

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

HANDBOOK

FOR SCREENING/INTERVIEWING COMMITTEES¹
GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 12

1 INTRODUCTION

2

1 Attachment 3 – Affirmative Action and Staff Diversity Plan

2
3 This plan, adopted by The Board of Trustees on April 28, 1994, and Policy Manual
4 Section 3.02, which provides for equal employment opportunity, demonstrate the
5 commitment of the College District "to equal employment and staff diversity through the
6 College District's affirmative action program activities." (Attachment 3, Page 3)²

7
8 PROCEDURE

9
10 I. REQUESTING THE POSITION

11
12 The hiring process starts when a department requests a new position or requests
13 to fill a vacant position. The department should make the request as early as
14 possible in the college year to permit a meaningful search process if the request is
15 granted. (Attachment 1, Pages 2, 4-5 and 7)

16
17 II. FORMING THE SCREENING AND INTERVIEWING COMMITTEE

18
19 The department forms the Screening/Interviewing Committee under procedures
20 monitored by the Academic Senate. (Attachment 1, Pages 2-3)

21
22 A. Eligibility for Membership

23
24 The composition of the Committee is designed to foster greater diversity.
25 To achieve this goal and to satisfy the guidelines of the Faculty Hiring
26 Procedures, departmental procedures for forming Committees should allow
27 ample time to identify persons eligible to serve. (Attachment 1, Page 3)

28
29 B. Certification by Committee Members

30
31 Members of Screening/Interviewing Committees for academic positions
32 are agents of the Board of Trustees. By law, they are subject to all laws
33 and regulations related to the review of applicants. As a condition of
34 serving on a Committee, potential members must certify that they will
35 maintain the confidentiality of the process and release information
36 regarding their participation to proper College District representatives. In
37 any given screening process, the College District may monitor the
38 documentation related to Committee activities as needed to ensure
39 Committee compliance with College District procedural and substantive
40 requirements. Should a challenge to the process occur, Committee
41 members might also be required to provide information to the Union or
42 third parties. (Attachment 4, Certification by Committee Member)

43

²"Equal employment opportunity" means that all qualified individuals have a full and fair opportunity to compete for hiring and promotion and to enjoy the benefits of employment with the District." (5 CCR §53001(d).)

1 III. PREPARING THE JOB ANALYSIS AND ANNOUNCEMENT

2
3 The aims, goals and legal responsibilities of Screening Committee members will
4 be addressed at an orientation meeting with the appropriate Vice Chancellor (or
5 designee), the Affirmative Action Officer (or designee), and the Director of
6 Employee Relations (or designee). All employment decisions, including decisions
7 related to the screening and interviewing of applicants for employment, must be
8 based on job-related considerations. Before a search process commences, the
9 Search Committee must conduct a job analysis.³ On the basis of this job analysis,
10 job specifications setting forth the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to job
11 performance can be prepared for the job announcement.

12
13 While the job analysis will identify qualifications necessary for performance in a
14 specific area, the District and AFT 2121 have agreed that certain criteria are
15 related to all faculty assignments and must be considered in each
16 screening/interviewing process. These Article 12, Upgrading, criteria are "job
17 performance," "credentials," "training," "experience in the field," "special job-related
18 skills," "affirmative action status," as explained in Section G below, "District needs,"
19 and "seniority" as relevant under specified circumstances. Article 12, Upgrading,
20 grants "first consideration" or preference rights to candidates who at the start of the
21 interview period are academic employees of the College District and who are at
22 least equal in qualifications to candidates from outside the District. Article 12,
23 Upgrading, includes an exception to first consideration in accord with the
24 affirmative action goals under law and District policy, i.e., that preference for
25 candidates whose hire would further the goals and timetables of the AAP takes
26 precedence over preference for current College District academic employees with
27 equal qualifications. Under Article 12, Upgrading, "length of service" in the College
28 District represents a job-related factor, and this factor is included in the job
29 announcement.⁴
30

