

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF EQUALITY INVESTIGATIONS

EMPLOYMENT EQUALITY ACT, 1977

EQUALITY OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION NO: DEC-E 2000/01

Ms. Frances Jackson

AND

Board of Management, Waterpark College, Waterford

*File No: EE 55/1998*

## **1. DISPUTE**

- 1.1** This dispute concerns a claim by Ms. Frances Jackson that she was discriminated against by the Board of Management, Waterpark College, Waterford in terms of Section 2(a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 and contrary to the provisions of Section 3 of that Act when she was unsuccessful in her application for the position of Deputy Principal, Waterpark College which was awarded to a male candidate.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1** The claimant applied for the position of Deputy Principal in Waterpark College in May, 1998. She was interviewed on Saturday, 16th May, 1998 along with all of the other female and five of the male applicants. The claimant was unsuccessful in her application. The successful applicant was male and, according to the claimant, he was less qualified than her and had less experience than she had for the position.
- 2.2** On 17th November, 1998 the claimant referred a claim to the Labour Court under the provisions of the Employment Equality Act, 1977. The Labour Court subsequently referred the claim to an Equality Officer for investigation and recommendation.

## **3. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMANT'S CASE**

- 3.1** The claimant, in her submission, claims that she was discriminated against because of her sex when a male was appointed to the position of Deputy Principal to Waterpark College on 18th May, 1998. According to the claimant the successful male applicant was less qualified and had less experience than her for the position.
- 3.2** The claimant states that she informed her employer of her complaint on 23rd May, 1998 and in a reply dated 3rd July, 1998 the employer refuted her allegations on the grounds that the successful applicant had more experience than her in school management. The claimant contends that this assertion illustrates the prejudicial ethos which blinded the Board of Management to the discriminatory nature of their action. According to the claimant she has, at least, 20 years experience as part of the in-school management while the successful applicant had at most 8 years. The

claimant says that the perception that the successful applicant's experience is of a superior quality to her experience reflects the unconscious prejudice that "man's" work 'minding' the money is more important than "woman's" work of nurturing the children. The claimant states that if she had not the experience necessary it can only be that the more 'prestigious' and relevant management task was allocated to the most junior B post holder before the most senior A post holder.

**3.3** The claimant alleges that this is in keeping with the prejudice and discrimination to which she has been subjected to consistently during her 29 years in Waterpark. In 1988-1990 the claimant contends that, as the most senior B post holder, she was passed over for promotion to an A post in blatant breach of the memorandum at the time. The claimant presumes that the then Board of Management thought that it was self-evident that a woman was innately too 'frail' to cope with the tough job of managing tough young men as the reason given was that the task would be too 'onerous' for her. Complementary to this prejudice is the prejudicial myth that work which can be done by a woman is thereby less strenuous. According to the claimant, when she eventually took over the duties undertaken by her male predecessor, they were far less onerous than her B post duties while the male who succeeded to her B post found the duties far too strenuous and asked to be moved to less strenuous tasks. The claimant says that some of the workload was removed from that job and it became an A post for the male post holder.

**3.4** The claimant contends that she was assigned tasks which male colleagues refused to do e.g. she was ordered to take all the senior religion classes. Furthermore she was cajoled into trying the Junior Certificate Art and she was forced to continue with this under the threat of losing her job and her employer was indifferent to the diagnosed danger to her health. According to the claimant all the weak and difficult classes were assigned to her, usually without consultation while her male colleagues were consulted and had an element of choice. The claimant says that the closer one is to the 'golden old-boys circle' the less weak or difficult classes one has and the more choice one has in what to teach. The claimant states that this treatment, however, did not prevent the employer from acknowledging their appreciation of her commitment, dedication, ability, creativity, co-operation, vision, success and enthusiasm.

**3.5** According to the claimant the Chairman of the Board claimed that the sole criterion for the appointment was suitability in accordance with Department of Education guidelines. The claimant contends that, in accordance with the Department's guidelines, she is the most qualified for the position. She also says that the school eschews its responsibility of this discrimination by locating the decision in the objectivity of the selection process. It is her belief that this objectivity was suspiciously too objective. The claimant asks the Board of Management if the selection of the Chairman of the Board as their representative rather than the much more qualified and pertinent person of the Principal was prompted by the Principal's own wishes. The claimant thinks that the objectivity was contrived to distance the Principal from the unpopular promotion of his most loyal and devoted friend and colleague. The claimant alleges that, in hindsight, the successful applicant was being groomed for this position. She says that this perception impugns the real objectivity of this selection process.

