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Background

At first glance, the hiring process would seem to be straightforward: Put an advertisement in the paper, review resumes, interview candidates, and make an offer. In its simplest form, the process is still intact, but technology, the growth of corporations, the legal environment, a dwindling workforce, and an increased demand for qualified workers have all affected the hiring process and produced both positive and negative outcomes.

In looking at Colorado Mountain College’s hiring process, the team members determined there was room for improvement. As with any new adventure, the group felt it was important to come up with some guiding principles so that the values of the college could be upheld. It was decided that the historical values of the college (Truth, Trust, Respect, and Responsiveness) would be adopted and used to guide the group’s decision-making process and deferred to if ever there was disagreement.

In an attempt to whittle down the 100 acres of the hiring process to a more manageable five, the group looked at the entire process and the ultimate goal as stated by the present principle, “to find the best applicant no matter how long it takes.” While this is a laudable goal, CMC faces many challenges that other community colleges do not face, along with the present challenges of the workforce environment. The group wondered if the hiring process needed to be expedited because of the limited number of qualified applicants.

The question was asked: Do we want to hire the best candidate in a very competitive environment or just hire the best person available? Of course, CMC’s goal should be to hire the best candidate. Nonetheless, when positions go unfilled service often suffers while workloads increase. The challenge in the present environment then is to find an acceptable balance between the quality of applicants and the timeliness of the appointment. If the candidate is under-qualified, the college will suffer because of increased training costs as well as a decreased level of service for its customers. However, if the best candidate is found in an untimely manner then the college will also suffer because of increased advertising expenditures and increased involvement from HR and search committee members, as well as the costs and service disruptions associated
with other employees of the college “filling in” while the search continues. It then seems that the goal of the hiring process should be to hire the most qualified candidate in the shortest amount of time.

One recent development in the streamlining of the hiring process was the introduction of Consensus, which starts with an online application process that filters the applications into an online database of candidates that can be accessed district-wide. While surely this has helped to expedite the process, it has not yet been codified into the latest employment manual. It is obvious that there needs to be an update to this manual, but what else might need to be refined?

In order to find the best five acres for the overall improvement of the hiring process, the team asked some questions:

- What causes variability in the hiring process?
- How might we be able to limit this variability?
- Can we, or is there a need to, eliminate steps in the hiring process?
- Can we combine steps in the hiring process?
- Who needs to be involved?
- If we add a member or step to the process, what do we gain or lose?
- What are the crucial steps in the process?
- Can we refine these steps?
- How can we actively control the “white space” in between steps?

The importance of the hiring team’s task is obvious as any organization or institution is only as good as its members. However, if a vital link in the chain is weak or missing, the entire organization and academic community can be effected. With this in mind, the group set about collecting data and searching for the answers to many of these questions.
Project Statement

Our Goal Is:

To improve the current hiring process of full-time non-faculty in order to hire the best, most capable candidate as efficiently as possible as measured by decreased time from vacancy through search committee formation and an increased applicant pool.
Operational Definitions

1. **CONSENSUS**: Software that allows applicants to submit on-line applications. Automates the screening process, and the process for sharing resumes and application materials, while enabling the committee to rank applicants and share results.
   a. Level One: Listing of all received applications.
   b. Level Two: Listing of all Level One candidates who meet minimum requirements.

2. **SEARCH COMMITTEE**: A group of employees responsible for reviewing resumes, selecting candidates for interview, interviewing candidates and recommending or ranking candidates for hire for a specific position.

3. **HIRING SUPERVISOR**: The individual who initiates the hiring process, and who will supervise the employee who is hired. The individual who provides clear direction to search committee to ensure the best candidate is selected for the position.

4. **SEARCH COMMITTEE CHAIR**: Person responsible for overseeing the activity of the search committee.

5. **FULL-TIME NON-FACULTY**: A fully benefitted employee that works 40 hours per week and whose primary responsibility does not include actual classroom instruction.

6. **EMPLOYMENT MANUAL**: A document used to provide guidance to the hiring supervisor, search committee chair, and search committee regarding hiring policies and procedures as well as templates and forms.