31 IV. SCREENING APPLICATION MATERIALS

32 The Screening/Interviewing Committee reviews applications prior to the Committee
33 interview and eliminates from further consideration applicants who either do not
34 meet the advertised minimum qualifications or who are manifestly not competitive
35 in terms of the job-related qualifications and experience of other members of the
36 applicant pool. The assessment of the Article 12, Upgrading, criteria made at the
37 screening stage should become part of the aggregate assessment of each
38 candidate who is interviewed. The Committee should not recommend candidates
39 to the Chancellor solely on a positive assessment of performance at one stage of

³The Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection describes the job analysis phase: "There should be a review of job information to determine measures of work behavior(s) or performance that are relevant to the job or group of jobs in question. These measures or criteria are relevant to the extent that they represent critical or important job duties, work behaviors or work outcomes as developed from the review of job information."

⁴Title 5, Section 53024(d) provides: "Seniority or length of service may be taken into consideration only to the extent it is job related, is not the sole criterion, and is included in the job announcement consistent with the requirements of Section 53022." Based on the foregoing, the job announcement specifies: "Length of service with the College as an academic employee may be taken into consideration in the College's evaluation of applicants."

1 the process, such as the interview; rather the Committee should recommend
2 candidates on the basis of a score that incorporates assessment at each stage of
3 the process.
4

5 A. Minimum Requirements for Hire

6 When applications are received, they must be assessed initially to
7 determine if the applicant is minimally qualified for the position. To the
8 extent that any MINIMUM requirement(s) have been identified for the
9 position (e.g., state-awarded credentials, minimum qualifications or
10 equivalencies, or other basic requirements necessary to job performance),
11 applicants who do not satisfy these minimum requirements may not be
12 considered for employment.
13

14 The establishment and operation of the Equivalency Committee is vital to
15 ensure that only qualified applicants are continued in the hiring process.
16 (Attachment 1, Page 5) Applicants who do not satisfy the advertised
17 minimum qualifications or the equivalencies are not eligible for interviews.
18 Similarly, applicants who do not submit all required application materials
19 must not be considered. Conversely, there is no requirement that all
20 persons who satisfy only the minimum requirements be interviewed. The

1 "seniority" as relevant under specified circumstances. Committees may
2 consider additional criteria **IF** those additional criteria are related to the job,
3 have been included in the advertised job announcement, and specifically
4 relate to the criteria of Article 12, Upgrading.

5

6 D. Assessing "Job Performance"

7

8 As noted above, one of the Article 12, Upgrading, criteria is "job
9 performance." Information on applicant "job performance" may be obtained
10 by asking (on the printed job announcement) for letters of reference that
11 comment specifically on job performance in similar or related areas of
12 responsibility and/or copies of formal evaluations of an applicant's prior

1 CHALLENGE COULD OVERTURN THE DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE.

2
3 To reduce the potential for challenges, each Committee should be certain that it
4 can document NOT ONLY that it assessed each candidate by the required criteria,
5 but that it did so properly and reasonably.

6
7 A. Article 12, Upgrading, Criteria

8
9 A challenge that the Article 12, Upgrading, criteria were not used can be
10 defended by demonstrating that the Committee used the criteria properly.
11 The Committee must be prepared to demonstrate how each criterion was
12 assessed within its own process. It has been agreed by College District and
13 AFT representatives that the sample questions presented on Attachment 5
14 to this Handbook address the specified criteria. Committees are not
15 required to ask the questions included in Attachment 5, but they are urged
16 to review them before developing their own questions. Whether these
17 questions or others are used to assess the Article 12, Upgrading, criteria,
18 interview questions and model answers to those questions should be
19 prepared in advance.