**3.6** The claimant contends that the reason that she was treated less favourably because of her sex is because she was the victim of a hierarchical mindset which sees a hierarchy of status as students, women, men unless women are more vocal in their assertiveness or young and beautiful in their physique. According to the claimant there was a core of 'old-boys' type network, a golden circle which seemed to see itself as more 'Waterparkian' than Waterpark itself. The claimant says that this influence on her career can be illustrated by the mechanisms engaged to prevent her promotion to an A post. The claimant mentions that, despite the recommendation of the Principal, the Board of Management appointed a male colleague to an A post position at an earlier time in her career. The reason the Board of Management gave the Appeals Board for their failure to appoint the claimant was, according to her, because of hearsay representations from staff to the Chairman of the Board. The claimant says that, despite winning this appeal, the Board of Management did not implement the Appeal Board's decision in the school year 1989-1990. The claimant was then appointed to an A post the following year. However her male colleague as a result had seniority over her. The claimant, in her submission, refers to a change in management structure in the respondent organisation in which a member of staff was hassled to resign.

According to the claimant this member of staff asked her to represent him at the Appeals Board because he had faith in her clarity of thought and her ability to articulate the situation. The claimant says that many of the staff felt that, by going up against the school, she would be viewed as disloyal and she would jeopardise her chances of promotion to Vice Principal. According to the claimant the configuration of personnel which she opposed at the Appeals Board were the same as those who were instrumental in passing her over for promotion to Deputy Principal.

- 3.7 The claimant states that it is her belief that the Principal wanted a man to be appointed to the position because he would command greater respect than a small middle-aged woman. The claimant also believes that this mindset derives from a traditional authoritarian culture where respect was closely identified with fear, obedience was the benchmark of the student-teacher relationship and the power to intimidate was integral to this process. Personal affection between a teacher and a student was a weak link in the chain of command and, according to the claimant, a weakness to which an emotional woman was prone. The claimant, in her submission, set out the reasons why she was more experienced and more qualified in terms of qualities and talents than the successful candidate. These are set out in Appendix A.

#### **4. SUMMARY OF THE RESPONDENT'S SUBMISSION**

- 4.1 In an initial response to the Equality Officer's request for a submission the respondent asked the Equality Officer to make a preliminary determination on the fact that, in its opinion, the claimant in her submission failed to disclose any grounds for a finding of discrimination on grounds of sex contrary to the Employment Equality Act, 1977 in the appointment of the Deputy Principal in May, 1998. In my reply to the respondent I noted the ruling in the High Court case of *Acot v Trustees of FWUI*<sup>1</sup> in which it was held that an Equality Officer should not make decisions on preliminary issues but should make a final decision having concluded the investigation. I pointed out to the respondent that the claim referred to me by the Labour Court for investigation is that which was set out in the claimant's referral form and the date of the discrimination as set out on that form was 18th May, 1998.

---

<sup>1</sup> High Court Decision of 13th April, 1989

- 4.2** In its submission, the respondent contends that the claimant's initial complaint and her submission fail to disclose any discrimination on grounds of sex by the Board of Management in the appointment of the Deputy Principal in May, 1998. According to the respondent the only allegation of discrimination on grounds of sex is the claimant's opinion that she is better qualified and has more varied teaching experience than the successful male applicant. The respondent notes that the claimant has a B.A. Pass with Distinction while the successful candidate has a B.A. Honours Grade 2.1 qualification. It is the respondent's contention that the selection was made on criterion of suitability and not on the criterion of seniority as in the past. Teaching experience was a factor in assessing suitability but it was not a determining factor. The respondent states that both candidates have more than adequate teaching experience for this management position.
- 4.3** The respondent states that the Board of Management advertised the position of Deputy Principal in the school and in the newspapers. Prospective applicants were invited to submit applications on a form prepared by the college. All of the female applicants and five of the male applicants were selected for interview. A Selection Committee was established by the Board of Management. This Committee comprised a school Principal from Dungarvan, Co. Waterford; a school Principal from Callan, Co. Kilkenny and the Chairman of the Board of Management who was also a past pupil of the College. The interviews were held on Saturday, 16th May, 1998. According to the respondent the Selection Committee prepared a list of questions which were put to each applicant. The respondent states that the suitability of all of the applicants was assessed by the Selection Committee at the end of the interviews using the same criteria. The successful applicant did an excellent interview and was the unanimous choice of the Selection Committee. The second choice candidate was female and the respondent submits that there was no discrimination on grounds of sex in the selection process.
- 4.4** The respondent contends that the Selection Committee took great care to ensure that all the applicants were given a fair and equal opportunity to demonstrate their suitability for the position of Deputy Principal. The respondent states that the marital

