

SBVC Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes

February 20, 2019

AS/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|--|---|--------|
| 1. Call to Order and Roll Call | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting called to order at 3:01 p.m. • Roll call via sign-in sheet [see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet]. | |
| 2. Public Comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None. | |
| 3. Senate President's Report C. Huston | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see attachment on the Academic Senate's website, under Agendas & Minutes, 2/20/19] • Reminder of the Faculty Diversification Workshop- a free workshop with free lunch and parking provided at Norco College tomorrow 9 – 3 p.m. This is a great flex activity. They're going to talk about how to grow and mentor a diverse faculty. This applies to all faculty. It's something we really need to bring to campus. • Curriculum Chair: Deadline March 1, 2019, at 5:00 p.m. • IEPI-PRT Visit: This is to look at TESS and computer support for our district. I have 4 potential faculty who are interested, but there is room for more. Please let me know if you are interested. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: I think it's during the week, right? I asked S. Nikac if it was okay to attend part of it. ○ C. Huston: They break it into different groups that talk about different aspects. It's set up in sections, so you can go to parts. The last time I was there I was the only faculty in a room full of classified employees and managers. If you're able to attend and you have honest feedback on TESS services, your voice is needed. ○ R. Hamdy: Also if you have knowledge of TESS services. I hope those of you who decide to go have some knowledge of what TESS does so we can improve on that. We don't want people to say it took too long to fix their computer because that's not what TESS is about. • FLEX Calendar: The Calendar Committee met last week. Essentially 2 calendars are being prepared for 2020/2021. One is a rollover calendar of what we have now, the other is a contingency calendar in case the 175 work day passes. We wanted to have a second calendar approved. We will get some mockups of those calendars and bringing it here for feedback. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: If that does pass, is that contingency a 16-week calendar? I'm just curious. ○ C. Huston: We are looking at about a 16.5 week calendar. There are a lot of things we are looking at, for example, we discussed taking Thanksgiving week off. ○ R. Hamdy: It might look like a longer semester like now, but there will be more breaks throughout like Thanksgiving. • District Budget Committee is meeting tomorrow for the first time in several months. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|--|---|--------|
| <p>3. Senate President's Report continued C. Huston</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to Board of Trustees agendas and minutes. I want to make sure you all know how to access those agendas and minutes so you know what's going on. If you've never been to a Board meeting, consider coming at 5:00 sometime. | |
| <p>4. SBVC President's Report D. Rodriguez</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see AS Documents: Vision for Success Goals and SBCCD Data] • I got this information from J. Smith and in working J. Gilbert. If you remember on Opening Day I shared some slides that alluded to our Vision for Success goals put out by the State Chancellor for all of the colleges. He asked the campuses to respond to this. This is a kind of summary of that. The reason why I bring this here is the State Chancellor is asking us to sign off and say we are in support of his goals. I don't necessarily think these goals are a bad thing. One great part of these goals is there are no repercussions if we don't meet the goals. He's just asking for colleges to support his Vision for Success. If you look at the sheet, on the last column, by the year 2021/2022 they're asking for a 20% increase in Associate Degrees from our baseline (the 2016/2017 year). It's not a huge jump. They want us to go from 784 awards to 941 awards. With AB705 and Guided Pathways I honestly believe we will be able to reach this without really changing what we planned to do. The same goes for certificates. You all have put forward so many certificates in the last year, and they're unduplicated. I just want to see if it's okay with you all if I go to the state with your support. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: Looking at previous data, we haven't hit those numbers at all. Not to say we aren't going to, but maybe the 20% is a bit on the higher end than what is realistic? ○ D. Rodriguez: The 20% is a statewide goal. ○ A. Avelar: So we might not hit 20%? ○ C. Huston: Right, and there's no penalty if we don't. Chaffey may reach 27% and we do 15%. ○ D. Rodriguez: And that was one of the first things I asked, but there is no penalty. ○ M. Copeland: Does the Statewide Academic Senate have a position on these goals? ○ C. Huston: My feeling is they don't have a problem with the goals, but the implementation by the Chancellors' Office is questionable. ○ R. Hamdy: Regardless, this is what's put out by the state, so they would expect that we do this, right? ○ D. Rodriguez: I think they don't expect us to <i>do</i> them, but they would hope we don't work <i>against</i> it. ○ C. Huston: I don't know why we would ever work against them. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Can we table this until we have more information from the statewide Academic Senate? ○ C. Huston: We can put this on a future agenda. It will take some digging to get more information. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|--|--|--------|