20
21 B. Proper Article 12, Upgrading, Assessments

22
23 A challenge to the proper assessment of Article 12, Upgrading, criteria may
24 require an assessment of the consistency of each Committee member's
25 review. To ensure that the screening/interviewing process can withstand a
26 challenge to the proper assessment of the Article 12, Upgrading, criteria,
27 each Committee should define its expectations in advance. In addition to
28 agreement on the criteria for evaluation of candidates, all candidates should
29 be asked the same questions and be required to perform similar
30 demonstration tasks. (Attachment 1, Page 6) Follow-up questions are
31 permissible as necessary to ensure complete answers.

32
33 C. Using Ratings and Narratives

34
35 Once the Screening/Interviewing Committee devises a rating system, it
36 should be followed by all members. For example, if a 0-5 scale is used,
37 Committee members should not rate candidates as "-1" or "5.5." Also, the
38 rating system should be structured to reflect the assessments of candidates
39 at each stage of the process. The Committee may decide to use percents
40 or other numeric scores, and the Committee may assign different values to
41 weights to different questions or criteria. Individual members of the
42 Committee should support their ratings with narrative statements. The
43 ratings and the supporting narrative must be consistent. For example, a
44 rating of "100" as the top possible score would be suspect if the narrative
45 identified defects in the response. Conversely, a low rating with a narrative
46 which identifies no defects would be equally difficult to explain. The scores
47 given to each candidate on each question or interview task should
48 represent the independent judgment of the Committee member. Before

1 individual scores are combined into a group score or average, the
2 Committee members should check their own addition, using a calculator, if
3 possible.

4

5 D. Rating Consistency

6

7 If two candidates receive identical ratings related to subject matter
8 expertise, but the narratives supporting the ratings are inconsistent (e.g.,
9 "comprehensive answer provided" v. "answered superficially but with
10 enthusiasm"), the question of proper assessment could be raised.
11 (Attachment 6 includes sample statements supporting ratings.)

12

13 E. Identifying the Most Qualified Candidates

14

15 After interviewing and rating candidates on each question and/or on a
16 teaching/professional demonstration, the Committee shall consider the
17 candidates' relative qualifications first. Following confirmation of individual
18 candidate scores, an aggregate score is calculated to determine the overall
19 relative ranking of the candidates. The aggregate score should include
ratings made at each stage of the hiring process.

1 F. Reference Checking and Evaluations

2
3 "Reference checks will be conducted by members of the Screening/
4 Interviewing Committee (typically the Chair) on the top three or four ranked
5 candidates. The committee shall utilize the form(s) developed by the
6 Department of Human Resources for this purpose. After these checks
7 have been made, the Committee should meet to discuss results, and may
8 vote to rank the top candidates again." "The job announcement will inform
9 the candidates that if they are in the top-ranked group of candidates their
10 references and current and former employers will be checked."
11 (Attachment 1, Pages 6 and 4)

12
13 If the job announcement so provides, the committee may request and
14 review the job evaluations of candidates.

15
16 G. Process After Reference Checking

17
18 As indicated in Section V.F., the Committee should meet to discuss the
19 results of reference checks and determine whether to rank the candidates
20 again. This is especially important because, as discussed in Section IV.C.,
21 aggregate scores are not necessarily definitive measures of the merits of
22 candidates. Rather, it is important for the committee to assess candidates'
23 overall performance in the examination process. Hence, after reference
24 checks are complete, committees should review the results of the entire
25 process, including aggregate scores, individual scores and the results of
26 reference checks.

27
28 Committees are encouraged to work together to resolve significant
29 differences in views about the qualities of applicants. Committee members
30 may, but are not required to, modify the scores of candidates in light of such
31 further discussion. When the committee's decision about a candidate is not
32 consistent with the candidate's numerical score(s), the committee must
33 explain its action in writing.

