

**SKewed SELECTION**

Absent any proof the candidate is unable to perform the posted essential job functions, candidates are automatically excluded if a "key word" search of their resume bears no fruit.

**MODERN SLAVERY**

Employees are not "human beings." Instead, employees exist as "human capital," with at-will employment used to constrict company loyalty and career longevity to the privileged few.

**ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

The "good-ole-boys" love to have women in Human Resources, because HR is the best place to "dump" women in senior level positions that ultimately have no "financial control or power."

**GLASS CEILING FOREVER**

**FACT:** Women and minorities have always made less than White males who perform the same job, and they always will; and HR manages the perpetuity of this inequity.

**Attention candidates,  
"You are not welcome!"**

HR directors complain about being inadequately staffed, but such arguments frequently demonstrate poor management and a failure to adapt technology to achieve strategic business unit objectives. Instead of validating if a candidate can actually perform the posted essential job functions (the work), too many employers conduct psychological assessments that have absolutely nothing to do with the performance of the essential job functions. Likewise, there's absolutely no correlation between requiring pseudo-HR credentials (PHR, SPHR, etc.) and achieving specific corporate financial

How can you hire the best if you don't validate before hire that the candidate is the best?

-- John Doe  
Seminar  
Instructor

objectives and realizing sustainable upswings in organizational productivity.

As demonstrated by Steve Jobs, Jack Welch, Lee Iacocca and many others, the "human" ability to create and inspire does not languish in an ERP, HRIS or applicant tracking system. Nevertheless, too many "HR people" stick human sardines into a database of *human capital mediocrity*. Why did you kill the "human" in Human Resources? Join us HR pros, and we'll provide you with viable solutions to put the "human" back into your human resources. You should and can do better!

The only meaningful salary survey is the one you don't pay for!

-- John Doe  
Seminar  
Instructor

Please allow at least forty-five (45) minutes for presentation with a fifteen (15) minute question and answer period.

REYNOS CONSULTING  
REYNOS.COM  
P.O. BOX 412  
CRETE, NEBRASKA 68333  
402-418-8424

Far too many disgruntled candidates and employees say,

**"HR Sucks!"**

**WHY DID YOU  
KILL THE  
HUMAN  
IN  
HUMAN  
RESOURCES?**



Candidates apply and I'm not required to provide any feedback, and I don't. I'm not required to interview "qualified" candidates, including so-called "diversity" candidates, and I don't. It's "at will" employment, so I can fire employees whenever I want, and I do.

Ha

Ha

But my employees better be "loyal" to me!



# WHAT HAPPENED TO THE "HUMAN" ELEMENT IN HR?

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO ACTUALLY MEETING WITH AND TALKING TO CANDIDATES?

## Seriously, never contact HR by phone, mail, or email !!!

The standard practice for most employers is to use online applicant processing and tracking systems, and "keyword" searches, to filter out candidates; but without first validating whether or not the candidate can perform the actual essential job functions at a standard level of performance that reconciles with current work performed by actual employees.

Even worse, many employers use "bait and switch" tactics by posting the essential job functions to attract candidates but instead of using the essential job functions and job standards to conduct selection assessments (in compliance with the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection), employers use personality preference and psychological testing which have *not* been vetted against the actual job opening and that never reference any of the essential job functions - in an attempt to assess and predict the so-called "mental frame of mind and well being" of a candidate.

Some employers believe applicant processing and tracking systems and "keyword" searches are necessary in order to effectively manage the volume of applications received for positions; but such assessments are primarily an indication of inept managers and poorly managed recruitment and selection programs.

**THE PROBLEM** - Employers want candidates and employees to "feel" committed to their organizations while concurrently telling candidates and employees: (1) don't walk-in, don't show-up uninvited, don't call us, we'll call you - maybe; (2) that job security in our "at-will" environment is non-existent; and (3) you "worker-bees" are a dime-a-dozen, which is why we only give top consideration to the highest-compensated ("Top 1%") of our existing or potential workforce or owners.

Employers can change this extremely negative dynamic by treating candidates and employees humanely, by conducting recruitment and selection campaigns that actually identify, measure, validate, and reward expertise and merit. The solution provided by this seminar is how to use technology to: (1) more accurately identify and validate the work-related proficiencies of candidates and employees; and (2) to put "humanity" back into an industry, back into a *profession that should be about people*.

Join us HR pros, and we'll provide you with viable solutions to put the "human" back into your human resources!

*Come and meet your "ideal" employee, John Doe!*

Hello!  
I'm John Doe!

John Doe?? Really?  
Absolutely. Why? For many, if not most employers, the "ideal"



employee must be bereft of any identity or personality, an automaton. The "ideal" employee must be astute enough to avoid having any political affiliations or risk being perceived as a political liability; astute enough to avoid having any cultural identity or risk being perceived as too "culturally sensitive" (translation: too Black, too Latino, too "ethnic," and too feminist, too pro-or-con immigration, abortion, etc.); and the "ideal" employee must be a "good match" for your organization. Unfortunately, since the "glass ceiling" remains a bastion for white males, a "good match" can rarely be a woman or minority, or only a token at best. Plus, and equally important, to reflect the current social landscape, the "ideal" employee must be overweight or obese, as are seventy-five percent of U.S. adults. In summary, despite so many laws to prompt social change, so very, very little has changed. In fact, the clear majority of HR departments don't even conduct walk-in interviews anymore, because ironically, *face-to-face contact with actual "human beings" is the very last thing HR departments want.*

Why have HR departments played a key role in maintaining the status quo? The easy answer, acting in compliance with employment law is much less of a concern than an employer's unilateral enforcement of "at-will" employment. So, is it disingenuous for an employer to aggressively "promote" pseudo-emotional commitments such as company loyalty while intentionally eliminating staff bereft of any emotion via reductions-in-force and other "at-will" actions? Oh, it's business as usual, right?

The Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection enable employers to validate the skills, knowledge, and proficiencies of candidates before hire. Unfortunately, the clear majority of employers refuse to validate candidate skills prior to hire.

WHY?

Why is HR so scared to be fair?  
Scared to comply with the law?

The at-will doctrine between employer and employee is completely unemotional. However, many hypocritical employers use emotion-based pre-employment psychological tests to determine the mental state of candidates but without any assessment against the posted essential job functions.

WHY?

Why does HR whine about its failure to perform?

Women do not exist in the majority of senior level positions even in industries heavily populated by women, such as health care and K-12 public education. However, to appear in compliance with AA/EEO, the general work-around for the past 25 years is to dump women in HR and to have women manage women.

WHY?

Why does organizational performance suffer at the hands of HR?

As defined by the "at-will" doctrine, the relationship between employer and employee is completely unemotional. However, employers use pre-employment psychological tests to determine the mental "fitness" state of employees.