INTERVIEW FORMS

REQUEST TO INTERVIEW AND APPLICANT LOG

Complete this form when you are ready to bring candidates to campus. The form consists of two parts: (1) the request to bring candidates in for in-person interviews and costs and (2) the applicant log i.e. the list of all applicants in the pool by the deadline date and their assigned tier.

REQUEST TO INTERVIEW

- Only Tier One (1) candidates should be listed
- No Tiers Two (2) - Four (4) should appear

APPLICANT LOG

- Should be organized for ease of use e.g. alphabetically, by tier
- All candidates who applied by the deadline should appear in the applicant log with an assigned tier and rationale including the tier one candidates to bring to campus.
- Rationale should be based on the qualifications for the position

REMINDERS

- This is a legal document. Any language used should be defensible to the public
- All signatures are required before contacting the candidates
**FINALIST APPRAISAL LOG**

Complete this form when you make your final recommendation on finalists. The form should list all candidates who appeared as a Tier One (1) on the Form 7 with their interview date and whether the candidate is recommended for hire.

**REMINDERS**

- Do not rank the candidates on the form.
- All Tier One candidates from the Request to Interview should appear on this form.
- Candidates should only be recommended as "Hirable" or "Not Hirable"

**GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATIVE LANGUAGE**

- All evaluation language should be based on qualifications and job description
- Describe skills, experience, training, and/or knowledge of qualifications
- Use positive/negative descriptors: strong, good, excellent, extensive, solid, poor, lacks, weak, deficient, inadequate

**EXAMPLE QUALIFICATION: STRONG COMMUNICATION SKILLS REQUIRED**

**PREFERRED LANGUAGE**

- Candidate has extensive knowledge of communication theory
- Candidate uses excellent communication strategies when working with customers
- Candidate lacks written communication skills, based on application materials

**NON-PREFERRED LANGUAGE**

- Candidate was best communicator of all those interviewed
- Candidate can communicate with people
- Candidate is terrible at written communication