34
35 H. Committee Recommendations to the Chancellor and the Application of Article
36 12, Upgrading

37
38 Once the Committee has identified the most qualified candidates, if the
39 Committee must decide between candidates who are equal to each other in
40 qualifications for possible recommendation to the Chancellor, it shall apply
41 the following Article 12, Upgrading, preferences:

- 42
43 1. Where necessary to further the published goals and timetables of
44 the College's Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) for the department,
45 preference for recommendation to the Chancellor must be given to
46 candidates who meet these goals and timetables.

47
48 Where both an inside and outside candidate further the published

1 goals and timetables of the AAP for the department, the Committee
2 shall accord preference to the inside candidate.

- 3
4 2. Where no equally qualified candidates further the published goals
5 and timetables of the AAP, preference for recommendation to the
6 Chancellor must be given to inside candidates, i.e., candidates who
7 are currently employed by the College District, over candidates from
8 outside of the College District. Insofar as inside candidates are
9 equally qualified to each other, the Committee shall accord
10 preference to the most senior candidate(s), i.e., those current
11 academic employees with the greatest number of semesters of
12 service (without a break in service) with the College District.

13
14 Information on which candidates further AAP goals and timetables, which
15 candidates are currently employed, and how much seniority inside
16 candidates have accrued, shall be obtained by the Affirmative Action
17 monitor assigned to the Committee. The monitor shall share this
18 information with the Committee as needed.

19
20 I. Advancing Candidates to the Chancellor

21
22 The Committee will determine the best qualified candidate(s) and, for each
23 position, send one to three names forward in unranked order to the
24 Chancellor for further consideration. (Attachment 1, Page 7)

25
26 Statistical variances of under five percent (5%) are ordinarily viewed as
27 insignificant, whereas variances of 5% or more are usually viewed as
28 statistically significant. For example, when a 5% break (based on the score
29 of the top candidate) exists between the top group of candidates and the
30 next candidate, it is logical to “draw the line” at the break point below the top
31 group. Hence, the committee has the discretion to submit as finalists all
32 names in the top group, subject to the maximum allowable number of
33 finalists (1-3 candidates per open position).

34
35 If no break point of 5% exists among the candidates, or where it occurs too
36 far below the best candidates, the committee may define a top group of
37 candidates at a point equal to 5% below the top score. From among the
38 candidates above the 5% line, the committee would then send 1-3
39 candidates per position. The committee, however, need not do so; it may
40 decide to submit the maximum number of names (3 per position) allowable.
41 Alternatively, it may decide to apply the preferences outlined in Section H,
42 Paragraph 2.

- 43
44 J. The search committee chair is invited and encouraged to be present to
45 provide information about the hiring committee’s process and to answer
46 questions from the Chancellor/designee.

III. THE HIRING PROCEDURE

A. Request for Position

The Department/Discipline Chair¹ shall submit a request, accompanied by a justification for any new or replacement positions needed, to the appropriate Vice Chancellor. Notification shall be sent to those administrative personnel who have purview over the Department/Discipline.

When requests for positions are considered at the Vice Chancellor's level, three faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate will attend.² Senate members appointed to this committee should rotate in order to reflect the diversity of programs. The Vice Chancellor, three appropriate administrators and the Academic Senate appointed faculty will vote on which departments will receive the position(s) requested. No full-time faculty position will be announced unless they have been agreed to by this committee.

The Vice Chancellor of Instruction or the Vice Chancellor of Student Services will inform Department Chairs of the status of their requests by May first for interviews to be conducted the following spring, and by November first for interviews to be conducted the following fall. If a request is granted, a Search Committee will be formed and a job announcement will be written. All screening and interviewing will take place during the academic year according to the time frame which follows in Section I. No hiring of full-time faculty is to take place during the summer.

B. Search Committee

Each department shall develop regular, democratic procedures for forming Search Committees. Upon notification of approval of a position the Department Chair³ will follow this established procedure to form a Search Committee (monitored by Academic Senate). At the first meeting of the committee the voting members shall select their chairperson.

