

Notes from 5/16/24 Chairs Committee Meeting Per Anonymous Hiring Process

- The intention is admirable, the execution is poor
- Blacked out sections is very inconsistent
- Examples - the CV/resume
 - Sometimes the entire page
 - Sometimes the dates and school names
 - Sometimes just the school names
 - Sometimes just the dates
 - Sometime the schools attended was blacked out, but the names of schools taught was visible
 - Sometimes blacked out proper names in the questions (like "AB 705")
 - Sometimes blacked out the proper names in the list of professional development attended
- I don't like not seeing their math grades, I think it's important to know that they are solid mathematically
- Since blacking out most/all of the CV and transcript, need to change how we ask and format the Employment History section to get more information
- Since blacking out was inconsistent, I wasn't always sure if the applicant forgot to upload a supplemental table of courses completed or if it was under one of the many blacked out pages
- Basically, if this process is going to continue, the entire application format and instructions need to change.
- The process for redaction needs to be consistent.
- All admin should be required to use the same process for all hiring
- I actually liked how they blocked out the candidate's name.
- I would block out all people's names (candidate names, supervisor names, etc.).
- I wouldn't block out college names. I guess you can deduce who the person is if you really want to though if they taught at Miramar
- We need to address the issue of candidates using AI for their responses - have a policy such as if AI is used their application will not be considered for interview
- Some applicants had identical responses the the diversity question - no doubt this is from cutting and pasting into AI or ChatGPT - how do we handle this?
- The process takes too long for HR to redact, we have been waiting on an application for some time for a recruitment I am on and still don't have the applications for an impending tally.
- HR with their low staffing issues, do not have time to complete this.
- I was on two other recruitments this semester and had the application redacted. I don't think it made much difference in the applicants we selected to interview.
- Seems like a lot of work for VERY little payoff and delays in the process.
- This process seems not fixable, prefer to resume previous method with just redaction of applicant names, and info that implies sex/gender/race/ethnicity/age
- Worst hiring experience in all my years here at Miramar
- Taking out years of service is not a good idea
- Redactions are inconsistent - seems not fair as a result
- The pool may not have changed despite this process

- I believe we may have eliminated some of the folks that may have been interviewed in the past
- Not able to see grades is a problem
- Liked candidate's name blocked out
- Logistics:
 - Took five weeks to get application
 - Had to rush through applications – six days
 - Can't interview for three weeks
- Level of experience is difficult to assess if we do not know how long they have held certain positions or the level of the institution they've taught (Middle school? High school? Two-year college? University? Public? Private? In-state? Out-of-state?)
- Major questions about how we see if adjuncts need to have POA to be in the interview, how are they selected? Who is confirming that adjuncts who per CBA should be interviewed are indeed being offered an interview? The committee is not able to assess this
- Very important to see resumes/cover letter after they are invited for interview - in the past we could look these over just before applicant came in the room for their interview - now we have no idea who they are
- District paid for someone who was not qualified to fly in for interview, this person had only high school teaching experience, thanked us for a vacation to San Diego, wasted District resources and the committee's time due to this ineffective process of redacting
- All the employers but SDCCD were redacted - how is that fair?
- For minimum quals – exact courses and degrees are needed which is why we need transcripts, as well as length of experience
- We ask for a chart with classes but it was very inconsistent as HR does not provide a template for upload, so the information varies, and if it was not provided by applicant I wonder if it was indeed uploaded but not made available to the committee
- Some committees said they did see transcripts, why some and not others? Too inconsistent
- Fine to remove name, age, gender, ethnicity, why not just block out info per Federally protected categories, and not information such as where they went to school and their grades
- This new process belittles committee members, the implication is that we are not able to set aside our biases and engage in a fair evaluation of applicants
- I wonder if we are reproducing the inequities
- Years of service was sometimes visible, seems very inconsistent
- Name of applicant and/or colleges attended or taught was visible due to the automated process being ineffective - does not seem fair to the other applicants
- Consider a department's track record - we have a diverse department so there is no need for this process
- I don't know how well this process can even be fixed, it needs to be abandoned
- I don't think this process changed our pool, it just wasted my time