status and the sex of each applicant was neither raised nor discussed by either the Selection Committee or the Board of Management. The respondent says that there is absolutely no question of the claimant having been discriminated against on grounds of sex on the appointment of Deputy Principal in May, 1998.

## **5. CONCLUSIONS OF THE EQUALITY OFFICER**

- 5.1** The issue for decision in this claim is whether or not the respondent discriminated against the claimant on the basis of her sex in terms of Section 2(a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 in relation to her failure to be appointed to the position of Deputy Principal in May, 1998. In making a decision in this claim I have taken into account all of the submissions, both oral and written, made to me by the parties.
- 5.2** The respondent argued that, as the claimant had failed to submit a prima facie claim of discrimination, it had no claim to defend. The claimant submitted a referral to the Labour Court contending that she had been discriminated against by the respondent when she was unsuccessful in her application for the position of Deputy Principal. In making her allegation the claimant stated that she was better qualified and had more experience than the male applicant who was appointed to the position. Her basis for this contention was that, in her opinion, she holds more qualifications and has more years of in-school management experience (20 as compared to 8) than the successful male applicant. I am satisfied that the claimant has made a prima facie case of discrimination against the respondent and there is, therefore, an onus of responsibility on the respondent to present whatever evidence necessary or sought by me (the Equality Officer) to support its contention that it did not discriminate against the claimant as alleged. In this regard I note the obligation on me as an Equality Officer, under Section 19(3) of the Employment Equality Act 1977, to investigate a dispute referred to me.
- 5.3** The respondent was reluctant to supply the information requested by me and had to be warned that, under the Act, it is an offence to obstruct or impede an Equality Officer in the exercise of her/his powers of investigation including the failure to produce any

records sought by her/him. It was with reluctance that the respondent agreed to submit the information requested. The respondent specifically and strongly objected to supplying details of all the applicants for the position and stated that the only relevant persons were the claimant and the successful male applicant. In making this assertion the respondent was mindful of the Labour Court ruling in the case of *The Rotunda Hospital and The Mater Misericordiae Hospital and Dr. Noreen Gleeson*<sup>2</sup> in which the Labour Court held that “***it can only judge the claimant vis-à-vis the successful candidate***”. The Equality Officer requested the information on all of the applicants to enable her to fully investigate the allegation of discrimination. The Equality Officer made it clear that there is an onus on her to fully investigate the claim of alleged discrimination and, in so doing, examine all of the evidence and decide on the basis of the evidence available the relevance or otherwise of it to the allegation. In adopting this approach the Equality Officer notes the more recent High Court case of *Mary Helen Davis and Dublin Institute of Technology*<sup>3</sup> in which Mr. Justice Quirke noted the examination by the Labour Court of a “***very substantial volume of evidence as to the prior experience and responsibilities of both Ms. Davis, the successful appointee and the other applicants including the other two unsuccessful applicants who were called by the Institute for interview***”.

- 5.4 According to the respondent the Department of Education and Science rules were applied to the establishment of the Selection Committee. According to these rules:

*“The Board of Management shall publicly advertise the post and set up a Selection Committee consisting of a nominee of the Trustees, a nominee of the Board of Management and an independent external assessor to be agreed on by the Board. The Committee shall select its own Chairperson from among its members”.*

The Selection Committee did comprise a nominee of the Trustees, a nominee of the Board of Management and an independent external assessor. The claimant questioned why the Principal of the College was not a member of the Selection Committee and, in so asking, mentioned that the Principal himself had told her that he had not wanted to be on the Selection Committee. I note that there was no requirement for the Principal to be a member of the Selection Committee and am satisfied there was not an onus on the respondent to ensure that he was a member.

