

HANDBOOK

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

1 INTRODUCTION

2

3 Members of Screening/Interviewing Committees undertake one of the most important
4 professional activities performed by college faculty: the identification of those who will be
5 responsible for providing quality public instruction and educational services. Members of
6 the Committees represent the College District itself in performing this complex and
7 important task: screening, interviewing, and recommending applicants for positions. In
8 this endeavor, Committee members are guided not only by their experience and subject
9 matter expertise, but by local, state and federal requirements.

10

11 This Handbook will guide members of Screening/Interviewing Committees through the
12 hiring process. The Handbook incorporates the procedures and mandates of the three
13 major College District documents (Faculty Hiring Procedure, Article 12, Upgrading, and
14 the Affirmative Action and Staff Diversity Plan) which govern the screening and
15 interviewing process. Copies of these key documents are attached to this Handbook, and
16 members are required to read them in their entirety before commencing the hiring
17 process. This Handbook does not supersede any of these three documents.

18

19 Attachment 1 - Faculty Hiring Procedure (As amended, November 21, 1991)

20

21 On June 27, 1991, the Board of Trustees adopted a Faculty Hiring Procedure which had
22 been developed by representatives of the Academic Senate and the Board. The steps in
23 this procedure are discussed in this Handbook.

24

25 Attachment 2 - Article 12, Upgrading

26

27 City College and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Local 2121, have
28 negotiated a candidate evaluation process which greatly influences the deliberations of
29 Screening/Interviewing Committees for faculty positions. The cornerstone is a provision
30 that grants "first consideration" or preference rights to candidates who are current College
31 District academic employees and who are at least as qualified as candidates from outside
32 the College District. This provision appears in the collective bargaining agreement as
33 Article 12, Upgrading, which has been clarified through the arbitration process.

¹This Handbook represents a part of the training required by the Faculty Hiring Procedures (June 27, 1991) and Section 53003 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

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
21 Faculty Hiring Procedure recommends that, at a minimum, the greater of six
22 applicants, or twice the number of openings, be interviewed. (Attachment 1,
23 Page 6)
24

25 B. Identifying Candidates for Interview

26 Screening applicants for relative competitiveness is lawful so long as the
27 screening is conducted in a neutral manner AND so long as the screening
28 criteria do not result in an unjustifiable, disproportionately adverse impact by
29 ethnicity, gender, or disability.⁵ In fact, at each stage of the
30 screening/interviewing process where applicants are eliminated from further
31 consideration, the Committee must base its actions on valid,
32 nondiscriminatory, job-related reasons. At the conclusion of the screening
33 phase, candidates who have not been selected for an interview may
34 request a written statement of reasons and a meeting with a College District
35 representative (the "Application Process Review Agent") regarding their
36 elimination. The Committee's documentation of the bases for elimination is
37 indispensable in providing applicants with this information. The process of
38 communicating with unsuccessful applicants is NOT a Committee function.⁶
39

⁵State regulations require the College District to monitor for adverse impact of screening processes on ethnic minorities, women and persons with disabilities. Moreover, College District Policy Manual Section 3.02 expressly prohibits discrimination based on race, color, ethnic group identification, national origin, ancestry, religion, gender, age, marital status, handicapped conditions, medical conditions, sexual orientation or status as a Vietnam-Era veteran.

⁶It is not unusual for applicants to know a member(s) of the screening committee or to ask members why they were not advanced for an interview. It is improper for committee members to discuss their own or committee assessments with applicants (or other unauthorized persons). Rather, committee members should refer applicants to the Application Process Review Agent. Committee members might say, for example: "I am not at liberty to discuss my own assessments or those of the committee, but you may contact the College's Application Process Review Agent if you want more information."

To ensure the appropriateness of the screening process, Committee members should:

- Establish job-related screening criteria which do not exclude applicants who are, in fact, qualified and competitive for the position;
- Conduct the screening of all applicants even-handedly;
- Conduct the screening of all applicants without reference to or consideration of the perceived or actual race, color, ethnic group identification, national origin, ancestry, religion, gender, age, marital status, status as a person with a disability, medical conditions, sexual orientation or status as a Vietnam-Era veteran of applicants;
- Review the fairness and appropriateness of screening criteria;
- Review applications that were screened out.