| <p>4. SBVC President's Report, continued D. Rodriguez</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Rodriguez: What kind of information do you need? ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Just to see what the statewide Academic Senate's stance is. They aren't always in agreement with the Chancellor. ○ M. Copeland: I'm curious if the Spring Plenary will have any resolutions regarding these goals. ○ C. Huston: The Area D meeting, which is when I'll get a look at the resolutions, isn't until late March, so it will be a little while before I can get a read on it. Is there a time frame from the State Chancellor's office? ○ D. Rodriguez: Early next month. It's just a yes or no. Is anyone opposed to me asking J. Stanskas and asking him? He should know. ○ C. Huston: It seems like this should be an action item on a future agenda? That way it's more formal and I can share an email response with all of you. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: We need to be careful because anytime you agree to do something there are repercussions. They may say there aren't, but they could put it in the data. ○ A. Avelar: We would want to know how it's being reported. Is there a financial risk? Could colleges lose funding? • Program Review submitted their recommendations to College Council. College Council supports those recommendations. I also support those recommendations. We are going to fund in order of Program Review's recommendations. An email went out campus-wide to talk about that process and what items would be funded. I just wanted to close the loop. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: I did see the list, but I didn't see faculty on there. Did I miss it? ○ D. Rodriguez: You didn't. ○ A. Avelar: Okay, what about faculty? ○ D. Rodriguez: We don't have information on how many we can hire in total as a district or what the distribution will be between Valley and Crafton. ○ A. Avelar: What are we waiting on to get that information? ○ D. Rodriguez: Usually that's discussed in the Chancellor's Cabinet. I don't know where it originates from. ○ C. Huston: What about the money that was supposed to come from the state specifically for growing full-time faculty? Did that come in yet? ○ D. Rodriguez: I don't know. ○ C. Huston: We can ask J. Torres about that as well. | |
| <p>5. Committee Reports</p> | <p>a. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo] ○ R. Hamdy: We are planning a workshop on February 27th for Advancement in Rank.</p> <p>b. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr] • No report.</p> <p>c. CTE [K. Melancon] • No report.</p> <p>d. EEO [R. Hamdy]</p> | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|--------|
| <p>5. Committee Reports, continued</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>e. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Burns-Peters: Are we going to have a great teachers conference? ○ R. Hamdy: Yes, we are planning it for April. We are finalizing plans and looking to hold it more locally instead of at Cal Poly Pamaona. ○ D. Rodriguez: Thank you! ○ R. Hamdy: I'll have more information on that soon. <p>f. Elections [D. Burns-Peters]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D. Burns-Peters: The Curriculum Chair position is open. • C. Huston: Did you get any applications? • D. Burns-Peters: No, but I'll send email again. <p>g. Curriculum [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>h. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>i. Accreditation & SLOs [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: I was hosting the State Senate Accreditation Committee yesterday afternoon during our committee's meeting. We worked on a statewide budget paper that was assigned to us by someone on the executive committee. We also worked on conference planning for the partnerships in excellence. A. Avelar will report on our ASLO Committee's meeting. • A. Avelar: We are working to put together our evidence for the different accreditation standards and sub-standards. We handed out information last semester to the committees. We did send out an email to committees asking for evidence and only received it from Professional Development, although we know that Program Review and Curriculum are coming. We re-strategized our approach. We split it up amongst sub-standards so we can go together to visit people. We are trying not to overwhelm the committee chairs and trying to condense the amount of interviews from the ASLO Committee. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: I think I mentioned this when you guys came in December and wanted it in February. There was no way we could collegially do this as a committee. We just need more time. ○ D. Burns-Peters: Just to support that it was the same for the online committee. It was distributed to our committee and they have a deadline to get it back to us. ○ A. Avelar: so I'm hearing our deadlines are too short. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Yes, especially if you want quality. ○ R. Hamdy: I think there may be a misunderstanding of what you want. Maybe there needs to be more clarification on that. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P. Ferri-Milligan: I understand that, but you need some kind of explanation of how evidence links to what is there. Program Review spans almost every standard I think. • A. Avelar: Right. And we want to keep in mind we are writing a shorter overall document. How long should it be again? • C. Huston: They want 150 pages. There are actual guidelines for the standards. • A. Avelar: We do appreciate all you've done as committees. That took up a good amount of time. J. Smith and A. Maniaol shared their work on Standards IVA and IVB. We have a better idea of how we are approaching the whole process. We also want to look for gaps in how we answer those standards. Did I miss anything? • B. Tasaka: No. Just know if you're a chair you'll probably be hearing from us again. • C. Huston: Directors and other positions too. <p>j. Ed Policy [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report <p>k. Legislative [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report <p>l. Financial Policy [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report | |
