Investigation October 29, 2020

## Correct Candidate Selected, but a Better Process Is Needed to Identify Scoring Errors

### Office of the Inspector General

| Candidate C's Recruitment Scores Improved in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Recruitment |  |                       |         |         |  |
|--|--|-----------------------|---------|---------|--|
|  | Supervision  | Technical             |         | X fr    |  |
| C  | Interview Scores   | Knowledge Test Scores | Change  |         |  |
| Candidate  | Nov '18 to Jan '19   | Nov '18 to Jan '19    | Nov '18 | Jan '19 |  |
| Α  | N/A – Candidate selected then resigned  N/A – Candidate selected then resigned |                       | 1       | N/A     |  |
| В  | No Change After Error<br>Corrected   | No change 2 2         |         |         |  |
| С  | No Change After Error Corrected Increased 3 1                                  |                       |         |         |  |

#### **Investigation Results**

BART's correction of a scoring error resulted in the correct employee being offered a promotional foreworker position. However, BART had to withdraw an offer to a different employee because the error was not identified until after the original employee had been offered the position.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Correcting Scoring Errors: Provide each candidate with a report of their points after the recruitment process ends but before offering a position to any candidate to avoid inadvertently offering a position to an incorrect candidate. Allow the candidate a reasonable period of time (e.g., 2-3 business days) to contact Human Resources if the candidate believes there is a discrepancy. Human Resources can then reach out to the Union President to notify them of the error and to determine if the Foreworker Evaluation Committee (FEC) chair should be contacted to reconvene and reevaluate the scores.



For more information, contact:



Harriet Richardson Inspector General



510-464-6132



hrichar@bart.gov

Providing independent oversight of the District's use of revenue.

Investigation October 29, 2020

#### **Background and Investigation**



The Human Resources Department retracted a job offer after identifying a potential scoring error. BART recruited

for a foreworker position in November 2018. The highest-scoring candidate (Candidate A) accepted the position but reverted to their previous position within a few weeks after starting in the new role. In accordance with the labor practices for Service Employees International Union (SEIU) foreworker positions, BART initiated a new recruitment process in January 2019 rather than selecting the second highest-scoring candidate from the 2018 recruitment. Upon completion of the 2019 recruitment process, Human Resources offered the position to Candidate B, who had ranked second in the 2018 recruitment and appeared to be the highest-scoring candidate in the 2019 recruitment. However, that same day, Human Resources learned that a potential scoring error was made and retracted the job offer. After confirming that a scoring error had occurred and correcting it, Human Resources offered the position to Candidate C, who was now the top scorer in the 2019 recruitment process. Candidate C had ranked third in the November 2018 recruitment process.



The Office of the Inspector General received a complaint from an employee who said they had been offered a

promotional position that the Human Resources
Department subsequently withdrew and
inappropriately offered to another employee. The
purpose of this investigation was to determine why
the offer for the promotional position was retracted
and whether the subsequent offer to a different
employee was appropriate. The investigation focused
on the process and not on individual candidates'
qualifications.

#### **Key Findings**



After correcting a scoring error, the Human Resources Department ultimately offered the position to the correct

candidate (Candidate C). However, a better process for identifying scoring errors in a timely manner could have avoided the confusion over which candidate should have received the offer and prevented the need to withdraw an offer made to Candidate B in error:

Scoring Process: Candidate B scored higher than Candidate C in November 2018, but in the January 2019 recruitment, Candidate C raised their technical knowledge score, which was based on multiple choice questions and a short essay. The SEIU labor agreement defines the process for recruiting foreworker positions, including the selection criteria and how some of those criteria are scored. Some scores, such as supervisory experience, are based on the candidates' work history rather than the interview or written exam. Candidates B and C both received 10 of 10 possible points for supervisory experience in the November 2018 recruitment but initially received fewer points in the January 2019 recruitment. The Human Resources recruiter caught the error for Candidate B but not for Candidate C, causing Candidate B to appear to be the highestscoring candidate and initially be offered the position. The error was brought to the recruiter's attention when Candidate C asked to see their scores. In accordance with the provisions of the SEIU collective bargaining agreement, the Foreworker Evaluation Committee reconvened and determined that the scores for both candidates should be revised. After correcting the errors and, with the improved technical knowledge score, Candidate C became the highest-scoring candidate and was appropriately offered the position.

#### BART Office of the General Manager Response to OIG Finding & Recommendations

# <u>Report Title</u>: Correct Candidate Selected, but Better Process and Documentation Needed When Correcting Scoring Errors

The Office of the General Manager agrees to the finding and to implement the recommendation.

| 1 | Recommendation:            | Provide each candidate with a report of their points after the recruitment process ends but before offering a position to any candidate to avoid inadvertently offering a position to an incorrect candidate. Allow the candidate a reasonable period of time (e.g., 2-3 business days) to contact Human Resources if the candidate believes there is a discrepancy. Human Resources can then reach out to the Union President to notify them of the error and to determine if the Foreworker Evaluation Committee (FEC) chair should be contacted to reconvene and reevaluate the scores. |  |  |  |
|---|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|   | Responsible<br>Department: | Human Resources  |  |  |  |
|   | Implementation Date:       | 9/10/2020  |  |  |  |
|   | Corrective Action Plan:    | For Foreworker Evaluation Committees, the recruiter will provide each candidate an overview of their scores, and allow 3 business days for candidates to contact HR with questions or potential discrepancies. If no discrepancies are brought up, HR will extend the appropriate offer. If a discrepancy is brought up, HR will notify the FEC chair to review the concern and decide if the panel needs to be reconvened to reevaluate.  |  |  |  |