---

<sup>2</sup> Labour Court Determination No. DEE003 of 18th April, 2000

<sup>3</sup> Judgement of Mr. Justice Quirke delivered on 23rd June, 2000 Ref: 1999 No. 493SpCt5

**5.5** The respondent stated that the Selection Committee set down eight criteria on which each of the eight (three females and five males) applicants interviewed were assessed.

These criteria were as follows:

- Management training and skills
- Understanding the position
- Management experience
- Record of contribution to school and generosity with time
- Understanding of school/Christian Brother ethos
- Ability at problem resolution
- Any perceived weaknesses
- Overall impression - is the person fit for the school

At the hearing of this claim the respondent indicated that it had asked each of the applicants the same eleven questions. Subsequent to the hearing the respondent submitted to me a copy of the notes made by the Chairman of the Selection Committee outlining, according to itself, the twelve questions which were put to the applicants at interview. I note that the notes provided contained a list of topics as opposed to definite questions and there were eleven, as opposed to twelve, topics listed as follows:

- Management of pupils (encourage and discipline)
- Management of teachers (work together, recruitment)
- Management of the school (finance)
- Dealing with parents
- School profile/recruitment
- School development
- Commitment outside hours
- Flexibility
- Supervision and management of the school/pupils
- Appreciate lack of resources
- School ethos

**5.6** According to the respondent there was a total of eleven (three female and eight male) applicants for the position of Deputy Principal. All of the female applicants and five of the male applicants were called for interview. According to the respondent the Selection Committee did not use a marking scheme. Each of the applicants were asked the same questions and they were assessed on the basis of the eight criteria set by the Selection Committee and set out in paragraph 5.5 above. Set out in Appendix B are details of how the Selection Committee assessed each of the eight candidates

interviewed. Overall the successful candidate received a more favourable assessment than any of the other seven candidates. In relation to the claimant's assessment the Selection Committee noted that when asked about her management training and skills the claimant pointed to these skills in terms of her role as a mother. At the hearing of this claim the claimant concurred with the respondent that, at the interview, she had mentioned that her management and training skills had stemmed from the fact of her being a mother. The respondent said that it was unable to assess the claimant's management training and skills on the basis of this response because it would have been unfair to the other candidates and it would have been discriminatory to have asked each of the other candidates if they were in the role of a mother or a father. The respondent was critical of the claimant's response and said that she should have been able to respond to the question by giving work examples.

**5.7** At the end of the claimant's interview the respondent says that the Selection Committee asked the claimant why she should be offered the position and, according to the respondent, the claimant asked if the Selection Committee would like her to sing a song. The claimant contradicted the respondent's version of this incident and said that at the end of her interview the Selection Committee asked her if she wished to say anything else and, according to the claimant, she said '*No, unless you want me to sing a song*'. Whichever version is correct I am satisfied that the remark was flippant and not appropriate in the context of an interview for the post of Deputy Principal. I consider it understandable that the Selection Committee drew the conclusion that the claimant was not a serious candidate for the position, even though the claimant may not have wished or intended to give that impression.

**5.8** The claimant did argue that the respondent, in a letter to the former Employment Equality Agency (now the Equality Authority), stated that "*The sole criterion for the appointment was suitability in accordance with Department of Education guidelines*". Two versions of this letter dated 3rd July, 1998 were submitted, the first of which was signed by the Chairman of the Board of Management. The second, which was not signed by him, held that "*The sole criterion for the appointment was suitability*". From the information submitted by the claimant I note that there is a letter from the Department of Education to her which states "*The appointment of a Deputy Principal*

*in a secondary school is a matter for the school authorities of the school concerned. The procedures for appointment are set out in Circular 4/98.*” As part of this Circular the Department has attached a specimen contract for Deputy Principals and has set out, as a schedule to this specimen contract, a non-exhaustive list of the specific professional duties, responsibility for which may be delegated, in whole or in part, to Deputy Principals. At no stage in this circular is an onus put on a school to use these specific duties as the basis for the criteria which it would develop for the purpose of assessing the suitability of candidates for the position of Deputy Principal. I am satisfied that the Selection Committee was entitled to develop its own selection criteria and I note that each of the candidates interviewed in this case were assessed on the basis of the same eight criteria.