| <p>6. Additional Reports</p> | <p>a. SBCCD-CTA [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had negotiations on February 14th. I think you got an email from the lead negotiator. We passed a proposal on wages in September. The one we received in January had a a 1% increase with no increase for part-timers. It causes us to ask why, if we are the ones doing the grunt work to make sure that students get through their programs, why are we not valued in terms of financial components. We countered right away. All the proposals should be on our website so you can see them there. We were also concerned that part timers didn't get any increase because their hourly rates are also below the median. • We are also working on our learning communities counterproposal. • Evaluations were also sunshined by the District. Currently we are in more of a discussion mode, but if you have feelings about evaluations or if anything stands out to you please let us know because we need to be mindful of issues from the faculty perspective. • The Board of Trustees are really the ones at the end of the day who will give directions to the District. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Smith: How far below the state median are our adjuncts paid? ○ A. Avelar: We don't look at the state. Our college has comparison colleges. I think it's about 10% below our comparison colleges, but I'm not completely certain on that. I'll send it to C. Huston and she can send it out. <p>b. District Assembly [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have not met since the last Senate meeting. Our executive meeting is next Monday. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| 6. Additional Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the last District Assembly meeting we had a big discussion about all the APs and BPs we are trying to efficiently review. We asked if we made a big deal of nothing and decided to look back at the recommendation from the accrediting body. I spoke with D. Allen, M. McConnell, and J. Gilbert. We are looking for a way to streamline the process. Every single item does not need to show up at every meeting. Hopefully by the end of the semester we will have something more efficient and effective. | |
| 7. Consent Agenda | <p>a. Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2/6/19 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion 1 | <p>Motion 1: Move to approve the consent agenda. 1st: T. Vasquez 2nd: D. Smith Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p> |
| 8. Old Business | <p>a. Guided Pathways update [T. El-Sharif]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not here <p>b. AB 798 Update [J. Bjerke]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see AS Documents: Establish Local Open Educational Resources Liaisons] I noticed that the Senate had previously approved an ad hoc committee of the Senate for OER. I was hoping we can reaffirm that. It was last approved from what I can tell in 2017-2018. I was hoping to get that approved again this year because I would like to start meeting with people. We have three textbook affordability initiatives going on right now. The Zero Textbook Cost Degree is wrapping up. We also have AB 789 funding; it's just about \$30,000, but people need to tell me how to spend that because there is a lot of flexibility with that money. I'm also in a position called Equity Champion which is a follow-up to the Zero Textbook Cost Degree grant that is a very small position with about a \$2,000 stipend and a lot of work. I go to a lot of meetings and I'm supposed to help forget the connection between Equity and Zero Textbook Cost related items. But also if we can reaffirm an OER ad hoc committee maybe we can increase our conversations about low cost materials. I'm not completely devoted to zero textbook costs at all costs. It's a good initiative; it increases equity. The numbers are showing that at the very least there is a correlation to students completing their courses and passing with a C or better. Those numbers are showing up with positive gains for equity. It's initial numbers, so the gains are small, but significant so hopefully we can keep that group going. I passed out a request that the Academic Senate appoint an OER liaison. At the state level they created a team of OER liaisons. It can be me, but it doesn't have to be. <p>• Questions/Comments:</p> | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|--|--|--|
| <p>8. Old Business, continued</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: Maybe we should discuss making OER a standing committee instead of ad hoc because of the nature of it. I remember when R. Pires was doing it that was part of the discussion. ○ C. Huston: I think we did talk about this for OER and also Guided Pathways as opposed to using ad hoc committees. It would add more committees to our committee list and spread faculty more thinly. This would include opening AB 2510. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion 2 ○ R. Hamdy: Can you plug the OER summit? ○ J. Bjerke: We will have a conference if you're at all interested in OER, especially if you're just getting started or if you want to learn more. It's Friday, March 29th, and there will be food from the Sunroom. | <p>Motion 2: Move to reaffirm the ad hoc OER Committee and agendize adding these committees to our committee list with more research.</p> <p>1st: A. Avelar 2nd: D. Burns-Peters</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: J. Bjerke, are you going to have a chance to go to the online committee and talk to them about the liaison? Do you have a copy I can send out faculty-wide to get people to apply? Some of the ASCCC positions come with reassign time. • J. Bjerke: I can get you a copy. There is a \$1000 stipend. <p>Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p> |
