Screening Committee Nomination Process

The Executive Board is finalizing the draft of the criteria, priority order of criteria, and which ones are essential vs. preferred. It will probably be very similar to the Standing Committee draft you reviewed at today's meeting. The screening committee draft will then be brought to the Senate for final edits and approval.

Screening Committee Internal Process

The discussions about screening committees has included what happens once you're on a screening committee. The pool of candidates that you will be asked to screen will very likely have a wide range of suitability or "fitness" for the job requirements and it is also very likely that you will have a difference of opinion with other committee members on a particular candidate. You may even have a difference of opinion with how Human Resources did its initial screening.

You will be asked to rank the candidates' applications with a range of 0 to 4:
• 0 means the candidate does not meet the minimum qualifications in your opinion or something else in their packet is a big red flag for you;
• 1 means you could maybe recommend the candidate for being interviewed but you have reservations;
• 3 means the candidate is a good candidate that you would recommend without reservation for an interview; and
• 4 means the candidate is an excellent candidate with superb experience and qualifications who should definitely be interviewed.
The ranking of 2 is purposely omitted to more easily distinguish the candidates the committee wants to interview from those that are not the worth the committee's time to interview.

Usually there is agreement on a candidate getting a 3 or 4 by all of the screening committee members and another candidate getting a 0 or 1 by everyone on the committee but *sometimes* you might see something(s) in a candidate's application packet missed by the rest of the committee that caused you to give a candidate a 0 or 1 while the other members gave the person a 3 or 4 or vice versa. Your screening committee should have time for you to explain your contrary ranking and have a discussion. Sometimes in those discussions the rest of the screening committee comes around to your view, sometimes you find that you misunderstood the worrisome thing in the application packet and come to agree with the rest of the screening committee, and sometimes you'll just have to agree to disagree. Humans are making the decisions, not a computer algorithm.

For the applications to which you rate a 0, you might wonder how they made it through the HR initial screening. You should be aware that HR is going to be as inclusive as possible and, therefore, don't assume that HR's initial screening is going to agree with how you'd do it. If an application is a zero ranking, give it a zero. If your concern goes the other way—you think some persons were unjustly excluded from applying, then be sure to talk with HR about the process. It's even okay to talk with HR about your concerns of a particular candidate, who you rated a zero but is still being moved forward by the rest of the committee. HR management is part of the confidentiality loop.

Student Housing

SB 169 established the Student Housing Grant Program that includes $1 billion for the CCC system. BC is applying for a grant to fund a new 152 bed residence hall. The estimated project cost is $71 million. To meet the grant's desired construction, start date of December 31, 2022, an accelerated design schedule is required. This will result in $3.1 million of pre-grant approval

costs to be funded from District Reserves (50%) and College Funds (50%). Links to documents shared at yesterday's Board of Trustees meeting:
• BC's Housing Total Cost of Operations Analysis
• BC's Project Schedule Analysis & Proposal Summary
• Student Housing Market Analysis from July 30, 2019
• Higher Education Student Housing Grant Program FAQs
• Higher Education Student Housing Grant Program Program Overview and Application Instructions (this document has a link to the legislation signed by the Governor).

Credit for Prior Learning

The CSU system has adopted a Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Policy which should help smooth the transfer of community college students with CPL to the CSUs: https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/9817841/latest/ .

The following points are changes to CSU's Executive Order 1036:
• Applies to both undergraduate and graduate degrees (the previous E.O. only addressed undergraduates)
• Strengthens language around challenge exams
• Refers to CSU's transfer policy to let everyone know that CPL included as course specific credit
• Requires that CPL be transcribed as a specific course or specific category of degree requirements (like credit for GE Area E for completion of basic training)
• Allows a student appeals process for CPL awards
• Includes a separate section (Article 4) focused on training and service in the military

This posting is timely, as the policy was revised (in part) with the anticipated passage of AB 1002 in mind. This bill requires the CSU to "develop a consistent policy to award military personnel and veterans who have an official Joint Services Transcript containing courses that have been evaluated by the American Council on Education…, course credit…, as appropriate for the student's needs, in a course taught on the campus where the student matriculates, with subject matter similar, or equivalent, subject to academic and faculty review, to that of the student's military education, training, and service."