

CDP QUALIFICATIONS REVIEW BOARD ACTION
DISAPPROVED

Agency: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

On May 1, 2018, the Qualifications Review Board (QRB) disapproved the CDP QRB case submitted. The board found that [the candidate] did not demonstrate sufficient depth and breadth of experience in the ECQs that would indicate executive leadership. Below are comments and recommendations from the QRB:

General Comments

- The board members examined the candidate's résumé, IDP, ECQ narrative, and mentor evaluations.
- The board felt the narrative was difficult to follow.
- The board felt the candidate provided too much context in his examples. He/she did not speak to actions and results that were clearly and directly related to him/her.
- The board felt the actions cited by the candidate were not executive level.
- The board felt the breadth of candidate's experience was very limited.

Leading Change

- Some of the actions did not appear to be executive level, e.g., led monthly conference calls.
- The board did not understand how the second example was relevant to leading change. Neither example was a particularly strong example of leading change.
- The board felt the Creativity/Innovation, External Awareness, Flexibility, and Vision competencies were not sufficiently addressed.

Leading People

- The board felt there was no substantive discussion of leveraging diversity or team building.
- It wasn't clear how team unity was built during Labor and Employee Relations training. It appears only management attended the training.
- The candidate did not provide a substantive example of the diversity of his/her team or how he/she leveraged diversity to achieve the mission and vision of the organization.

Results Driven

- The board felt the Accountability, Customer Service, Decisiveness, and Entrepreneurship competencies were not sufficiently addressed.
- The candidate provided too much context.
- Some of the actions did not appear to be executive level, e.g., prepared a schedule with milestones.
- The candidate indicates that he/she held the division accountable, but didn't clearly explain how.
- The candidate also provided that he/she addressed an issue from a customer service perspective, but there was little evidence to demonstrate how he/she anticipated and met the needs of internal and external customers. It was also unclear how responding to IG allegations demonstrated the delivery of high-quality products and services or a commitment to continuous improvement.

Business Acumen

- The board members found the narrative difficult to follow.
- Some actions did not appear to be executive level, e.g., initiated and implemented electronic routing system for documents.
- The candidate used buzzwords, but the substance to demonstrate the competencies was missing.
- The board recommended that the candidate clearly identify the challenge he/she faced, his/her specific actions to address the challenge, and the results of those actions.
- The board felt that none of the competencies were sufficiently addressed.

Building Coalitions

- The narrative was heavy on context with limited discussion of the candidate's actions. The "How" was missing from the narrative.
- The candidate spoke to securing funding but not building a coalition in the second example.
- Some of the actions discussed did not appear to be executive level, e.g., led weekly conference calls.
- The board members felt the three competencies, Partnering, Political Savvy, and Influencing/Negotiating were vaguely addressed.
- The narrative lacked specifics. For example, the candidate indicated that he/she had to be aware of partners' political differences, but didn't explain why this was significant or if the differences lead to changes in his/her approach.

Note: The agency has the options of: (1) revising this case based on the QRB feedback; or (2) resubmitting this case as is.

When this case is resubmitted, regardless of which option is chosen, it will be reviewed by a brand new QRB in its entirety.

Whichever option is selected, please create a new QRB request record in the Executive and Schedule C System and submit as a new case. Please note the disapproval date on this transmittal slip. **A new case should be submitted within 60 working days of receipt of this report.**