| <p>9. New Business</p> | <p>a. College Promise [D. Rodriguez and D. Humble]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see AS Documents: San Bernardino Community College Promise Draft] • This is a Districtwide Promise Program. It's a scale up of Valley Bound. There will be more funding. The District was generous in allocating a \$10 million endowment. It's a 2-year program, versus the previous program that was 1 year. We will be able to loan students a Chromebook while they're going to school here. There is also money set aside for textbooks. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|--|--|--------|
| <p>9. New Business, continued</p> | <p>One goal is to see how we can use more of our online resources, but for those classes that require textbooks we don't want students to be at a disadvantage. There are transportation vouchers as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They'll have to commit to 2 years as a full-time student, as well as tutoring hours and counseling to ensure they're on track with their Ed Plan. There will also be community service because I think it's important that students give back. There is also going to be a peer mentor program. We'll ask 2nd year students to mentor 1st year students in a paid position. • The promise program, much like Valley Bound, will start reaching out to students in the 9th grade. We have the resources to talk to students and then invite them to our campus in the 3rd, 5th, 7th, and 9th grade. We are working with our school districts right now. We want to ask, "How do we launch this in the high schools?" Last year Valley Bound served about 277 students. We talked about the Promise accommodating 1,000 students across the District with about 700 for Valley. Just for Valley Bound we have about 600 applications and we don't want to tell our students no. The District generously said whoever is willing to come and keep up their end of the promise will get funding. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: 105 hours of tutoring per student? Where does that money come from? ○ D. Rodriguez: From the endowment. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: So tutoring services will get funding from this? ○ M. Copeland: Are you saying you're anticipating about 600 students for this program? ○ D. Rodriguez: At least. I'm anticipating about 800, but we know there will be attrition. We'll do our best to keep them in though. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Is Valley Bound going to go away? Because Valley Bound is a great program. ○ D. Rodriguez: This is Valley Bound scaled up; it has all the same components. You'll hear it being termed as the promise, but it's in essence Valley Bound. We'll probably phase the name out. I am committed to keep all the same components of Valley Bound because the program works. When you measure students peer-to-peer, the success rates and retention rates are very different. ○ P. Wall: when is it going to start? ○ D. Rodriguez: This fall. ○ M. Tinoco: Under student support it's saying that starting in the 12th grade students will have an Ed Plan? Is that where counselors get involved in the high schools or will the students come to us? ○ D. Rodriguez: Both. The boots on the ground part of it- I'll leave it to the professionals who are currently running it. There is funding for additional support folks to help out with that- counselors, support staff, etc. ○ C. Huston: Are we hiring them categorically or full time, tenure track? ○ Diana: I don't know yet. We will make the announcement on March 8th that we are | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------|
| | <p>officially launching the SBCCD promise. Crafton will also have a promise program; theirs may look different than ours, but it will benefit their students. It's a lot of students to wrap our arms around, but I think that the District is being generous with the funding. You all heard about the District purchasing buildings? The revenue from the leases of those buildings will be used to continuously fund the promise program. I'm excited about it. I think we will see some huge successes. Thank you all who have been supportive of Valley Bound. Without you this would have been harder to get off the ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Ababat: If this is the case, we are talking about the 20% increase [related to the Vision for Success] would be very feasible, right? ○ D. Rodriguez: Yeah. ○ C. Huston: Some of them would come to us anyway, but it might help with graduation rates. ○ A. Avelar: I know it's a draft, but since I was hired we don't charge "tuition" we charge "fees," right? ○ D. Rodriguez: Correct. ○ A. Avelar: Can we change it so we don't use the word "tuition"? ○ C. Huston: If you have any more feedback send it to President Rodriguez. Can we get a look at the next draft and vote to support or not? Or we can keep it as an information item? ○ T. Allen: I think we are okay with what's here. ○ D. Rodriguez: I'll bring back literature and documents. I know we'll hit some potholes because it's new, but we have a strong enough foundation that we can work through it. ○ A. Avelar: Maybe updates that the proper support staff are being hired. | |
