clear, purposeful, and meaningful feedback;
- provision of feedback is timely and promotes confidence in recruitment to the NICS;
- all communications are equally accessible to both internal and external candidates and all Section 75 groups.

**OPEN AND TRANSPARENT**

**What evidence is there that communication with candidates is comprehensive, accurate and helpful?**

- candidates find the communication at each stage of the process to be clear, informative and beneficial;
- comments, enquiries and / or complaints are dealt with in an efficient, appropriate and timely manner;
- learning drawn from comments / enquiries / complaints is applied for the purpose of improvement.

### **Recruitment Practices in other Organisations**

There are many similarities between recruitment practices in other organisations and the NICS, not least balancing the need to provide open, meaningful feedback to candidates against the risk of legal challenge.

The organisations interviewed reported an increasing volume of requests for competition feedback from candidates. They also reported a greater level of detail expected by candidates in the feedback provided to them. One public sector body which has traditionally provided detailed post sift feedback to candidates, if requested, is reviewing this practice due to the increased demand and the limited resources available to devote to provision of feedback.

Only one of the organisations consulted supplied the candidate with a copy of the panel's interview notes following a request for post interview feedback. In the other organisations the interview records from each panel member are summarised to provide the candidate with the key points including strengths and areas for development. One organisation also reported that the feedback they provide does not repeat the questions asked but outlines the area the question covered. It then refers to the answer provided by the candidate and details what they neglected to provide in their evidence.

All of the organisations consulted considered face to face or verbal feedback to be of most benefit to candidates and all but one of them provided face to face feedback to their internal applicants. Less than half provided face to face or verbal feedback to external candidates.

In one organisation the local managers provide the face to face feedback with internal candidates. The manager is provided with guidance on how to provide feedback. Human Resources usually only gets involved if the manager is new to the process and requires support or believes there is a contentious issue. They reported that although interview feedback requires significant preparation time, almost as much as the interview, they consider it an invaluable tool for developmental purposes.

The Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) have developed an Interview Feedback Process for internal candidates. At least 2 panel members must be present for face to face feedback. Candidates cannot challenge the panel's decision during these meetings. The purpose of the meeting is to provide *'candidates with constructive comment in a positive environment'* only. The ground rules of the process are read out at the start of the meeting and if candidates persist in challenging panel decisions, after a warning, the session is terminated. NIHE report that this process has demonstrated proven benefits for a lot of their staff.

One major public sector organisation that employs a similar feedback process to the NIHE report that in spite of receiving 15,000 applications in 2013 they facilitated no more than 30 face to face feedback meetings. They believe that because these meetings are not an opportunity to challenge the panel's decision it is only candidates genuinely seeking feedback for development reasons who request it.

One organisation who does provide verbal feedback to external candidates is the Public Appointments Service (PAS) in the ROI, the centralised provider of recruitment, assessment and selection services for the Irish Civil Service. Every senior appointment competition has a senior member of the PAS assigned to it. The PAS representative oversees every stage of the competition and performs a quality assurance role in the process ensuring adherence to the Commission for Public Service Appointments Codes of Practice. Among other things their responsibilities include note taking during the candidate interviews for the panel and gathering and providing feedback to internal and external candidates. When a request for feedback is received the PAS representative provides feedback to the candidate using the shortlisting/ interview notes. If requested by the candidate, the PAS representative will contact them by telephone and provide feedback verbally.

## Survey Results

The percentages quoted in the body of the report are calculated using the actual number of candidates who answered a particular question within the survey. Not all candidates responded to all questions.

### Communications

Total number of candidate responses – 37

For the purpose of this survey communication refers to all contact with the candidate by HR Connect from the point at which they submitted their application. Below is the total number of candidates surveyed who considered communication during the selection and recruitment process to be adequate, appropriate and timely.

	<b>Communications to be Adequate</b>	<b>Communications to be Appropriate</b>	<b>Communications to be Timely</b>
<b>Number of Candidates</b>	<b>32 (86%)</b>	<b>30 (88%)</b>	<b>29 (85%)</b>

### Feedback

Total number of candidate responses – 35

Feedback refers to information provided to the candidate in relation to their performance against the competition criteria / competencies. Effective refers to the ability of the feedback to function as a tool for improvement in the future.

	<b>Number of Post Sift Candidates</b>	<b>Number of Post Interview Candidates</b>
<b>Feedback to be Fair or Very Fair</b>	<b>11 (50%)</b>	<b>11 (79%)</b>
<b>Feedback to be Unfair or Very Unfair</b>	<b>11 (50%)</b>	<b>3 (21%)</b>
<b>Feedback to be Open or Very Open</b>	<b>9 (43%)</b>	<b>9 (64%)</b>
<b>Feedback to be Closed</b>	<b>12 (57%)</b>	<b>5 (36%)</b>
<b>Feedback to be Timely</b>	<b>13 (72%)</b>	<b>8 (67%)</b>
<b>Feedback to be Not Timely</b>	<b>5 (28%)</b>	<b>4 (33%)</b>
<b>Feedback to be Very Effective</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Feedback to be Effective</b>	<b>4 (21%)</b>	<b>3 (25%)</b>
<b>Feedback to be Partially Effective</b>	<b>4 (21%)</b>	<b>2 (17%)</b>
<b>Feedback to be Not Effective</b>	<b>11 (58%)</b>	<b>7 (58%)</b>