Only applicants who meet minimum qualifications AND who are the most highly competitive will be interviewed.

C. Article 12, Upgrading, and the Hiring Process

Within both the screening and interviewing phases of the hiring process, assessments made to identify candidates for interviews, as well as interview questions or tasks developed to identify candidates for recommendation to the Chancellor, must address all of the specified Article 12, Upgrading criteria. (This does not imply that a separate question must be asked for each criterion, only that all criteria should be included in assessments.) Moreover, the final Committee assessment of a candidate should be an aggregate score which reflects the assessment of the criteria made at each stage of the hiring process, from the paper screening through the interview process. This aggregate score should ensure that recommended candidates have earned a broad, favorable assessment from the Committee. At the same time, the aggregate score is not intended to require the Committee to advance a candidate who exhibits deficiencies merely because strengths are also evident.

For example, two candidates may have identical aggregate scores. The score of one candidate may be the result of relatively consistent assessments throughout the process. The other candidate may have widely varying assessments, which reflect great strengths but also great weaknesses. A Committee may well decide that the deficiencies weigh against recommending the candidate regardless of the aggregate score. Of course, the reasons for such decisions must be documented.

The criteria which Article 12, Upgrading, requires Screening/Interviewing Committees to consider are "job performance," "credentials," "training," "experience in the field," "special job-related skills," "District needs," and

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
13 related teaching/counseling/librarianship performance, whether in the
14 College District or elsewhere.

15
16 E. Letters of Reference

17
18 The job announcement describes various materials which must be
19 submitted by an applicant. If the applicant fails to provide all of the required
20 materials, further consideration must not be given and the application must
21 be "screened out." The type of reference letters submitted by applicants
22 occasionally becomes an issue for Committees which are attempting to
23 determine who should be interviewed. Occasionally, candidates provide
24 only character references which include no information about how the
25 candidate might be qualified for the job. If the job announcement requires
26 letters related directly to knowledge, skills or ability necessary to perform the
27 job, a person who submitted only character references has failed to provide
28 suitable application materials and should be disqualified from further
29 consideration.

30
31 Should persons who serve on Committees provide letters of reference for
32 an applicant? Neither the College District nor AFT 2121 has taken a
33 position on this issue. The main consideration is that each Committee
34 member be committed to a fair assessment of all candidates.

35
36 V. INTERVIEWING CANDIDATES

37
38 In writing questions or in designing interview tasks, such as teaching
39 demonstrations, Committees must be sure to assess each candidate for the
40 criteria listed in Article 12, Upgrading: "job performance," "credentials," "training,"
41 "experience in the field," "special job-related skills," "affirmative action status," as
42 explained in Section G below, "District needs" and "seniority" under the
43 circumstances described below. (Note once again that a separate question is not
44 required for each criterion, provided that all criteria are assessed at each phase.)
45 IF A COMMITTEE CANNOT DEMONSTRATE THAT IT HAS PROPERLY
46 ADDRESSED EACH OF THESE CRITERIA, THE EVALUATION OF
47 APPLICANTS BY THE COMMITTEE CAN BE CHALLENGED. ANY
48 CHALLENGE COULD DELAY THE HIRING PROCESS. A SUCCESSFUL

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
20 ratings made at each stage of the hiring process from the screening through
21 the interview. If aggregated scores or averages are very close, it is
22 advisable to re-check addition.

23
24 Once the Committee calculates an aggregate score for each candidate, it
25 will be able to determine, through use of these scores, the relative
26 qualifications of the candidates. Additionally, the Committee will be able to
27 identify candidates who are equally qualified.

28
29 As discussed in Section IV.C., aggregate scores are not necessarily
30 definitive measures of the merits of candidates. Hence, it is important for
31 the committee to assess candidates' *overall performance* in the
32 examination process. When the committee's decision about a candidate is
33 not consistent with the committee's numerical score(s), the committee must
34 explain its action in writing.