- 5.9** Having examined the applications for the position of Deputy Principal and the interview notes I am satisfied that there were a number of candidates, both male and female, that the Selection Committee assessed to be better able for the post than the claimant. On this basis I am satisfied that the respondent did not discriminate against the claimant in relation to her application for the post of Deputy Principal of Waterpark College.
- 5.10** In her submission the claimant outlined a number of incidents which she alleged were of a discriminatory nature. These incidents were not related to this competition for appointment to the position of Deputy Principal. Therefore, I do not consider it necessary or appropriate to spell out the detail of these incidents. However I note that the respondent organisation has, presently and also over a number of years, a higher proportion of males to females among its teaching staff. In 1993/1994 there were 17 permanent teachers in the respondent organisation of which 14 were male and 3 were female. This changed in 1998/1999 when there were 22 permanent teachers employed of which 15 were male and 7 were female. At the time of the interviews for the post of Deputy Principal the numbers of serving permanent teachers was the same as in 1998/1999. Having regard to the imbalance of male to female teachers in the respondent organisation the respondent should strive to ensure that fair procedures operate within its organisation and that the female staff (who are in the minority) are treated in a similar manner to the male staff (who are in the majority).

**6. RECOMMENDATION**

**6.1** In view of my conclusions above I find that the Board of Management of Waterpark College did not discriminate against Ms. Frances F. Jackson in terms of Section 2(a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 and contrary to the provisions of Section 3 of that Act when it did not appoint her to the position of Deputy Principal of Waterpark College.

**6.2** The respondent failed to submit to me a copy of its Equal Opportunities Policy as the Chairman of the Board of Management of the College was unable to confirm whether the College had such a policy. I, therefore, recommend that the respondent put in place an Equal Opportunities Policy and suggest that it seeks the assistance of the Equality Authority in this regard.

---

Gerardine Coyle  
Equality Officer

23rd August, 2000

**APPENDIX A**

Extract from  
the claimant's submission

**THE ATTRIBUTES AND EXPERIENCE WHICH HAVE EQUIPPED  
THE CLAIMANT TO BE THE MORE EXPERIENCED AND  
MORE QUALIFIED CANDIDATE FOR THE  
POSITION OF DEPUTY PRINCIPAL  
OF WATERPARK COLLEGE**

1. I have far greater experience within the school system with years hands-on training in school management, especially in Tutor Significant skills as outlined by Luke Monahan, S.M. and aspired to by the school in its Charter of Excellence. Such skills have been identified by Professor John Coolahan as helping to improve '*the quality of learning and living environments for school communities in contemporary Ireland*'.
2. This experience and ethos translates itself into far greater relational skills. I have far greater rapport with the students and staff. Mr. Carberry represents the more traditional authoritarian mode. He appears to equate respect with aloofness and unquestioning obedience. He rarely if ever socialises with the staff. Such a demeanour is counterproductive with weak students. It is a testament to the effectiveness of my attitude and greater interpersonal skills that I am constantly assigned all the weaker students and Mr. Carberry is never deployed to the weak stream.
3. Because of my better leadership skills I was ordered to take over the Religious Education Department when the Christian Brothers withdrew from the school. It was a daunting task, with no text. An apathetic, even hostile student body but because I am able to inspire, enthuse and energise my students I transformed this department into vibrant interested classes, who were ready for extra religion classes in their own time and in holiday time. A group of 16 year olds eventually accompanied to a Bible Course run by the MSCs in Grace Dieu Retreat House on Thursday nights from 7.30p.m. to 9.30p.m.
4. As well as having more experience, better interpersonal skills, greater leadership skills I also have an experiential understanding of the pedagogy of education. When I could not attend the staff in-service day because I broke my leg I drew up a written submission to the staff, where I outlined my vision of motivating the student (especially the weak student) by letting them experience excellence in their work. The Principal used my submission and my work programme for the weak 1.14s as the basis of his paper to the Conference vision and managerial progressiveness and his speech was quoted in the report on this conference and circulated to schools. Consequently Waterpark was asked to participate in an international E.U. programme with Belgium and Northern Ireland. Waterpark was the most dynamic component of this ISIS project largely due to my vision, energy and commitment; qualities which were remarked on by Brother Kent, CBS promoter of the project and in recognition of the quality of my dedication the Board of Management presented me with a voucher for dinner for 2. The

Principal confirmed that without my input there would have been no project. My vision has been recognised by other parties in the wider debate on education and I am regularly asked to appear on panels on National and local radio and to contribute to the media.