| <p>9. New Business, continued</p> | <p>b. HR Hiring Committee Handbook [K. Hannon]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see AS Documents: Screening Committee Guide] • Thank you for inviting me. For those of you who don't know me I am Kristina Hannon. I'm the Executive Director of Human Resources. I've been at the District for 2 years this July. • I've worked in different capacities in community colleges in the area. At each place different things would happen on hiring and screening committees. When I came here as the director, the first thing I asked was, walk me through the process even though I experienced the process as a candidate. There weren't really clear-cut guidelines in writing, partially because of turnover and changes in leadership. We were piecing together APs/BPs. In reviewing some of the accreditation recommendations from the last visit, there was documentation that we should have a Screening Committee Guide developed. This includes working with the State Chancellor's office on the recruitment of diverse faculty and staff. It also includes a codified process that everyone can follow. Part of that process is educating committee members on bias in hiring. We also want clear-cut guidelines so if something happens it's in the handbook and it's not dependent on a generalist making a decision in the moment. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------|
| <p>9. New Business, continued</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a draft. The intent of this conversation and any conversation that follows is to get feedback and ideas, and a vote from Senate saying that you reviewed it and support it. One other guideline is the candidate experience. The Chancellor's office wants us to track if a candidate turns down employment or if they apply but do not come for the interview. We would like to know why. It could be a flaw in the system. Also any of you who are chairs who have to hire adjuncts, this is a guide you can use in that process. We are all educators so I don't want to go line-by-line. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>How to Serve on a Screening Committee</i> covers Roles and Expectations. We want consistency in how the chair is selected and their role. We also want to make sure that the committee adheres to all guidelines in the document; they are cross-referenced in the APs/BPs. There is no single clear-cut AP/BP that speaks to the process; it is sort of pieced together. This document would be a standardized document unless something changes internally or at the state level. We would bring those changes to campus bodies, including this one. It will be on our website. The requirements of the committee are stated. ○ <i>How to Read and Evaluate Applications</i> comes up a lot. For faculty hiring the minimum qualifications are clearly stated and we go by the guidelines. More recently at the last District Assembly we pushed through the District Equivalency Committee; that is going forward. This document points to the equivalency process outlined in AP/BP. We want to be able to point to this as the District equivalency process. This will be used for all hiring- faculty, classified, and managers. It also talks about competencies- a term I'm trying to introduce in more classified job descriptions. We are launching into a classified study where we will analyze and review all classified job descriptions. As a committee we want to be able to point to competencies you want to see. ○ <i>Candidate Selection and Screening Criteria</i>: In some cases the committee can ask to review the HR review for any academic and manager positions- I don't know if that was afforded to you in the past, but it will be- for those who were screened out. We want to create desirables beforehand so we can communicate an expected timeline <i>before</i> the position is posted so that the candidate can plan accordingly. We want to be able to say we anticipate having first-level interviews around this timeline. We think that will help with the candidate experience, but if for some reason there was a lag, they know ahead of time why they didn't hear anything. The state has a statewide hiring booklet with some of this information as well as processes taken from other institutions. Page 6 discusses screening instruments for faculty- I want your feedback on this. The same for administrative positions. ○ <i>Elimination of Bias and Decision Making</i>: This is a strong part of the process. We want to remove our own bias when looking at the applications. Everyone is required to do the EEO training once every 3 years. As the EEO committee continues to meet and look over the requirements, so that timeline may change but t's never a bad thing to be reminded. This would be included in the handbook as a refresher. ○ <i>How to Conduct an Interview</i>: This involves developing interview questions. HR wants to | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------|