¹ Until a new organizational structure is adopted in the various campuses (formerly known as Centers), a request may be generated by any combination of the following: program supervisors, program faculty, discipline committee, program administrators.

² Until the merger of the two Academic Senates is complete, there shall be an interim procedure where 2 members from each Academic Senate will be chosen. The committee will then be composed of four faculty members, the Vice Chancellor and three other administrators.

³ Until the organizational structure of the District is formalized, "Department Head" will be assumed to be synonymous with Discipline Chair, program supervisor, or other appropriate faculty overseer of a program area.

leg

The approval of open positions and initiation of the hiring process should take place early enough in the academic year for effective recruitment and for the undertaking of all procedures in a thorough, thoughtful and timely manner. "Timely" means that the hiring process should take place between the beginning of fall semester and the end of the spring semester when all parties can be notified. The application deadline and the candidate interview portions of the hiring process shall not take place between the end of the spring semester and the beginning of fall semester, nor during vacation breaks, except for emergencies where agreed upon by the representatives of the department.

D. Receipt of Applications

All applications, supporting papers, and letters will be sent to the Personnel Office. Within five working days after the close of application, the Personnel Office will forward to the Equivalency Committee the files of those applicants who claim to have the equivalent of the minimum qualifications listed on the job announcement.

Within five working days the Equivalency Committee will decide on these claims and return all files to the Personnel Office with a report on each file indicating whether the applicant does or does not have qualifications equivalent to the minimum qualifications stated on the job announcement. The files of applicants who meet minimum qualifications and applicants whose claims of equivalence have been approved will be forwarded to the Search Committee.

E. The Equivalency Committee

The Equivalency Committee will have three members chosen by the Academic Senate for three-year terms, with a maximum of two consecutive terms. After a faculty member has served as an Academic Senate appointee on this committee, he/she may not serve as a standing member for six years.

To ensure memory of past practices, only one member of the initial committee will be appointed for a three-year term. A second member will be chosen for a two-year term, and a third member will be chosen for a one-year term. The Senate appointments should ensure a diversity of opinions. Appointments should rotate to ensure, over time, representation of all segments of the college community.

When a determination of equivalence with reference to a particular job is made, two members of the department/discipline which is doing the hiring and an invited administrator will meet with the three-person standing

committee to review the claims of equivalence. The two faculty members shall not also be on the Search Committee. The five faculty members shall form the voting body of the committee. The Affirmative Action Officer, or an appropriate designee, may also sit as a nonvoting member of this committee.

F. Preliminary Screening

The Search Committee will select those applicants to be interviewed who best meet the qualifications listed in the job announcement. It is recommended that whenever possible the committee interview a minimum of six applicants or twice the number of openings (whichever is larger).

been present at all interviews of the candidates. Reference checks will be conducted by members of the Search Committee on the top three or four ranked candidates. After these checks have been made, the committee

January 15, year x (2001):

Applications close, but individual departments may close applications later. In all cases, there must be a definite closing date. If any departments need to extend the deadline, this information must be available on the toll-free number listed on the job announcement; and a statement that the deadline may, in some cases, be extended must also be listed on the job announcement.

March 1, year x (2001):

Start of interview period. Individual departments may start interviews later.

April Board Agenda, year x (2001):

Candidates listed.

May Board Agenda, year x (2001);

Candidates listed for departments following a la

in the Department. The Chair then checks with the Dean to ensure that the provisions of AB 1725 concerning the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty are being observed. The hiring procedures are the same as those for a full-time position from the point in the full-time procedure where the Search Committee is formed to the point where the candidates are ranked. It will then be the duty of the Search Committee to select the number of individuals, in order of their ranking, that the Committee wishes to place in the Department's part-time hiring pool. When a position is open, the Department Chair must offer positions to individuals in the pool in order of their ranking. Except in the special cases described below, a new pool cannot be started until all the individuals in the old pool have been offered positions, or will be offered positions, or three years have elapsed, whichever comes first. Once applicants are hired for a part-time position, their names are removed from the pool. The listing will be maintained by the Personnel Office and the Department.