35
36 Any process used by the Committee to rate or compare candidates must be
37 valid and support the decisions of the Committee. Committees which use
38 processes that are not reflected in the rating sheets must be careful to
39 record such processes in writing. For example, if the Committee uses a
40 chalkboard in its rating process, and the calculations or notes on the
41 chalkboard are the basis for determining candidate elimination or
42 advancement, the chalkboard calculations or notes must be preserved for
43 potential later review.
44

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.

ATTACHMENT 1

SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FACULTY HIRING PROCEDURES
[Date-stamped: 1991 JUL, PRESIDENT'S OFFICE]

June 27, 1991

I. PHILOSOPHY

It is the philosophy of the San Francisco Community College District that hiring procedures and guidelines be established to provide for a faculty of highly qualified people who are

- a) highly proficient (or knowledgeable) in their disciplines,
- b) skilled in serving the needs of a varied student population as teachers, counselors, librarians and in various other instructional and student services capacities,
- c) able to foster overall institutional goals, and
- d) sensitive to the diversity of the work force of the state of California, including diversity in ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, and gender.

The faculty, represented by the Academic Senate, has an inherent professional responsibility for the development and implementation of procedures governing the hiring process in order to ensure the quality of the future faculty and to seek a faculty which is culturally balanced and representative of the state's diversity.

II. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROCEDURES

The Affirmative Action plan adopted by the Board of Trustees provides a process to ensure that Search Committee members, as agents of the Board, are knowledgeable about and committed to Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Employment. It is desirable to have as broad a representation on a Search Committee as possible.

All members must be provided training and orientation in

- a) basic hiring procedures, including writing a job analysis
- b) fair employment practices and procedures
- c) equal opportunity and non-discrimination, and
- d) relevant sections of the collective bargaining agreement.

Training should also include the affirmative action goals and timetables for the discipline or area for which the hiring is to take place. This is necessary to assure greater success in reaching these goals. The Affirmative Action Officer shall be responsible for monitoring all proceedings related to hiring, pursuant to Title 5.

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.

Until the faculties of the various campuses are fully integrated into organizational structures with elected chairs, hiring committees in the non-Credit division will be formed according to the procedure already established.⁴

The Search Committee will consist of a minimum of four faculty members of the department who will be tenured faculty whenever possible. The backgrounds of the members of the Search Committee should reflect the diversity, range of interests, philosophies, and programs in the department. The composition of the committee should, as far as possible, be consistent with Federal and State guidelines on race and sex. Whenever possible members of protected groups shall be included in the Committee, and it is recommended that the Committee reflect the diversity of the student population, the work force, and the groups named in the non-discrimination statement.

No Search Committee shall consist of all men or all women or be all of the same ethnicity. At least 40% of the committee shall be members of the under-represented groups identified in the District's Affirmative Action Plan (Alaskan/Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Chicano/Hispanic, Women). The Department Chair can ask faculty members from related departments or other colleges, part timers, administrators, counselors, or persons from industry to serve on the Search Committee in order to satisfy this requirement. When an individual serves on a Search Committee outside his or her own department, that individual may not serve on any other Search Committee outside his or her department for a period of two years.

In the case of small departments, members of the Search Committee may be selected from related departments. Both the Chair of the related department and the individual faculty member(s) selected must agree to this selection. Only faculty not currently applying for positions may be considered for committee membership.

C. Development of the Job Announcement

The appropriate Vice Chancellor or designee and the Affirmative Action Officer or designee will hold a general orientation meeting with the Search Committees to discuss the hiring procedures and the aims, goals and

⁴ The Academic Senate, through Faculty Council Presidents and Discipline Committee chairs, shall issue a call for volunteers to serve on Search Committees. From these names, a list shall be drawn up at random by the Academic Senate Executive Council at the beginning of each academic year. When Search Committee members are needed, their names shall be taken in order from the list. Faculty members selected should be from the discipline in question and should, whenever possible, reflect the diversity of the District, as noted above. All non-credit faculty members who serve on Search Committees will receive release time, in accordance with past practice.*

legal responsibilities of the College. The aims, goals and legal responsibilities will have been forwarded to the Chairperson of the Committee before this meeting.

