Hi All,

First off, thank you so much for the opportunity to observe and give feedback to you guys. While I'm by no means an equivalency expert, after serving as EEO Faculty Rep, EEO Rep, and on the hiring procedures taskforce, I've had lots of experience learning about best practices in hiring. As I thought about what I'd improve, I hope it doesn't come off as confrontational, I know you guys are doing a lot of hard work. I just thought about how some reimaging could make your processes more fair/ transparent for the college.

Let me know if you have questions.

Oh, also sorry for my informal tone. I just couldn't get myself to put on inauthentic professionalism for this.

<u>Your Meetings:</u>
- The conversation I witnessed seemed so important. It seemed integral. People had insight. There were things you were unsure about and they were talked out. At least one person changed their mind! It was actually fascinating to me that you guys were able to ever feel comfortable doing this without talking because:
    - I was very concerned that people had voted using the wrong paperwork. Without a meeting, this could have gone unnoticed or unchecked.
    - I was also concerned that people voted who weren't there. I can't think of anything else at COS except for elections where you're allowed to vote if you're not there for discussion.
    - Recommendations for your meetings:
        - Always talk about candidates prior to voting
        - Don't let people vote if they don't participate in the conversations.
        - As was suggested, have experts in the room. This should also help with what Russell mentioned in Senate (wanting discipline experts from CTE). I don't think these experts should be from the committees, and could even be from outside COS when necessary. This person could look at the coursework without knowing the candidate's identity so you won't have to worry about them advocating super hard.
        - David mentioned to me that you were worried about timeliness of meetings (like you didn't want to get stuff back really late). I

feel like if you set a standing meeting, this would help (maybe just for Spring) for deliberations. When there's nothing to review, cancel it. It would be helpful for committee planning too to know when you guys meet to talk to there.
  - I'd argue to have an EEO Rep there always

- With the first candidate you discussed, it was interesting (and sort of concerning) to me that you all voted "no" but you voted no for different reasons. I wonder (and this is just me radically reimagining at this point) what would happen if you voted on each ISSUE you guys see with a candidate's application. For example, let's say that there's a class that one of you wants to fail the whole candidate for. If the rest of the committee see this as fine, then you should not fail the candidate for that reason. This would also help with the documentation mentioned in best practices (and asked for by committees). If you had a majority on each thing that was "wrong"- it would help. I guess I"m saying that I think it would make committees more comfortable if you guys agreed on your no.

Process:
  - It's really helpful for there to be feedback for committees, but also perhaps training. I told David a couple stories of how I feel much more capable of knowing if we should send y'all something or not now when I'm on the committee side. I literally recently told a committee I'm on not to send something to you guys, and I got a text from someone saying, "thanks for sending that, I wasn't sure, I need equivalency training." A workshop where perhaps committee members from across campus could "be in your shoes" and try to determine if something has equivalency could be so cool and helpful and help with those bridges.
  - Feedback! Please. Help people understand, across campus, why stuff is getting denied.
  - Clear options for appeal or resubmission. I feel like I keep hearing conflicting info about whether this is allowed. I know David, you've argued that we don't give feedback/ allow resubmissions on other things in the hiring process. But in other things we are comparing candidates against each other. This is just us asking whether they get in the door. Its different.

Your online packet:
  - Okay, in my obsession, I have feedback for your online packet:
      - I told David this, but you guys need a different example. I have a second Master's in Instructional Design, so I understand the classes

being described on the left. They are in no way equivalent to what they are saying. This threw me off a lot when looking at it. I thought I was understanding your process, but frankly, the ones you denied when I was there seemed a lot closer related to me (as an outsider to the field) than your example (where I'm an insider… which again, this is why listening to experts matters!) But yeah, please change that example. Its for sure throwing off candidates

- Be clear in directions about ALL course stuff- like all requirements for a degree.
- Talk about how "work experience" isn't considered. "Please note, we do not consider work experience" (I might argue you should, but that's a different day)
- Have a clear list of everything you want from them AND example.
- Add that third column to the example

Anddd the AP:

- Yeah, I'd love you to keep an appeal process, but a bigger thing that wasn't mentioned stood out to me.
- You guys should review this part:

  3. Evaluation of Equivalency for Faculty
  In evaluating the qualifications of applicants, the Equivalency Committee reviews transcripts and other supporting documents to determine equivalency by meeting thefollowing criteria:

  3.1 Disciplines requiring a Master's degree
  In disciplines normally requiring an M.A./M.S. one of the following must be satisfied:
  - B.A./B.S. plus 36 semester units or more (to be determined by the level-one hiring committee) of graduate level coursework in the specific discipline from an accredited institution,

-
- So this, reads to me that the "you evaluate candidates is that you ask do, "do they have 36 units in the SPECIFIC discipline? This is not saying, you take other classes to match classes in a program, this is just like, hey do you have 36 units in English? You're good. Please change this to better match what you're doing.