

2008 Innovations Awards Program APPLICATION

CSG reserves the right to use or publish in other CSG products and services the information provided in this Innovations Awards Program Application. If your agency objects to this policy, please advise us in a separate attachment to your program's application.

ID # (assigned by CSG): 08-M-22MN

Please provide the following information, adding space as necessary:

State: Minnesota

Assign Program Category : Human Resources - Office of Diversity

1. Program Name - Monitoring the Hiring Process
2. Administering Agency - State of Minnesota Department of Corrections
3. Contact Person - Pamela Kelly
4. Address – 1450 Energy Park Drive suite 200
5. Telephone Number – 651-531-7256
6. FAX Number – 561-643-3444
7. E-mail Address – Pamela.Kelly@doc.state.mn.us
8. Web site Address – www.doc.gov
9. Please provide a two-sentence description of the program.

The program is designed to track affirmative action hires as required by state statute. It provides managers with an objective process to evaluate candidates in the finalist pool.

10. How long has this program been operational (month and year)? Note: the program must be between 9 months and 5 years old on March 1, 2008 to be considered.

The newly created program was established in July of 2006.

11. Why was the program created? What problem[s] or issue[s] was it designed to address?

The program was created to establish more consistency in how candidates were selected for hire when the hiring manager was not going to select the candidate, who met the minimum qualifications and was a member of a protected group where the department was not meeting its affirmative action hiring goals.

Some of the problems were the inconsistent measures used to hire e.g., not evaluating each candidate's skills, knowledge and/or abilities the same; candidates would claim a protected group status to be included in the interview; supervisors were given protected group information prior to selection and it led to a perception that candidates selected for hire were subjective rather than objective.

12. Describe the specific activities and operations of the program in chronological order.

Please see DOC policy #103.009 that is attached to this document.

13. Why is the program a new and creative approach or method?

Hiring managers do not have knowledge of where the disparity exists or which candidates are members of the protected group where the disparity exists. Hiring managers are also required to complete a memo justifying why they are not selecting the protected group member and be able to demonstrate they are evaluating all candidates' qualifications for the job using the same criteria.

14. What were the program's start-up costs? (Provide details about specific purchases for this program, staffing needs and other financial expenditures, as well as existing materials, technology and staff already in place.)

Time to train all hiring Supervisor/Managers in the department.

15. What are the program's annual operational costs?

16. How is the program funded?

Part of the training program for supervisors/managers.

17. Did this program require the passage of legislation, executive order or regulations? If YES, please indicate the citation number.

No it already existed.

18. What equipment, technology and software are used to operate and administer this program?

Computers, Sema 4 data base

19. To the best of your knowledge, did this program originate in your state? If YES, please indicate the innovator's name, present address, telephone number and e-mail address.

Not sure (updated the program)

20. Are you aware of similar programs in other states? If YES, which ones and how does this program differ?

Similar programs exist in other states. The difference would be in the selection of candidates to consider for hire. It would be dependent upon what the state's civil service hiring process is.

21. Has the program been fully implemented? If NO, what actions remain to be taken?

Yes.

22. Briefly evaluate (pro and con) the program's effectiveness in addressing the defined problem[s] or issue[s]. Provide tangible examples.

Pros: Hiring authorities have reported they have received fewer complaints from employees about the hiring process. Hiring managers must use the same skill, knowledge and abilities in evaluating each Candidate in the finalist pool.

Con: It takes time to prepare the packet to demonstrate the justification for a missed opportunity should be granted.

23. How has the program grown and/or changed since its inception?

24. What limitations or obstacles might other states expect to encounter if they attempt to adopt this program?

Unable to comment on as the process used for establishing a candidate pool would be a major factor in how you would develop a process for monitoring affirmative action hires.