The Search Committee will develop the Job Announcement. Under the section titled "Minimum Qualifications: (required)" the minimum qualifications agreed to by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees will be listed and shall include both an understanding of the sensitivity to the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disabled, sexual orientation, and ethnic backgrounds of California Community College students. The minimum qualifications adopted may be higher, but may not be lower, than those mandated by the State. When local academic qualifications exceed those of the State, only the local Minimum Qualifications shall be listed. Any specific qualifications that will be considered must be included in the job announcement.

The job announcement will inform the candidates that if they are in the top-ranked group of candidates their references and current and former employers will be checked. Salary information will be supplied by the appropriate Vice Chancellor or designee. The job announcement will be reviewed and certified by the Affirmative Action Officer to ensure conformity with affirmative action and nondiscrimination commitments prior to being posted.

Any changes to be made in the job announcement must be approved by the Search Committee.

The Personnel Department will be responsible for conducting publicity in compliance with existing legal regulations and practices. The job announcement must be widely advertised at least 45 days prior to the close of applications. Appropriate publications, including the college newsletter(s) and those recommended by the department, shall be utilized. Advertisements should be placed in relevant major newspapers, professional journals and regular issues of major community and ethnic newspapers. Departments are encouraged to recruit candidates and will receive copies of the job announcement for distribution. The Personnel Office will provide a toll-free telephone number containing all relevant information pertaining to job openings.

The collective bargaining agent will be notified of all approved positions.

All reasonable efforts shall be made by the Affirmative Action Office and the administration to recruit a diverse pool of applicants to satisfy the District's Affirmative Action requirements. The Board of Trustees must ensure that salaries, fringe benefits and working conditions are competitive to attract the pool of applicants required.*

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). Interviews will be scheduled by the Chair of the Search Committee. Applicants not selected will be notified promptly in writing by the Personnel Office in consultation with the Search Committee. Such letters must be sent by the Personnel Office within ten school days after notification by the committees.

The names of the applicants not selected, and the reasons for their non-selection, will be assembled in compliance with Federal and State regulations and submitted with all personnel data to the Personnel Office after the screening process is completed. The Personnel Office will keep these records for five years.

G. The Interview

The Chairperson of the Search Committee will arrange for the interviews according to a predetermined departmental procedure. The candidates who are to be interviewed shall be given a copy of the procedure. This procedure may include inviting faculty, students, or administrators to attend the interviews in a nonvoting capacity. Teaching demonstrations, or other appropriate demonstrations for counselors and librarians, may also be required by the procedure. Within a particular Search Committee the interviewers must agree upon and use the same criteria for evaluation. All candidates shall be subject to the same procedures and questions, but follow-up questions are allowed. It is the committee's responsibility to abide by the instructions of Assembly Bill 1725, fair employment practices and procedures, equal opportunity and non-discrimination, and relevant sections of the collective bargaining agreement.

H. Ranking of Candidates

The Search Committee will rank all candidates interviewed. The ranking will be in accord with the contract between the District and Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, particularly Article 12.* To vote and participate in final deliberations, a Search Committee member must have

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 may vote to rank the top candidates again.

Once the top ranked candidate(s) have been selected by the Search Committee the Committee will meet with the Chancellor to discuss its choice. It is the responsibility of the Search Committee to ensure that the Chancellor is fully informed about how and why a particular individual(s) was selected over all the other applicants. A written record of the reasons for selection will be kept by the Personnel office.

The Committee may forward unranked one to three names for consideration by the Chancellor.* If one name is forwarded, the candidate will be offered the position with the understanding that the Board must act on the appointment. If the candidate does not accept the position within five working days the Committee may select the next ranked candidate or may choose not to hire. With every rejection of a job offer by a candidate the committee may select the next ranked candidate or choose not to hire.

In the unlikely event that the Board of Trustees does not act on the candidate whose name was placed on the agenda, the Chancellor will provide the Search Committee, in writing, specific reasons for the Board's rejection of the candidate. The Search Committee will then meet with the Chancellor for clarification and either resubmit the same name or recommend another candidate or decide not to hire.

