

## **Guidance note: reviewing nominations and interviewing nominees**

This document is intended to provide guidance for those reviewing nominations received for Society positions on boards, committees and panels, (hereafter referred to as committees), and those interviewing any nominees for such roles.

The guidance provided is not exhaustive but is intended to prompt discussion and consideration around the diversity of Society decision makers, addressing feedback from our community on the current lack of representation in many areas of our work and delivering on our strategic commitment to place EDI considerations at the heart of all that we do. This approach also supports a consistent and transparent process across all committees and areas of Society operations.

Reviewers and interviewers are reminded that all committee roles are voluntary positions. Volunteers can bring new opinions, ideas and approaches, and will act as advocates for the Society within their own communities.

### **Selecting reviewers and interviewers (hereafter referred to as reviewers):**

- It is important that reviewers understand the full scope of the role and the levels of experience/expertise required to perform it well;
- Reviewers should understand how the respective committee functions, its current make-up and skillset and how its work supports the delivery of Society strategy and key charitable objectives;
- Where possible reviewers should represent diverse perspectives to help avoid shared biases and encourage broader and more inclusive thinking about who is being invited to join a committee.

### **Prompts/questions to consider:**

- Does the nominee have the required skills/experience to perform the role effectively? Do these complement those already in place on the committee?
- What is the nominee's motivation/interest in volunteering for the Society and in this specific role?
- Do they bring a unique perspective?
- How could they help the committee to adapt and improve?

### **Selecting candidates for appointment:**

- Reviewers should rank all nominees in order of preference, noting those that are considered appointable and those that are not, with feedback on their nominations/interviews and areas they may wish to reflect on for the future, (a form is provided for this purpose as Appendix I);
- Reviewers are reminded that the Society places EDI at the heart of its activities. Protected characteristics<sup>1</sup> and other personal attributes, such as geographical location, should not disadvantage or advantage any one nominee over any other, unless specifically related to the role requirements;
- The completed table and any accompanying feedback from reviewers will be provided to the Nominations Panel for their review and final decision on appointment.

### **Further reading:**

- [NCVO guidance on involving volunteers in an organisation](#)
- [Charity Commission guidance on recruiting and managing volunteers](#)

---

<sup>1</sup> \*Protected Characteristics as covered in the Equality Act 2010 are age, gender reassignment, being married or in a civil partnership, being pregnant or on maternity leave, disability, race including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

## Appendix I: Nominee feedback form

<b>Role available</b>		<b>Reviewers/Interviewers</b>	
-----------------------	--	-------------------------------	--

Please fill out this feedback form during the review of submitted nominations and/or interviews with relevant feedback for each nominee and your final recommendation to the Nominations Panel on which nominations you feel should be progressed. Nominees should be ranked in the table below (starting with your 1<sup>st</sup> choice – please expand the form as necessary to include all nominees reviewed/interviewed for any one role). Please note feedback provided will be shared with nominees upon their request.

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Nominee Number/Name</b>	<b>Nominee Feedback</b>	<b>Do you consider this nominee appointable? (even if they are not your 1<sup>st</sup> choice)</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	e.g. Applicant 01 or John Bloggs	John has demonstrable experience in the required areas and their particular skills in ABC will complement the current make-up of the committee etc.  In future, John may like to provide more examples of their experience in ABC...	Yes / No
<b>2<sup>nd</sup></b>			
<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>			
<b>4<sup>th</sup></b>			