**SEEED Hiring Subcommittee—**

**(Linda Allen, Pat Tyler, Nina Floro, John Mosby, Lucia Lachmayr)**

1. **Why we chose to look at our hiring practices at Skyline**

The Hiring Committee was the outcome of looking at the domains in our committee work in 2011-12 and realizing that one of the inequities that existed on campus was the faculty that mirrored the diverse student population. We wanted to understand why we weren’t hiring a more diverse faculty and staff and wondered what the experience of the hiring process was and if it in any way hindered or helped in the hiring of diverse staff and faculty.

Started with the SEEED Inquiry Question:

How do our practices and processes in connecting, entry, and progress and completion impact campus equity and student success?

We began with the above and focused to this, our hiring focus question:

 *“How do our current hiring practices assist or exclude in the attracting/hiring/retaining of faculty, staff, administrators reflective of our student population?”*

1. **Methods**

We deliberated on how best to collect the data and decided that a survey was the best way to go. We struggled with whether we should incorporate our survey into the District survey or do our own anonymous survey. After debating the pros

* + Research conducted (what did you do to try and address your inquiry question - surveys, interviews, looking at institutional data, etc.)
	+ Survey Monkey or Zoomerang

We had several preliminary questions:

* What percentage of Skyline new hires comes from within the district?
* Look for data specific to Skyline
* What are the percentages for adjuncts?
* Find clarification on the hiring processes (Classified staff, esp.. How advertised?)
* Can we gather data from current hiring committee members and job applicants after the process is over? Is there a way that such data can be gathered using anonymous surveys addressing the process? I*f so:* Interview faculty (and/or interviewees) on hiring committees? Question of whether an Anonymous survey or through the District.
* How do screening instruments that committees develop promote biases (individual, group, institutional, etc.)? (From previous survey)
* Hiring manager/College President/VPI/VPSS/Deans (Question of biases/conflicts of interest/know the candidate/etc...)

With the help of the Institutional Planning and Research Office, the SEEED Committee, and Human Resources Office, the Hiring subcommittee created a questionnaire that asks people who have been on Skyline College hiring committees to respond to a hiring survey. This survey will be attached to the district questionnaire, which staff and faculty who have been on recent hiring committees have been sent from the SMCCD District offices. We will also look at sending this out to faculty via Survey Monkey to gather a wider range of responses from people who have participated in previous hiring committees. Responses would be confidential.

SEEED Hiring Committee Questionnaire:

Questions (except for #9, 10 & 14) were scored on a 4-point Likert Scale

N=50

SEEED Hiring Committee Questionnaire and response:

1. What position are you? (Faculty, Classified, AFSCME, Administration)

Faculty 50%

Classified 40%

AFSCME 0%

Administration 10%

1. Have you ever been on a Skyline College Hiring Committee?

Yes 88%

No 12%

1. If so, how long ago?

Within the last 1-2 years 81.8 %

Between 3-5 years ago 9.1%

6-11 years ago 9.1%

Over 12 years ago 4.5 %

1. What position was your Committee for? (Faculty, Classified, AFSCME, Administration)

Faculty 52.2%

Classified 54.3%

AFSCME 0%

Administration 26.1%

1. How familiar were you with the current district hiring processes and policies?

Very familiar 37.5%

**Familiar** 45.8%

Not very familiar 12.55%

Not at all familiar 4.2%

1. How well did your committee adhere to the established hiring processes and policies?

**Very well** 56.5%

Somewhat well 26.1%

Not very well 13.0%

Not at all 4.3%

1. To what degree do you think personal biases influenced the development of the screening instruments?

Very much  0.0%

Somewhat 8.7%

**Not very much** 56.5%

Not at all 34.8%

1. To what degree do you think others’ personal biases influenced the development of the screening instruments?

Very much 21.3%

Somewhat 23.4%

**Not very much** 34.0%

Not at all 21.3%

1. To what degree do you think your personal biases influence your preference of candidates?

Very much  0.0%

Somewhat 23.9%

Not very much 32.6%

**Not at all** 43.5%

1. To what degree do you think others’ personal biases influenced the committee’s choice of candidates?

Very much 27.7%

Somewhat 23.4%

**Not very much** 34.0%

Not at all 14.9%

1. Do you think the interview *questions* to the candidates were biased?

Yes 15.6%

No 84.4%

1. If so, on what do you think that bias was based? (In what way?)

Ethnicity 35.0 %

Gender 10%

Age 5%

Communication Style 45.0%

Experience 65.0%

Differently-abled 0%

Religion 0%

Sexual Orientation 5%

/Other(fill in) 0%

(Open-ended Question)