5. I am more versatile. I can be deployed in almost any capacity within the school structure. I have taught Irish, Geography, German, Art, R.E., English, History, Maths and P.E. When the Christian Brothers withdrew, the school relied on my versatility to step into the R.E. Department, which I did successfully. When the Art teacher retired the school turned to me to take on the new Junior Certificate Art. The Principal asked me as *'the only person on the staff who could possibly turn their hand to it'*. This I also made a success of despite the most adverse conditions and minimal support. When Brother O'Connor broke his leg it was to me the Principal turned to devise innovative solutions to provide for the Honours Leaving Certificate Maths. Similarly when Tadhg Galvin left the Leaving Certificate Maths class I was asked to step in and help save the day.
6. I am more innovative and creative. I pioneered class tours, Christmas parties, the idea of using Kilbarry, the poetry corner, the award system and peer mentoring. I submitted a paper to the Board of Management in applying for my post in 1989 on the value of and the logistics of setting up a student council. I set up the school magazine which Peter Grogan brought out and I was highly praised for the production of the Waterpark Supplement in the Munster Express. I have been commended for the level and quality of project work I inspire the students to produce. For the Waterpark centenary I produced the Centenary Concert which was so successful without any input or help except for Mr. Keegan's choir and the Junior School. I was also asked to take responsibility for festooning the school for the occasion.
7. I am a more experienced and more effective Youth leader. I have been involved with setting up youth groups and workshops for youth groups on a local and national level and my work has been highly commended by as diverse agencies as the Bishop, the Diocesan advisors and Le Cheile. I have taken off groups of Waterpark students to Youth Festivals all over the country in my own time and set up after school meetings.

**APPENDIX B**

Summary of the Assessment of  
each of the candidates by the  
Selection Committee

Candidate 1 - Female

Qualifications: Pass Degree and H.Dip Ed (Hons)

Assessment by the Selection Committee:

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Management Training and Skills                            | <b>NONE</b>   |
| 2. | Understanding the position                                | <b>POOR</b>   |
| 3. | Management Experience                                     | <b>LITTLE</b>   |
| 4. | Record of contributing to School and generosity with time | <b>REASONABLE</b>   |
| 5. | Understanding of School/ Christian Brother ethos          | <b>POOR</b>   |
| 6. | Ability at Problem Solving                                | <b>POOR</b>   |
| 7. | Any perceived weaknesses                                  | <b>Lack of experience. Poor insight into the nature of the job.</b> |
| 8. | Overall impression - is the person fit for the school?    | <b>NOT READY</b>  |

---

Candidate 2 - Male

Qualifications: Pass B.Sc Degree and H.Dip Ed (Pass)

Assessment by the Selection Committee:

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Management Training and Skills                            | <b>SOME</b>   |
| 2. | Understanding the position                                | <b>FAIR</b>   |
| 3. | Management Experience                                     | <b>LIMITED</b>  |
| 4. | Record of contributing to School and generosity with time | <b>LIMITED</b>  |
| 5. | Understanding of School/ Christian Brother ethos          | <b>LIMITED</b>  |
| 6. | Ability at Problem Solving                                | <b>POOR</b>   |
| 7. | Any perceived weaknesses                                  | <b>Lack of creativity to approach and too rigid.</b>  |
| 8. | Overall impression - is the person fit for the school?    | <b>GOOD COMMUNICATOR<br/>QUESTIONABLE SUITABILITY</b> |

Candidate 3 - Female (Claimant)

Qualifications: Pass B.A. with Distinction and H.Dip Ed (Hons)

Assessment by the Selection Committee:

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | Management Training and Skills                            | <b>MOTHER</b>  |
| 2. | Understanding the position                                | <b>GOOD</b>  |
| 3. | Management Experience                                     | <b>“A” POST IN THE PAST</b>                                      |
| 4. | Record of contributing to School and generosity with time | <b>REASONABLE/GOOD</b>   |
| 5. | Understanding of School/ Christian Brother ethos          | <b>POOR</b>  |
| 6. | Ability at Problem Solving                                | <b>Unpredictable/not willing to exercise authority</b>           |
| 7. | Any perceived weaknesses                                  | <b>Not a serious candidate - Not fully committed to the post</b> |
| 8. | Overall impression - is the person fit for the school?    | <b>DITTO</b>   |
- 