C. Special Cases

When a Department needs an individual to fill a position but there is no one in the pool who is qualified to fill that position and insufficient time to go through the above procedure, the Department Chair can do the hiring individually or with a small committee. Individuals hired this way must go through the standard hiring procedure for part-time hiring when a part-time Search Committee is formed.

When no individual in an existing pool is qualified for a unique position in the department and there is time to start a new pool, then a new pool which will replace the old pool can be started. Individuals in the old pool are automatically in the new pool. New individuals in this pool, except for the individual qualified for the unique position, will be ranked below individuals in the previous pool.

These procedures are considered special, and are to be used only when absolutely necessary.

V. EQUIVALENCY PROCEDURES, FACULTY

A. GENERAL STATEMENT

The purpose of the equivalency process is to assure that the hiring procedures are open to applicants who can provide evidence that they have education and experience at least as good as what is required by the minimum qualifications defined by state law and by approved local

degrees have different names or if they acquired their qualifications by a route other than a conventional one.

B. THE WORK OF THE EQUIVALENCY COMMITTEE

It will be the duty of the Equivalency Committee to consider applicants on a case by case basis to determine if those applicants do indeed have qualifications that are equivalent to those stated on the job announcement. The committee will keep accurate records of its deliberations and decisions and ensure uniformity within and between all cases.

The person who claims to have equivalent qualifications will have to provide evidence as clear and reliable as college transcripts and work experience being submitted by the other candidates, that he or she has qualifications that are at least equivalent to what is required by the minimum qualifications. Specifically, the one making the claim must provide evidence in regard to each of the following:

1. For establishing the equivalent of a required degree, possession of at least the equivalent in level of achievement and breadth and depth of understanding for each of the following as separate and distinct criteria:
 - a. The general education required for that degree and
 - b. The major or specialized courses required for that degree.

An applicant who does not provide sufficient evidence, in the judgment of the committee, in regard to either a) or b) does not possess the equivalent of the degree in question.

2. For establishing the equivalent of required experience, possession of thorough and broad skill and knowledge for each of the following criteria:
 - a. Mastery of the skills of the vocation sufficient to serve as a basis for teaching the other courses within the discipline.
 - b. Extensive knowledge of the working environment of the vocation.

An applicant who does not provide sufficient evidence, in the judgment of the committee, in regard to either a) or b) does not possess the equivalent of the experience in question.

C. EVIDENCE

Evidence that the applicant has qualifications equivalent to those on the job announcement shall be:

1. A transcript(s) showing that appropriate courses were successfully completed at an accredited college or appropriate foreign institution.
2. Publications that show a command of the major in question, the general education of the candidate, or his or her writing skills.
3. Other work products that show a command of the major or occupation in question.
4. Work experience.
5. Life experience leading to expertise in a specific academic discipline.

It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to supply all documentation needed to evaluate equivalency.

D. REPORT OF THE EQUIVALENCY COMMITTEE

The Equivalency Committee will report its findings to the Personnel Office only in the following form:

1. The applicant meets the minimum qualifications through equivalency.
2. The applicant does not meet the minimum qualifications through equivalency.

E. REVIEW

It is recommended that at the end of each year or at least at the end of every two years all individuals who served on equivalency committees meet to discuss the process. The aim should be to gain uniformity from year to year and from applicant to applicant. It is assumed that the equivalency procedures detailed in this document will be updated to reflect the knowledge gained from the work of these committees.