1. Is there anything else you would like to share about your Hiring Committee experience? Please share below:
* Was not considered at all to a interview that i was qualified for.
* Bias based on: - personal relationships - personal preference (who you know)
* The bias I experienced in the hiring process were based on what individuals prioritized and emphasized from the job announcement and a feeling they experienced from the candidate during their interviews.
* The administrative interviews after the selection committee had forwarded candidates were rather hostile. Instead of focusing on the demonstrated teaching abilities, record and accomplishments of the individual candidates, the administrators seemed to be angry that the best qualified candidates did not conform to their non-academic biases.
* Committees do not decide who is getting the job. I do not think this is a comprehensive survey.
* I have worked as a tenured faculty in other Districts in California and have now been at Skyline for over 15 years. I came to work here and continue to be impressed our clear, fair and thorough hiring practices.
* Question 12 seems to assume that the answer to 11 should be YES. In almost all the cases listed I have found the committees I've sat on to be quite conscious of these potential prejudices and biases and we have worked directly to avoid these issues. However, the choices in 12 include experience which is one of the attributes we often list as desirable in a job listing. I find that experience is a valuable quality in a teacher (as are sensitivity, flexibility and creativity) and to that extent I am indeed biased to prefer those qualities in a teaching candidate. While I don't view experience as a measure of quality directly, I can't think of one situation in which a lack of experience would be a more desirable quality.
* I was in an awesome committee!
* I think hiring policies for all employees, including managers should be consistent and transparent in written documentation that has been approved by all constituencies. Further, ALL lateral hires/transfers should go through a vetted process practiced by a hiring committee. Managers should NOT be given the authority to hire or appoint people for a job without going through a committee. My concern is, primarily, that lateral transfers from one college to another may not meet the needs of the specific college. A committee representative of the college, not the sole manager, has the insight to determine who best "fits" the needs of that position.
* There is nepotism going on, inexperienced chairmanship of hiring committees, blackballing going on from Administration, 'hidden agendas" (meaning the hiring committees are just 'fronts' going through the motions when their is a candidate that is already decided on. Very unfair practices going on.
* This is a very devisive survey. When you say "personal biases" do you mean biases that have nothing to do with the job? I mean there are biases as to the professional qualties of the hiree. However, the job descriptions are very carefully created by the committee so it articulates the needs of the position. I resent the fact that my professionalism would be called into question like this.
* Several of the committees on which I participated designed questions that were directly geared toward an intended applicant's experience to the degree that at times the questions seemed to be tailored for him/her to the exclusion of ANY other applicant. Also, should there be any member of the committee who did not personally like an "in-house" candidate, that individual would not be hired....regardless of qualifications. We need to be far more equitable in our hiring processes.
* I don't think there was bias, but I do think there was prior knowledge--based on evidence-- that was used
* It would be great if all the candidates are already all pre-screened before giving the list to the committee. From my previous jobs, all applications are screened by Human Resources. This would help the committee members a great deal.
* Experience, if it can be considered a bias, is critical in selecting candidates for interviewing for positions. Committee members will naturally lean toward candidates who have more work experience i the field they are interviewing for. I don't know if you can fairly call this a bias.
* I only have experience going through the hiring process as an interviewee not a committee member.
* Please give a chance the employee that who never been to the hiring comittee and have a experience. Thank you!
* the dean prepared to give the president what the president wanted. What the president wanted was clear from the outset.
* This survey concentrates on the negative aspects of personnel evaluations. As such, it determines little as to the balance of these negative attitudes verses the evaluations of positive attributes observed. In other words, while biases are unavoidable, how much impact did they eventually have in the final determinations? We all have biases, so is that not why we have committees to "average" out those biases? I'm not sure how much useful information this survey provides. With regards to the interview questions, are not all the questions biased to elicit specific responses? What would be a non-biased question (from the list provided) that would not favor one desired attribute over another? Are you not actually asking if the evaluations of the responses to the questions were biased, and not if the questions were biases?
* This survey should define "bias" before asking questions about whether there was bias in hiring processes. Everyone brings certain biases to hiring decisions. Some biases may include beliefs about professional skills or characteristics that, if conscious and openly-presented, may be appropriate in hiring committee discussions and decision-making.
* Unfortunately, I don't believe this survey targets aspects of our hiring processes that are critical to an assessment of equity issues.
* Nepotism-the chair said this is who I want because that person was strongly suggested by another employee.
* From experience I see hiring committees made out of a group of people who work in the same office, therefore they already know who they want to hire and go through the hiring process only as a 'procedure'. We need to figure out a way of making people from outside the 'hiring' office to participate in the hiring committee to make it a real 'equal opportunity' for everyone.

*4 Basic Themes to open-ended question:*

1. Lack of Transparency—Personal relationships biased candidate selection (In-house candidates seen as getting preference)
2. Process— a. Requirements too narrow for position/requirements prioritized or tailored to specific candidate, or b. Process is very clear and transparent.
3. Administrative—a. Committees lack power to decide final candidate. b. Managers not going through the proper vetting process
4. Survey—a. Biased survey, or b. Survey not comprehensive enough
5. **Results/Analysis**

Limitations to the survey in that it was open to all Skyline employees and therefore anybody could access it, including those with agendas and/or those who had not ever had experience with hiring committees, and as can be seen from the open-ended survey, those who had not been hired. Therefore it could be considered a first draft and open to a revision and administration through the HR department.

Looking at the data presented on the PowerPoint, the most recent hires at Skyline are somewhat representative of the demographics of our student population, although the college as a whole is not as much. The largest group that was underrepresented on the faculty/staff /administration to student ratio in the demographics of the college was Filipino and Pacific Islander.

The hiring survey revealed some strong feelings that the hiring process itself was unfair. Going through each respondent and correlating answers might give a more clear picture of the particular populations for whom the hiring process seemed to be biased.

This survey was administered at the end of a particularly busy semester hiring-wise, and for many who responded, especially if they had not been hired, it may have predisposed them to a stronger response than might have been garnered in a semester where there was limited hiring.

1. **Implications/Interpretations:**
2. Our survey had limitations, from how we crafted the survey, to who responded and because we could not do any follow up responses.
3. We think that with more time, more committee members to weigh in and more depth to how we can access potential respondents, we might get a clearer picture of people’s experiences on hiring committees. We also think that it might behoove the college to make the hiring process much more transparent so as to mitigate possible misinterpretations and/or possible bias on the screening and hiring committees.
4. We need to make a more concerted effort to recruit, hire and retain representative faculty/staff/administrators that mirror our student population, especially those that are underrepresented (currently Filipino and Pacific Islanders).