7. **POSITION TYPES**: (For more information see Appendix A)
   a. Labor Trades
   b. Clerical Technical
   c. Professional
d. Administrative

8. OPEN DATE: The first day the position is advertised.

9. RESUME REVIEW DATE: The day the search committee begins reviewing resumes.

10. START DATE: The day the new employee reports or leaves work.

11. OPEN UNTIL FILLED: Continual review of resumes until hiring supervisor or committee chair no longer wants to accept applications. This is the default option for administrative and professional positions.

12. NON-FILLED: A position that remains vacant and for which the search process continues.

13. POSTMARK DATE: The date application materials are due and are no longer accepted. This is the default option for labor trades and clerical technical positions.

14. QUALIFIED APPLICANTS: The applicants who have satisfied all of the minimum requirements for the position.

15. INTERNAL ONLY POSTING: Advertising that is open to only current employees within the organization.

16. SCREENING: The process of reviewing applicant credentials.

17. EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION FORM: Document completed by the hiring supervisor to initiate the hiring process.

18. DIRECT REPORTS: Employees that work under a director or manager who is responsible for their work and whom the employee reports to.
The Current Hiring Process

To better understand the current process used by CMC to hire qualified candidates, the team looked at the current employee manual and several documents provided by the Chief Human Resources Officer, Kelly Johnson. While no current flow chart exists that maps-out the current hiring process, we felt that it was in our best interest to create such a document. The flow charts on the next four pages are culled from the information contained in the employment manual and from discussions with team member Kelly Johnson.

After discussing the process, the team determined that there definitely was room for improvements and that certain measures might be taken to expedite the process. The linear construction of the process itself implies that one phase must be completed before the next phase in the process can begin. One question that was immediately raised was: How much time usually elapses between the completion of one phase and the start of the next? The ensuing discussion seemed to focus primarily on the first four phases of the hiring process, which immediately led us to focus on this part of the entire process as our five acres.

Using primarily anecdotal evidence from members of the committee and from outside conversations with members of various hiring committees, our initial hypothesis was that the first four phases of the process could indeed pose the greatest challenges to “hiring the most capable candidate as efficiently as possible.” According to Newton’s first law, objects at rest tend to stay at rest while objects in motion tend to stay in motion unless acted on by some force. It was our hope that once we gave the hiring process a push at the start that it would continue to stay in motion until the finish. With this in mind, the team wanted to get a closer look at the exact steps that are involved in the first four phases of the hiring process.
Current Hiring Process at a Glance

Vacancy Occurs

5 Acres

Advertising the Position

HR Applicant Screening

Selecting the Committee

Committee Rates Applicants

Interviews Scheduled

Interview Criteria Established

Interviews

References Checked

Recommendation & Job Offer

Closure with Other Candidates

= Hiring Team’s Five Acre Field

= Additional Hiring Process phases
Five Acre Field: Phases in hiring process
Vacancy Occurs (Current Phase 1)

Employee gives notice or vacancy occurs

Hiring supervisor completes “Employment Authorization Form”

Required Signatures are obtained:
1) Campus Dean or Director
2) Director of HR
3) Dept. VP or Dean of College Relations
4) President

Drafts position announcement or revises existing announcement

HR Generalist reviews announcement

Announcement sent to hiring supervisor for review
Advertising the Position (Phase 2)

Internal only advertising if adequate pool of candidates

Establish application review deadline

Opening is created in Consensus

External Advertising (2-5 weeks depending on position)
HR Applicant Screening (Phase 3)

1. Internal only advertising if adequate pool of candidates

2. HR performs initial screening of applicants

3. HR gets committee members names

4. HR sets up access for committee

5. HR provides list of applicants who remained at Level One in Consensus to Committee Chair. This takes place 3-4 days after closing/review date.
Selecting the Committee (Phase 4)

1. Hiring Supervisor assumes role of committee chair or appoints the chair.
2. Hiring Supervisor determines the committee’s role.
3. Committee chair creates a shortlist of possible committee members.
4. Committee Chair selects committee members.
Analyzing the Current Situation

A closer look reveals that there are exactly 23 steps contained in the first four phases of the hiring process. If we assume there is some lag time between the completion of one step and the start of the next, then the process becomes even longer and further exacerbates the inefficiency of the hiring process.