VI. COMPLIANCE*

The Academic Senate shall have responsibility for monitoring and ruling on the

compliance of all parties involved with the screening process (excluding Affirmative Action violations). Violations of the established procedure alleged by Senate members or Administrators will be reported to the Academic Senate President. After investigation, the Academic Senate President may report to the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

- A. Except as modified by the District's Affirmative Action and Staff Diversity Plan or Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan (hereinafter "Plan"), upon its adoption, and Article 4, and/or Sections B.5 and B.6 of this Article, the District will give first consideration to inside applicants for:
- (1) Assignment of additional hours up to 60% of a full-time load; and,
 - (2) Full-time positions.
- B. When a screening/interviewing committee screens applications for full-time tenure track positions for recommendation to the Chancellor, the following procedure will apply:
1. The administration will determine the job needs relating to the position.
 2. The screening/interviewing committee will identify, screen, interview and recommend final candidates to the Chancellor.
 3. In evaluating candidates for recommendation to the Chancellor, the committee shall consider each candidate's job performance, credentials, training, experience in the field, special job related skills, affirmative action status (See Article 4), and District needs. In assessing the relative qualifications of inside applicants insofar as they are competing against each other, seniority shall also be considered as a factor.
 4. The Committee will determine the most qualified candidate(s) and, for each position, send one to three names forward in unranked order to the Chancellor for further consideration.
 5. Once the District has adopted the Plan, the committee shall follow the goals and timetables in the Plan in evaluating candidates who are equally qualified under the criteria of Section B.3 and shall make every effort to ensure that the finalist(s) to be presented to the Chancellor meet(s) the needs reflected in the District's Plan.
 6. Notwithstanding any other provisions in this Article, once the District has adopted the Plan, preference between candidates who are otherwise equal shall go to those candidates who fulfill the goals and timetables of the Plan. If, in applying the criteria in Section B.3, the screening/interviewing committee concludes that an outside candidate and an inside candidate who are otherwise equal both fulfill the Plan goals and timetables, the inside candidate shall have first consideration.
- C. The ultimate decision regarding hiring and the selection of candidates for hire is a prerogative reserved to the Board of Trustees.

ATTACHMENT 4

CERTIFICATION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER

As agents of the Board, committee members are prohibited from releasing information regarding applicants, applicant materials or committee deliberations to anyone who is not authorized by the College to receive such information. This prohibition does not preclude a committee member from reporting perceived irregularities in the process to the monitor or the Personnel Office, and committee members are specifically encouraged to do so immediately.

As agents of the Board, committee members are required to release to proper College representatives, any and all materials used or prepared by the committee member. These materials include the rating sheets prepared by the committee member. Proper College representatives include the Chancellor and/or any designee of the Chancellor or the Board, including the affirmative action officer, the affirmative action monitor assigned to the process, the Director of Personnel, the Director of Employee Relations, and legal counsel.

If any member fails to maintain the confidentiality of the process as provided above, or fails to preserve and release materials related to the process as provided above, that person, in addition to any other action which may be appropriate, may be precluded from serving on future committees. Additionally, should any member fail to preserve and release materials to College representatives as described above, the committee assessments may be recalculated disregarding the evaluations of the member failing to preserve and release the information.

I have read and understood the above paragraphs and agree by their terms.

Signature

Date

Print Name

ARTICLE 12 CRITERIA (ARTICLE 12, SECTION 12.B.3)
SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

CREDENTIALS

1. This consideration is made at the paper-screening level.

TRAINING (Does the candidate know the content? Can the candidate teach? How would the candidate correct a content or teaching “shortfall”?)

1. What specific course work in _____ have you had? What additional course work has prepared you for the position? If you had a question about (a content element) what resource materials would you consult?
2. What (teaching, counseling, resource) training has prepared you for this position? If you encountered (a difficult instructional, counseling, or resource problem) what resources would you consult?

JOB PERFORMANCE (What indications can the candidate offer that he/she will be successful in doing the job?)