If the Committee forwards more than one name for the Chancellor's consideration, the Chancellor shall recommend a name for Board of Trustees consideration or may decline to advance a name.*

I. Time Frame

For hiring for faculty positions to start in a particular year (x), the following must be done by May 1 of the previous year (x - 1). In the following example, year x is arbitrarily set at 2001.

May 1, year x-1 (2000):

Decisions made about faculty positions open for hiring in fall of year x (2001)

October 1, year x-1 (2000):

Job announcements fully completed, ready for national publications, etc. All information relative to faculty openings and deadlines available on a toll-free number listed on all job announcements.

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 later schedule.

In general, hiring should be done for the candidate to start at the beginning of the academic year. The following timeline would be used for the exceptional case of hiring to start in spring semester: Hiring for spring year y + 1 (2002):

November 1, year y-1 (2000) replaces May 1, year x-1.

April 1, year y (2001) replaces October 1, year x-1.

September 1, year y (2001) replaces March 1, year x.

October agenda, year y (2001) replaces April agenda, year x.

November agenda, year y (2001) replaces May agenda, year x.

IV. HIRING PROCEDURES FOR PART-TIME FACULTY

A. PART-TIME HIRING STANDARDS

All faculty hired for part-time positions in a department will be subject to the same standards required of full-time faculty in that department.

B. PART-TIME HIRING PROCEDURE

1. Continuing Part-time Faculty

The hiring of continuing part-time faculty is the responsibility of the Department Chair, subject to the provisions of the contract between the College and the American Federation of Teachers, Local 2121.*

2. New Part-time Faculty

The Department Chair decides if new part-time faculty are needed

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 qualifications. Such applicants deserve careful consideration even if their

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 Board of Trustees.*

All pertinent provisions contained in the District's collective bargaining contract shall be observed. The District's agreement to these procedures is subject to fulfillment of the District's obligation to meet and negotiate with AFT Local 2121 over all matters subject to negotiations under Government Code, Section 3543.2, including those items marked herein with an asterisk (*).

VII. REVIEW AND REVISION

This hiring policy and its procedures are subject to review and revision at the request of either the Academic Senate or the Board of Trustees or its representatives. Such revised policy or procedures shall be mutually agreed upon by representatives of the Board of Trustees, and the Academic Senate, and approved by the Board of Trustees, before it replaces the previously agreed upon hiring policy or procedures. Both the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees pledge to resolve problems by mutual agreement so that an orderly hiring process may proceed for the succeeding academic years.

Adopted by

ACADEMIC SENATE (Credit) /S/ by
 Steve Levinson

ACADEMIC SENATE (Non-Credit) /S/ by
 Lorraine Koffman

BOARD OF TRUSTEES /S/ by
 Mabel Teng, President

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.

1 D. Arbitration Standards and Confidentiality

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

1. The selection of the District's work force for hire and promotion inherently requires the District to apply judgment and discretion regarding the relative qualifications of applicants. The Union has an interest in monitoring the District's compliance with its obligations under Article 12. In the event of a dispute regarding Article 12, if the Union, after reviewing any grievances over the District's application of the criteria of Article 12.B as well as information provided by the District, seeks arbitration, the parties agree that the appropriate standards of review are:

1.1 Did the District in fact apply the Article 12 criteria and/or procedure? If not, did the District's conduct prejudice the grievant and what remedy is appropriate?

1.2 Was the District unreasonable in exercising its discretion and judgment in applying the Article 12 criteria?

2. The Union agrees to uphold and protect the confidentiality of committee processes and procedures at the level of the President, Chancellor and Board of Trustees. In the event of a grievance alleging a violation of Article 12, the District shall, upon the Union's request, promptly provide to the Union such information which can be legally disclosed, which is relevant and necessary to enable the Union to evaluate the grievance intelligently. The Union pledges not to disclose information regarding candidates to any other person except as is essential for the Union to evaluate the grievance.

E. Pay and fringe benefits based on the load following the upgrading process shall be granted in accordance with Articles 20 and 21, Compensation and Fringe Benefits.

F. Full-time positions designated to be filled by Long Term Substitutes shall, whenever possible, be filled in accordance with this Article.

**SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT**

**Affirmative Action
And
Staff Diversity Plan**

1994 – 1996



NOTE: COVER PAGE ONLY

Copies are available from the Affirmative Action Office (415/241-2285)

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."

AFT
2121San Francisco Community College District Federation of Teachers
San Francisco Community College District Federation of Teachers

August 4, 1994

TO: LARRY KLEIN, DIRECTOR
EMPLOYEE RELATIONS
CITY COLLEGE OF S.F.VIA FAXFR: CHRIS HANZO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
AFT LOCAL 2121

RE: ESL GRIEVANCE INVESTIGATION

I would like to raise an issue unrelated to settlement negotiations in the ESL upgrading grievance. It concerns unit member _____ and several discrepancies that appeared in the scoring at the ESL paper screening level in the two areas outlined below. Our interest here is to correct any such discrepancy in the assessment of her applicant file in the future and to improve the process for all applicants where inconsistencies occur in scoring.

1. At the paper screening level, in the category of "teaching experience in ESL," _____ was initially scored as follows: 5,5,3,5, and 3. This corresponded to the committee's scale granting 0 pts for under 3 years of experience, 2 pts for 3-6, 3 pts for 7-9 yrs, 5 pts for 10-12 yrs, and 7 pts for 13 yrs or over. Ultimately, the committee decided to double credit for anyone with 10 yrs or more experience. As a result, _____ final scores in this category were: 10, 10, 3, 10, and 3.

_____ has 11.5 years teaching experience in ESL. Why did some members of the committee see only 7-9 years of experience? Furthermore, why did the committee choose to double only the highest categories? This seems patently unfair since it arbitrarily places twice as much value on the years of experience for someone in the higher two categories.

2. At the paper screening level, in the category of "advanced educational training in ESL," _____ was scored as follows: 1,1,0,2, and 2. _____ is disturbed that she can only receive up to 2 points for her advanced training, but she clearly deserves the maximum here? Why the discrepancy?

_____ was close to the cut-off for an interview, and scoring that accurately reflected her training and experience could have made the difference. Again, we hope that these concerns can be addressed so that improvement in this area are made for future screening processes.

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 the number of anticipated applicants for a position, the greater the need is for applicants to be clear and precise, and not rely on the committee's ability to find or interpret information in the application.

Why did the committee choose to double only the two highest scores? That choice was made after the first pass yielded too many candidates than could possibly be interviewed. I believe they assumed that people with less than 10 years experience were not senior enough, given how many people there were with 10 or more years experience. Future committees should beware of such shortcuts because they compound any errors that may have occurred in previous scoring. If scores for a particular criterion are to be adjusted (for example, doubled), then all such scores should be so adjusted.

Why did the candidate not receive the maximum score for "advanced educational training?" My answer is only a guess here, but I believe the committee might have valued the training less than the candidate does because it is not training in ESL, but rather in a foreign language and in language and reading development. Although reasonable people might disagree with the committee's non-consideration of these relevant fields, nothing in the candidate's letter explains the relevance of this graduate work to the teaching of ESL. The candidate must have expected the committee to make the connection, but the committee did not. However, once again, the committee should have questioned the wide range of scores for this criterion and questioned whether they were applying consistent criteria consistently.

Why was advanced educational training worth only two points when teaching experience ended up being worth up to 14? The committee did not feel that a year of graduate work was as valuable as a year of teaching. As it happens I tried to argue this point with the committee, but the committee felt that its value system was correct for ESL instructors.

Every committee I have worked with begins the process aware of the importance of its efforts and committed to doing a fair and conscientious job. It is only when these committees encounter staggering numbers of applicant folders to review that they begin to realize that they might not have planned for every contingency. Needless to say, the greater the number of individual cases, the greater the possibility of individual variation. One might call this both the joy and the curse of diversity. I have never observed a committee become so cynical that it just selects the 15 most attractive applications to interview. Rather, committees always buckle down to do the difficult screening task they have set for themselves. Nevertheless, time constraints and large numbers of folders can contribute to less-than-perfect results. Perhaps your memo and this response will alert committees to these pitfalls.