The first phase is a perfect example of where white space, or the time that an item sits waiting for action to occur, can overrun a process and create delays. When a vacancy occurs, it is the hiring supervisor’s responsibility to fill out an Employment Authorization Form. If it takes several days to find this form and complete it, then the process has already been delayed. This form must then be signed by the campus CEO or director and then forwarded to the chief human resources officer. If interoffice mail is used, it might take several days to reach HR. After it is received by HR, then it must be forwarded to the department vice president or dean of college relations and then on to the president to obtain the final signature. And these are only the first two steps of the entire hiring process. While the use of electronic delivery could increase the efficiency of distribution, it does nothing to minimize the steps involved in the process or the time that transpires while a document awaits review.

The sheer number of steps in the hiring process surely contributes to delays and adds to the overall amount of time it takes to fill a position. However, the linear approach to the process also contributes to its overall inefficiency. The check-off method implies that the next phase or step in the process can not start until all previous steps or phases have been completed, which is categorically untrue. Therefore, it is our hope and goal to create a more synchronous process where various steps can be accomplished in tandem so that all may benefit from increased efficiency.

Our first step in seeking synchronicity is to find out exactly where the process breaks down and what, if any, phases or steps can be omitted or refined. The best way to accomplish this goal was to find data that would measure the time it took to complete or accomplish each phase and the steps contained therein. In a perfect world, the time it took to accomplish each phase would be available for analysis. In this way, we could immediately see how long it took to accomplish each phase and where to focus our energies for the greatest return. Unfortunately, the only available data measures the time
between the “open date” and the “start date.” This means there is no way to objectively measure the time it takes to complete the first phase nor does it help us determine how much time is consumed by each phase in the middle of the process. Even with these limitations, the team felt it was important to look at the data that was available to see if there are any trends or other problem areas.

Chart 1: Average number of days to fill positions, by campus

We can quickly deduce that most campuses take on average over 60 days to fill a position. At first, we might suspect that Aspen and Summit (approximately 30 days) have found a way to hasten the hiring process, with West Garfield (50) also showing some efficiency. However, further research reveals that all three of these campuses had filled only clerical positions within the time frame that the data was collected.
Chart 2: Average number of days positions are open, non-filled positions by campus

While 60 days, and certainly 30 days, does not seem like an inordinate amount of time, it is important to take into account the positions that go unfilled. This graph reveals a startling conclusion: The majority of campuses (five out of eight) have positions that remained vacant after 120 days (four months), which is almost an entire semester. It is important to note that these positions were unfilled as of Sept. 30, 2008, the date the data was compiled, so the actual number could be much higher as of today’s date or these positions may be filled. While these openings may not be due to any inefficiency in the hiring process, it does perhaps point to other problems such as: an inadequate hiring pool, cost of living, salary, lack of qualified workers, or other reasons.
Chart 3: Average number of days to fill positions, by position type

Certain positions, such as administrative and professional, may take longer to fill than others. This graph supports that assumption and shows that the administrative positions take the most time to fill, followed somewhat closely by professionals. It is also good to see that both labor trades and clerical positions only take around 40 days to fill. It is worth noting that administrative and professional positions inherently take longer to fill based upon several factors, including length of time for opening, coordinating candidates’ and search committee members’ schedules for interviews, length of notice provided to the soon-to-be-former employer, and relocation time. Since many of these factors do not apply to clerical/technical and labor trades positions, these vacancies should be filled more expeditiously.
Chart 4: Average number of days positions are open, non-filled positions by position type

Once again, the most disturbing news from the data comes in the form of non-filled positions. Professional and labor trades remain unfilled for more than 140 days, with professional approaching 160 days. Again, this may well not have anything to do with the hiring process but more to do with the current environment of the communities the college serves. For some labor trades positions, the sense of urgency has been lessened with the hiring of contractors, so the process has been allowed to be prolonged. Applicants for these positions are also highly sought-after by many private employers who offer extremely competitive salaries. The cost of living and the salary offered have a direct correlation to the time that some of these positions remain open. Several of the professional vacancies remain open, and have for a period of time, due to the lack of urgency from the hiring supervisor/chair to fill these positions.
Chart 5: Average number of days to fill positions, by site/position type