Candidate 4 - Male (Successful Candidate)

Qualifications: B.A. 2.1 Hons, H.Dip Ed (Pass) and Dip in Computer Studies

Assessment by the Selection Committee:

- |    |   |                         |
|----|---|-------------------------|
| 1. | Management Training and Skills                            | <b>FINANCIAL SKILLS</b> |
| 2. | Understanding the position                                | <b>GOOD (very)</b>      |
| 3. | Management Experience                                     | <b>PLENTY</b>           |
| 4. | Record of contributing to School and generosity with time | <b>EXCELLENT</b>        |
| 5. | Understanding of School/ Christian Brother ethos          | <b>AVERAGE</b>          |
| 6. | Ability at Problem Solving                                | <b>GOOD</b>             |
| 7. | Any perceived weaknesses                                  | <b>Nothing Specific</b> |
| 8. | Overall impression - is the person fit for the school?    | <b>VERY GOOD</b>        |

Candidate 5 - Female

Qualifications: Pass B.A. Degree, H.Dip Ed (Pass) and H. Dip in Counselling

Assessment by the Selection Committee:

1.	Management Training and Skills	<b>PEOPLE SKILLS</b>
2.	Understanding the position	<b>GOOD</b>
3.	Management Experience	<b>Curricular and Organisation Management Experience (mainly)</b>
4.	Record of contributing to School and generosity with time	<b>GOOD</b>
5.	Understanding of School/ Christian Brother ethos	<b>REASONABLE</b>
6.	Ability at Problem Solving	<b>GOOD</b>
7.	Any perceived weaknesses	<b>Lack of administration experience Too early</b>
8.	Overall impression - is the person fit for the school?	<b>FAVOURABLE</b>

---

Candidate 6 - Male

Qualifications: B.A. and H.Dip Ed.

Assessment by the Selection Committee:

1.	Management Training and Skills	<b>NONE</b>
2.	Understanding the position	<b>LIMITED - Supervision mainly</b>
3.	Management Experience	<b>LIMITED</b>
4.	Record of contributing to School and generosity with time	<b>REASONABLE but would not be found wanting</b>
5.	Understanding of School/ Christian Brother ethos	<b>Discipline and Academic Results</b>
6.	Ability at Problem Solving	<b>Not fully committed to management role</b>
7.	Any perceived weaknesses	<b>Ditto. Difficult to assess because did not sell himself fully</b>
8.	Overall impression - is the person fit for the school?	<b>DITTO</b>

Candidate 7 - Male

Qualifications: B.A., H.Dip Ed and D. Ed Management

Assessment by the Selection Committee:

1.	Management Training and Skills	<b>PLENTY</b>
2.	Understanding the position	<b>GOOD</b>
3.	Management Experience	<b>REASONABLE</b>
4.	Record of contributing to School and generosity with time	<b>GOOD</b>
5.	Understanding of School/ Christian Brother ethos	<b>GOOD</b>
6.	Ability at Problem Solving	<b>GOOD</b>
7.	Any perceived weaknesses	<b>Lack of in-school management role</b>
8.	Overall impression - is the person fit for the school?	<b>GOOD CANDIDATE</b>

Candidate 8 - Male

Qualifications: B.A. (Pass & Hons), M.A. Hons (2.1) H.Dip Ed (Hons) and H. Dip Ed Admin (Hons)

Assessment by the Selection Committee:

1.	Management Training and Skills	<b>PLENTY</b>
2.	Understanding the position	<b>GOOD</b>
3.	Management Experience	<b>Very Limited - Transition Year and Board of Management</b>
4.	Record of contributing to School and generosity with time	<b>DEBATING Only</b>
5.	Understanding of School/ Christian Brother ethos	<b>GOOD UNDERSTANDING</b>
6.	Ability at Problem Solving	<b>O.K.</b>
7.	Any perceived weaknesses	<b>Glib and Lack of in-school management experience.</b>
8.	Overall impression - is the person fit for the school?	<b>Organised and Effective Individual but would he measure up - have reservations.</b>