| <p>9. New Business, continued</p> | <p>develop a question bank. In collaboration with the committee we might have some standard questions that we pull from the bank. A lot of times we can pick out commonly asked questions. Do we know what the first question typically is? "Tell us why you want to work at Valley College." We don't want anyone to be caught off guard, but we want to get to the meat of things. We are working hard on question development so the committee doesn't have to work so hard. I want the committee to be educated and knowledgeable so we don't have to fail recruitments. It helps us when you know the law. We also want to develop a truly effective scoring sheet that pulls out the similarities and differences in scoring so that the conversation can happen. That's the whole point of the deliberation. Having the criteria and talking about acceptable answers before interviews begin is a good way to vet out those differences. I think this will be beneficial for us. There's also a section on internal candidates. This is important to me. I want us to be able to protect the process. It can be a daunting experience for an adjunct to apply for a full-time position or for one of you to apply for a manager position. It's so hard to keep what you know about someone out of that room, but it's important for that person to be interviewed based on what they displayed in the application and interview process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions/Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: One issue I know of with coming up with answers ahead of time is that answers get leaked. How does that get addressed? If someone is a close friend with a candidate should they excuse themselves? ○ K. Hannon: Yes. We really do discuss bias in our EEO training. Bias can include liking someone too much as well. I don't like punitive responses to things, but the hiring context is one thing that can really get the college in trouble if something is considered illegal or discriminatory in the hiring context and we start getting sanctions and the state attaches those sanctions to other services and things it can get bad. The way I've been able to combat it in the past is to allow the committee members to call things out when things happen in the interview process or question development process. We have to feel comfortable with calling each other out. That's really the only way we can let things out. With bias we don't know it unless you express it. In this context it's important we hold ourselves and others accountable. Ideally if you think you can't assess a candidate based on information, whether it's good or bad, we should have a conversation about it. ○ M. Copeland: It sounds like some of the things you covered are actually in the training. How do you want feedback? ○ K. Hannon: How do you normally do it? How are you sending President Rodriguez feedback about the promise program? ○ D. Rodriguez: Oh you don't want that. Can I make a suggestion? If we could have this document electronically we can send any revisions to you, would that work? ○ K. Hannon: Yes. Ideally I don't want thirty different comments, but I want you to feel comfortable with this. This isn't going out until I've had the conversations and I'm | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|--|--|--------|
| <p>9. New Business, continued</p> | <p>comfortable enough saying this is what we are going to live by, but we will live by this. When accreditation comes we will already be living by this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: Is there going to be something similar for second level interviews and are forums in here? ○ K. Hannon: Yes, forums are there. This is just for first level interviews because once we go to second level that is where Title V says that the hiring manager can conduct the interview. At this point it truly is just screening, so you might hear “search committee” or “screening committee.” It doesn’t go into hiring until the second level. I’ll have recommendations for the hiring manager about having an EEO rep in the room. The conversations about having non-hiring managers in the room will be up to the hiring manager. Our requirement is that we have this guide for the screening committee since nobody on the screening committee is bound by law. This is the only way we can give guidance and say this is our expectation. If the hiring manager does something I can address that there. Forums are in there- forums vs. meet and greets. The reason the forums are in there is because they’ve been used in different ways at both campuses and I realized we didn’t have anything on how to conduct it. When we recently did this for the presidential forum at Crafton, it was a very drawn-out process. I realized we needed this in writing. ○ D. Rodriguez: The forum for the longest time was conducted under the purview of the Senate? Are we saying that’s no longer the case? ○ K. Hannon: The forum I participated in at Crafton was an extension of the hiring context. It may not have been the same as what was done in the past. I’m not sure what was done in the past. That forum was done by HR because confidentiality had to be maintained; all the comments and questions had to come through me. I had to go through every comment card and email before I could release it to the hiring manager. What I understand has happened here more recently was more of a meet and greet. ○ C. Huston: We can share any thoughts we have on forums with you. ○ T. Vasquez: I was in a meeting where the hiring manager was on the screening committee. ○ K. Hannon: I believe it was on the <i>Screening Committee Role</i>. This could only be the second time the hiring manager can see the candidate. If they’re only on second level, they will only see them once. Hiring someone after seeing them once is not enough. ○ C. Huston: Is that consistent with the AP? Does the AP state that the manager can be on both? We need to make sure we follow processes if there are changes. ○ T. Vasquez: They also need to know their role because they can sway opinions. ○ R. Hamdy: I think it’s great that we send K. Hannon feedback, but I think it should come back here. If K. Hannon wants to come back with how the feedback was incorporated? | |
| <p>10. Announcements</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Jones: If you students are interested in seeing our pharmacist come, let me know [see flyer]. | |
| <p>11. Adjournment</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m. • Next meeting: March 6, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in AD/SS 207. | |