1. Based on the “Examples of Duties” on the position announcement, how are you prepared to satisfy those duties?
2. What index would you most rely upon that you are doing a good job? (Be specific, e.g., all my students get good grades, my students seek me out for more in-depth discussion, my students transfer to baccalaureate institutions.) What is your success rate using that index?
3. How have your supervisors rated your performance of similar duties?
4. What was your most challenging (instructional, counseling, resource) problem? How did you solve it?
5. Letters of reference.
6. Demonstration (Teaching, etc.)

EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD (What related experience has the candidate had which enhances the potential for his/her success? What responses will demonstrate that the candidate has an understanding of general institutional goals and student needs?)

1. What special projects, committee assignments, conferences, etc. have you been involved in which are related to this position?
2. What do you view as the primary mission of a community college?
3. How do you accomplish that mission with a "typical" urban community college student?

SPECIAL JOB RELATED SKILLS (Does the candidate possess any special skills related to this assignment? Does the candidate possess the special skills necessary to serve the College's clientele?)

1. How do you vary your (teaching, counseling, resource services) when your (classes, counselee, clients) include persons who are diverse in terms of ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, learning styles or other factors of diversity?
2. What college resources outside of the (classroom, counseling office, library/media center) do you think are most important in assisting students to reach their full potential?
3. Assume you have a student with a severe physical disability. What do you view as your responsibility to that student?

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION STATUS

1. Is there a goal or timetable?

DISTRICT NEEDS (Does the candidate satisfy any identified unique needs not necessarily related to the content? For example, a small department may have to do all the things larger departments do, but with fewer people. A department with a declining student body may need persons with ideas and/or abilities regarding recruitment of students, etc.)

1. The District has a special need for _____. How do you, or how does your background, prepare you to satisfy that need?

ATTACHMENT 6

Ratings of candidate qualifications should be supported by a narrative describing the rating.

Assume a rating scale of "0-5", with "0" indicating the candidate had no answer to the questions and "1" through "5" indicating increasing acceptable responses. Ratings within this range might include supporting statements such as the following:

Q: "Indicate ways in which you vary your (teaching, counseling, resource services) when your (classes, counselees, clients) include persons who are diverse in terms of ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, learning styles or other factors of diversity?"

A: "Candidate stated he/she believes that these student characteristics do not suggest or require varying presentations.

"Candidate described culturally sensitive teaching aids which he/she has used successfully".

"Candidate has taken courses/workshops in working with a diverse student body and polls students in the class for suggestions."

"Candidate described a variety of ways to permit students to suggest greater sensitivity to the group to which they belong and described a situation where he/she constructed a lesson to include greater sensitivity."

"Candidate stated that he/she considered such matters to be the responsibility of the student's family or group to which he/she belongs. He/she would be willing to attend a workshop only if it were required for employment."

"Candidate described how the characteristics might evidence themselves in the course at issue."

"Candidate uses current news items related to diverse groups if possible in coursework and also identified potential resources for diversity referrals."

TO: Chris Hanzo
FROM: Larry Klein
DATE: August 8, 1994
SUBJECT: ESL Grievance Investigation

Thank you for pointing out some problems. I will respond to you as best I can. In addition, I would like to share the substance of your memo, but not the unit member's identity, with future hiring committees.

Why did some members of the committee see only 7-9 years of experience teaching ESL? Two members miscounted or misinterpreted the information provided by the candidate. The candidate's letter did not state "I have taught ESL for X number of years." Moreover, careful reading of the application is required in order to find 9.5 years of ESL teaching experience. Perhaps some members of the committee felt that 10 full years were required for the 10-12 year rating. At any rate, if the candidate has 11.5 years experience teaching ESL, that experience is not immediately evident. The more important consideration, one that I hope all hiring committees will pay attention to, is that the committee should have questioned the discrepancy among the scores since they were evaluating an objective question. Candidates, on the other hand, need to learn to be more specific in their letters of application, stating the precise number of years experience teaching a particular subject in the District, the precise number of years teaching that subject at other colleges, and the precise number of years of all post-secondary teaching experience. The greater