Timberline Campus had openings for administrative positions that averaged close to 130 days, and Roaring Fork and West Garfield campuses had administrative openings that averaged close to 100 days. Two other locations – Vail-Eagle and Central Services – also saw that administrative positions took the longest time to fill, compared to other positions at their site. These positions remained open for various reasons, including internal campus desires, committee delays, staffing, and salary.
Chart 6: Average number of days positions are open, non-filled positions by site/position type

This chart shows the longest time-to-fill for positions, by far. Alpine Campus has had labor trades positions stay open more than 250 days, and Central Services has had professional positions stay open nearly as long. Clerical/technical positions at the Roaring Fork Campus come in a close third. Even after these great lengths of time, the positions were unfilled as of the date the data was collected. These positions remained open for various reasons, including issues with background checks, committee delays, staffing, supervisor review, and low applicant pool.

One important detail to remember when looking at the data and results is that we can only measure the time from when the position was advertised to the start date, which is not the date when the position was offered but rather the date when the employee first reported for work. Also note that the date the position was advertised is not the date the
position was vacated. As of now, this data can not be tracked, but this is something that should be tracked in the future. Perhaps the best overall data to look at would be how long the position was vacant. This would then tell us how long certain services have been interrupted or compromised.
Analysis of the Cause of Current Outcomes

In order to determine the variables that influence the time required for hiring a non-faculty full-time employee and the size of the applicant pools, the following instruments were utilized:

- Cause and Effect Diagram
Many of the causes under the heading of “Environment” are beyond our control. While it would be nice to adjust the cost of living downward, this is simply beyond the control of CMC. This is also true of the distance between sites. Some observers might say that an insufficient applicant pool is also something that simply comes with the territory and the current economic and geographical environment that CMC finds itself in. However, there may be creative ways to increase the applicant pool and this should not immediately be dismissed as beyond CMC’s control. The rest of the inputs (Methods, Machinery, Materials, and Workforce) are all contributing factors that can be influenced.
or controlled by CMC. While we could choose to approach each factor as a separate cause in and of itself with a distinct solution, we believe there is the possibility of an underlying factor that contributes to each of these forces. In looking at the diagram, two things came to mind: one is the employment manual itself and the forms and instructions contained therein, and the second is a lack of training or “best practices” that should be followed.
Survey of Search Committee Chairs

Team members conducted a survey of employees who had served as a search committee chair during the past year. The full results of the survey can be found in Appendix B.

The survey consisted of the following questions:
1. What type of position was your committee helping to hire?
2. At which CMC location was the position housed?
3. Did you rely on your Employment Manual?
4. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “The Employment Authorization form was easy to complete.”
5. If you were the hiring supervisor, was the advertisement for the open position returned for your approval within one to two days after you submitted the Employment Authorization form to HR?
6. Did the ad adequately capture the requirements related to the position?
7. Was the amount of time too long, too short, or just right for the review date of resumes?
8. Has the practice of keeping a position open until filled vs. advertising a closing date provided flexibility or hindered your work as a search committee chair?
9. Did you receive access to the applications within one to two days after the review date?
10. Do you believe it helps the hiring process if supervisors or committee chairs can contact candidates who have not provided the required application materials?
11. Have any of the following delayed your formation of a search committee? Check all that apply.
12. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “As the hiring manager or search committee chair, I understood my role.”
13. Do you have anything else you would like to add? (Or: Based on your experience, can you suggest ways a search committee could more efficiently help to hire the most capable person for the job?)

The results from the committee chair survey both confirmed and challenged some of our initial thoughts. A good number of committee chairs are not using the employment manual to guide the process, but over 70% say that they understood their role as a
committee chair. Many pointed out that HR was used as a resource to guide the process and was very helpful. However, 30% of respondents said that they either did not understand their role as a committee chair or were unsure. By no means is this number insignificant, and it does point to the fact that for some there needs to be more training in place.

Another interesting finding was that 50% of respondents said it took more than the two days allotted for HR to submit an advertisement for their approval after the submission of the form. One wonders if this delay was caused by HR or if it was caused by a delay in obtaining the required signatures on the Employment Authorization form once it left the individual campus.

The ability to contact candidates with incomplete applications was a divisive topic as some felt that this responsibility was either unnecessary or should be a function of HR. