

PART TWO: ACTIVITY 7



Vignette Activity

During the Vignette, think about...

While watching the Vignette consider the following prompts:

- What skills or qualities does Cheryl look for to determine a candidate's 'merit' or 'worthiness'?
- What interests or values does Cheryl look for to determine how well a candidate will 'fit' with existing faculty or department priorities?
- In what ways is Cheryl following / not following the designated hiring process (e.g. how is she 'compliant' with the hiring process)?
- What is the potential impact of Cheryl's conceptions of 'merit', 'fit', and/or 'compliance' on candidates from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups being served?

PART TWO: VIGNETTE TEXT

Players

- **CHERYL** is chair of the search committee for a new full-time math instructor with a half-load teaching basic skills math and a half-load mathematics education. Cheryl has been at Mazana College for 20 years and currently teaches college-level courses, particularly those in the calculus sequence. She has a master's in math from Stanford.
- **ESMERALDA** is a member of the search committee who has been at Manzana for 6 years. Esmeralda was hired to teach the courses in the basic skills sequence, however, she also teaches discrete math and linear algebra courses. She has a PhD in math from Cal State LA.

Scene

Cheryl initiates a video conference with Esmeralda.

Cheryl: Hey Esmeralda, do you have a minute? I wanted to talk to you about the search for the half-math ed, half-basic skills position.

Esmeralda: Sure. What's up?

Cheryl: Well, I just wanted see what you're thinking about the applicants now that we've finished the first round of interviews. I've been talking to some of the other search committee members, and it seems that the candidates that everyone has identified as rising to the top are Megan Hanson, Jason Klotz, Jake Haynes, and Roberta Rodriguez...

Esmeralda: You mean Reyes?

Cheryl: Yeah, her. Whatever her name is. Anyway, I wanted to see where you stand on the applicants, especially the last two since we can only bring three back campus for the finalist interviews. I think Jake is heads-and-shoulders above Roberta. There's no question...

Esmeralda: Shouldn't we wait until our search committee meeting tomorrow to talk about all the applicants?

Cheryl: Well, I don't want to spend the majority of the meeting arguing, so I figured I'd take the temperature before the meeting to see if we can reach a consensus and not waste our time.

Anyway, it's clear even just with their applications that Megan and Jason are all too qualified not to move on to the next stage. They all have their PhDs from one of the UCs and have been teaching at a community college for a while. So really, it's about Jake and Roberta.

Esmeralda: I don't think that's what we are supposed to be doing according to the Academic Search and EEO Guidelines.

Cheryl: Oh, those are just for guidance, they're not binding. Anyway, I think Jake is as qualified as the other two. His academic pedigree is amazing. A masters from Stanford? And he's been teaching for 5 years. I know one of his colleagues at the community college he works for now. I called him and he said Jake's a great guy to hire!

The other candidate, Reyes, she's an adjunct at a community college in Illinois. Heartland? Highland? One of those, I can't remember exactly. She got her masters from some school I've never heard of. Plus, she's only been out of graduate school for 2 years, and doesn't have the experience.

Esmeralda: That's great that Jake's colleague gave him a thumbs-up, but doesn't Jake teach calculus or differential equations? Well, regardless, did you use the interview rubric for the candidates?

Cheryl: The rubric? No, I am pretty good at knowing a candidate when I see one. Five minutes was all we need to know whether they would move forward. Everything Jake said after the first five minutes was icing on the cake. I figured we could all fill out the rubrics together during the committee meeting.

Esmeralda: I'm pretty sure we aren't supposed to do that.

Cheryl: Well, I think showing a united front is important. We don't want to give our vice president of instruction any reason to doubt the judgment of the committee. The Dean is completely behind getting Jake onboard. us, Jake's student evaluations are solid. The students said he was funny. Did you notice what a great sense of humor he had during the interview?

Students love it when we tell jokes in class. We all like to work with a colleague who seems laid back and fun—he would jive well with us.

I know that others on the committee like Reyes, and she teaches dev math courses where she is now, but her answers seemed to me like she's "playing favorites" and giving more attention to her Black and Hispanic students.

Esmeralda: I took the CORA course last year that was being offered through the equity office and one of the things I learned is that we as instructors need to be better about developing relationships with our Black and Latinx students and making them feel welcome in our classes. I liked that she went into detail about how she encourages her Black and Latinx students to succeed, and creates a class environment where group work is a norm. I also thought it was interesting how she introduces everyday applications for math concepts.

Cheryl: Mm, I guess, but that strikes me as unfair to the other students in the class. Anyway, Jake presented himself as very confident his entire interview. Reyes seemed nervous at first and that worries me.

Esmeralda: If I recall, she was very confident when talking about her teaching.

Cheryl: Well, I'm not sure her style of teaching is what our students need. We need to prepare them for the real world. Jake seems like he would be the guy to do that. He's knowledgeable about the subject and the way he talks about his lectures, it seems like they are very straightforward and no-nonsense. Math is a very straightforward and blind subject. I look forward to his teaching presentation.

Esmeralda: But I think experience working with students who are in our basic skills classrooms, the vast majority of whom are Black, Latinx, and Pacific Islanders is also important. Reyes did a good job of talking about her methods, though I wish I could have followed up on her answers to get more information.

Cheryl: You know, I wonder if focusing too much on specific groups is making more of an issue out of race than it really is. All of Reyes's focus on Black, Hispanic, Pacific Islander students in her interview seems more like coddling to me than teaching. That is only going to make it harder for the students later on.

On the other hand, Jake's conceptual knowledge is very sophisticated, he obviously had good professors at Stanford—some of whom were my professors! The way he described his lectures seems to be consistent with the way it's done around here. Anyway, students need to learn how to be independent learners in the classroom, that is how you and I learned and we made it right?

Esmeralda: I'm not sure...

Cheryl: [interrupting Esmeralda] Oh come on, you know we did. Anyway, what Jake doesn't know I'm sure he can learn and learn quick.

Esmeralda: I don't know. I had professors who had been teaching for years without realizing there's a lot more to teaching courses than meets the eye.

Cheryl: Really? I guess it's been a while since I've done the remedial classes. Anyway, I better go and talk to Cynthia about the search. So, can I count on your support to push for Jake?

Esmeralda: I don't know ...

Finish

PART THREE: DISRUPTING INEQUITABLE PRACTICES IN HIRING

Listed below are three forms of inequitable practices in hiring that we have experienced in our work.

Three Common Forms of Inequitable Practices

1. Colleagues focus on traditional merit, fit, or compliance.

"He's been teaching for such a long time. We need someone with that kind of experience."

"I know his reference personally. He only recommends people who are the best."

2. Colleagues focus on race/ethnicity explicitly or implicitly.

"Can we still hire white men?"

"We can't find qualified applicants of color for the position?"

3. Colleagues express concerns about reduced rigor in hiring.

"So do we need to lower our standards?"

"Are you telling me to hire a person of color even though they may not have the required experience or meet the minimum qualifications?"

ACTIVITY 8:

Disrupting inequitable practice in hiring

1. Which forms of resistance (those listed here or others) have you encountered on your campus?
2. How do you navigate resistance on your campus?
3. Which forms of resistance do you still struggle with?

Navigating Resistance, Generating Buy-In

1a. Colleagues focus on traditional merit, fit, or compliance.

“He’s been teaching for such a long time. We need someone with that kind of experience.”

Goal: Help the speaker identify practices that undermine equity and learn how to support students’ success.

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speaker’s Needs	Addressing the Speaker’s Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-In
<p>The speaker believes that years of experience confirm the applicant’s ability to help students succeed. In this case, it is important to ask additional questions about teaching approach, conceptions of students, etc.</p>	<p>Share with speaker that length of time teaching does not always result in student success. Also, provide examples of the factors that contribute to equitable student success such as, teaching style, culturally-relevant pedagogy, etc.</p> <p>Rationale: Focuses on the factors that actually contribute to student success rather than those that do not. Also clarifies that long-standing markers used to validate instructor success do not always result in student success.</p>	<p>“We’re identifying applicants based on criteria that do not tell us about their ability to create equitable outcomes with our student population. Instead, let’s consider other factors, such as [insert examples], which are important for student success.”</p> <p>Rationale: Move the focus to highlight the relationship between equity-focused markers and student outcomes.</p>

Example continued from above...

1b. Colleagues focus on traditional merit, fit, or compliance (continued).

"I personally know her recommender.
 He only recommends the best."

Goal: Act as a mirror so speaker and other committee members can recognize the dynamics taking place.

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speaker's Needs	Addressing the Speaker's Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-in
<p>The speaker chooses to rely on another's evaluation of the participant, rather than considering other, more reliable markers. Speaker may be more comfortable giving credence to someone outside of the hiring process and outside of the college.</p>	<p>Mirror the speaker's focus on merit or fit (depending on the context of the conversation). This can help you and others clarify the speaker's intentions.</p> <p>Rationale: Reflecting the speaker's words is useful for both the speaker and the audience.</p>	<p>"It seems as though we are relying on the assessment of someone who is not connected to our department. How will this type of assessment help us select the appropriate applicant who can serve <i>our</i> students' needs?"</p> <p>Rationale: Encourages speaker and others on the committee to reflect on the choices that they make to qualify candidates.</p>

WORKSHEET

Your Turn: Develop this example, adding or modifying to the information provided.

1. Colleagues focus on traditional merit, fit, or compliance.

- 1 Share representative quotes (actual statements you have heard on your campus):
- 2 Jot down notes with your ideas on how to respond in the table below.

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speaker's Needs	Addressing the Speaker's Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-In
<p><i>Rationale:</i></p>	<p><i>Rationale:</i></p>	<p><i>Rationale:</i></p>

2a. Colleagues who focus on race/ethnicity explicitly or implicitly

"Can we still hire white men?"

Goal: Communicate that the focus on equity is designed to support student success, not eliminate racial/ethnic groups from the hiring pool.

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speaker's Needs	Addressing the Speaker's Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-In
<p>The speaker fears that white individuals who have been known to succeed in the hiring process will lose their advantage. The focus is on the benefit gained by the applicants, not students.</p>	<p>Point out that the new criteria are in place to support student success, not to eliminate a group of individuals from the hiring pool. Also, asking, "Who benefits?" is valuable for centering the focus of the discussion.</p> <p>Rationale: <i>Historically, traditional criteria of merit, fit, and compliance have privileged whites over others. By shifting the focus to students, we are considering what supports their success and broadening the hiring pool, not simply eliminating groups from the pool.</i></p>	<p>"The purpose for using these new criteria is to focus on engendering student success. Who benefits when we focus on whether or not White male candidates will be viable candidates in our hiring pool"</p> <p>Rationale: <i>Reassures that students are the focus of the initiative.</i></p>

Example continued from above ...

Example continued from above ...

2b. Colleagues who focus on race/ethnicity explicitly or implicitly (continued).

“We can’t find qualified applicants of color for the position?”

Goal: Re-center race-consciousness and attend to the importance of restructuring the search process

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speakers’ Needs	Addressing the Speaker’s Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-In
<p>Speaker is uncomfortable with engaging in a new process for hiring—one that may require focusing on nontraditional practices.</p>	<p>Acknowledge that there are qualified applicants of color and that finding these individuals requires exploring criteria that may be somewhat unfamiliar.</p> <p>Rationale: Recast the “problem” of looking for qualified applicants of color as the opportunity to be more effective in the hiring process in an effort to benefit? a group of students the college wishes to serve more effectively.</p>	<p>“Studies show that racially-minoritized students also benefit when they interact with faculty of color, so it is beneficial for us to find qualified applicants who can help us support our students’ success.”</p> <p>Rationale: Turns the attention back to the student, their success, and a focus on race in the hiring process.</p>

WORKSHEET

Your Turn: Develop this example, adding or modifying to the information provided.

2. Colleagues who focus on race/ethnicity explicitly or implicitly.

- 1 Share representative quotes (actual statements you have heard on your campus):
- 2 Jot down notes with your ideas on how to respond in the table below.

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speaker's Needs	Addressing the Speaker's Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-In
<p><u>Rationale:</u></p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u></p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u></p>

3a. Colleagues who are concerned about reduced rigor in hiring.

"So do we need to lower our standards?"

Goal: Confirm the need for high standards and rigor in the hiring process.

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speaker's Needs	Addressing the Speaker's Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-In
<p>The speaker gives credence to traditional markers because (s)he is most familiar with these forms of evaluation. Anything else is perceived as reducing rigor.</p>	<p>Often, when we are accustomed to using certain criteria and practices, new, unfamiliar models can seem to be less effective than what was used in the past. It is important to help the speaker explore the use of new criteria.</p> <p>Rationale: Let the speaker know that their concerns have been heard and that you understand their thoughts and rationale.</p>	<p>"Would you be willing to look at these criteria with me so we can better understand the ways they can help us in the selection process?"</p> <p>Rationale: Reviewing these criteria with the speaker can engender a conversation that is based on the ways the criteria can support the process of searching for applicants who are aptly qualified to support racially minoritized students.</p>

Example continued from above...

3b. Colleagues who are concerned about reduced rigor in hiring (continued).

“Are you telling me to hire a person of color even though they may not have the required experience or meet the minimum qualifications?”

Goal: Use data to demonstrate that race/ethnicity does matter.

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speaker’s Needs	Addressing the Speaker’s Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-In for the Activity
<p>The speaker believes that it is unfair to intentionally hire a person of color who may or may not meet all of the qualifications.</p>	<p>Acknowledge that work needs to be done to create an environment that fosters the success for racially-minoritized students. It is important to look into past hiring practices that hinder faculty of color to assist in creating a diverse applicant pool.</p> <p>Rationale: African Americans and Latinx continue to be underrepresented in faculty hiring with the community college system.</p>	<p>“Looking at the data disaggregated by race/ethnicity allows for critical self-reflection among our own practices, policies and procedures. By examining our own practices, policies and procedures we can construct an environment that welcomes faculty of color.”</p> <p>Rationale: Talking about race can be challenging—but looking at data disaggregated can break tension around talking about race in regards to faculty hiring. Approaching the topic from this angle reduces the blame or accusatory tone and transitions it to a more collaborative, “Let’s see what can be done together” endeavor.</p>

WORKSHEET

Your Turn: Develop this example, adding or modifying to the information provided.

3. Colleagues who are concerned about reduced rigor in the hiring process.

- 1 Share representative quotes (actual statements you have heard on your campus):
- 2 Jot down notes with your ideas on how to respond in the table below.

Specify the Resistance in Terms of the Speakers' Needs	Addressing the Speaker's Needs	Talking Points to Elicit Initial Buy-In
<p><i>Rationale:</i></p>	<p><i>Rationale:</i></p>	<p><i>Rationale:</i></p>

Actions for Building Buy-In

- *Develop an equity advocacy team with the explicit goal of gaining broader buy-in*
 - *Involve a cross-section of stakeholders from across campus departments/offices.*
 - *Create a group that is comprised of an HR representative, full and part time faculty member, and a dean or chair.*
 - *Hold regular meetings, some that are closed (to develop talking points) and some that are open (to get responses on the talking points from new listeners and “naysayers.”)*
 - *Set equity-minded goals for the advocacy team and develop a curriculum that others can adapt.*
 - *Discuss disaggregated data by race and ethnicity regularly in equity advocacy team meetings so that data can infuse all the talking points in ways that seem natural and expected (diminish acceptance of anecdotes).*
 - *Involve the Office of Institutional Research to assist with data request.*
- *Create a strategic storyline or a message about the importance of the work*
 - *Create a template to communicate your plan (for example, in faculty and department meetings, the All College Forum or Flex Day, and through executive administrators’ public communications).*
 - *Harness the power of data when creating your storyline*
 - *Brand the plan, make it memorable and spread the word*

Principles for Disrupting Inequitable Practices in Hiring⁸

Do:

- Notice your reaction to the comment. It's not always what you say, but how you say it—From what perspective are you addressing the speaker when you respond?
- Consider the consequences of *not* addressing the comment. By not speaking up, you may give that person permission to repeat their behavior.
- Use it as a teachable moment
- Remember: As a person in a position of power, you are responsible for addressing offensive comments and behaviors.
- Ask questions to help the person critically reflect on what she/he said and to clarify any misinterpretations or misunderstandings.

Don't:

- Disregard the political outcomes of speaking up, particularly if the comment is directed toward you.
- Presume the person intended to offend because they may be oblivious about the effects of their statement.
- Label someone as 'biased' or 'racist.' Such labels can put people on the defensive and are not likely to alter their behaviors or thought process over the long term.

⁸ Adapted from Harvard Business Review: Gallo, A. (2017, February 8). How to Respond to an Offensive Comment at Work. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2017/02/how-to-respond-to-an-offensive-comment-at-work>

The **Multiple Measures Rubric for Application Review** was designed to provide multiple lenses by which candidates may demonstrate their potential for (1) achieving equitable outcomes in their own courses, and (2) providing institutional leadership on issues of equity.



This rubric is not meant to be a scorecard; i.e. it is not meant to provide a number-ranking. It is meant to help reviewers more efficiently identify a candidate's actions, beliefs, and use of language on issues of equity that might indicate their capability of successfully teaching students racially marginalized by the traditional setting of higher education.

About the Rubric: The rubric has two axes. The horizontal axis provides multiple measures that focus on characteristics of equity minded faculty. The vertical axis breaks each characteristic into a spectrum.

Faculty who draw attention to patterns of inequities in student outcomes by race/ethnicity (data), and conduct race conscious self-study into their own practices

Faculty who have an awareness that their practices do impact student outcomes but is race neutral, or who are race conscious without aligning their practices to data

Faculty who view student outcomes as determined by student characteristics such as a lack of preparation, ability, persistence, or valuing education

No information was provided in documents

Equity Minded

Student Centered

Teacher Centered

N/A

VERTICAL CRITERIA

	Possesses Cultural Competence (CC)	Engages in Critical Self-Reflection To Ensure Ongoing Improvement (EI)	Focuses On Instructor/Institutional Responsibility (IR)	Uses Position and Knowledge To Support Student Success (KS)	Conveys A Belief That Students Are Capable (CB)
Equity Minded Faculty (EM)	Shares common experiences with students at the institution OR Intentionally creates classroom practices based on students' backgrounds	Uses systematic and data driven self-reflection to improve their own practices with a focus on minoritized students	Changes to classroom practices are driven by the analysis of disaggregated data and a desire to identify and eliminate barriers	Uses institutional position and knowledge to empower minoritized students OR Acts as an advocate for minoritized students during dept. and college service	Demonstrates the adoption of practices and language that validate students as the holder of knowledge, particularly for minoritized students
Student Centered Faculty (SC)	Expresses general knowledge and respect of various students' backgrounds, but this seems to have limited impact on classroom practices OR Classroom practices that address experiences and values of students' backgrounds are race neutral	Demonstrates self-reflection related to classroom practice, but this effort does not seem to be data driven nor race conscious OR Thoughtfully adapts best practices to better match students, but does so in a race neutral manner	Changes to practices are motivated by a desire to help all students, but racialized patterns remain concealed OR Expresses belief in equitable outcomes, but seems to lack knowledge for using race conscious approaches	Uses institutional position and knowledge to benefit students, but does so in a race neutral manner	Classroom practices and language draw on students' funds of knowledge, but do so in a race neutral manner
Teacher Centered Faculty (TC)	Devalues the backgrounds of minoritized students while valuing whiteness by operating in a paradigm that all students are the same	The process of self-reflection is largely absent OR A lack of effectiveness in practices is viewed as being caused by student deficits	Classroom practices seem motivated by a perception of student deficits OR A student's failure is seen as indicative of a deficit within the student rather than the institution	Policies and processes are created with a focus on institutional needs OR Suggests students are served best when asked to be self-reliant	Students' funds of knowledge are devalued OR Classroom practices seem motivated by a perception that students are flawed and must be fixed
N/A	No reference made	No reference made	No reference made	No reference made	No reference made

The horizontal axis contains five equity-minded lenses

HORIZONTAL CRITERIA

To use the rubric efficiently, use a shorthand marking system; for example, EM, SC, and TC might mean Equity Minded Faculty, Student Centered Faculty, and Teacher Centered Faculty, respectively. EM⁻ or SC⁺ might indicate you feel a candidate is between Equity Minded and Student Centered. SC in CC might indicate that a candidate is Student Centered in the Possesses Cultural Competence criteria.

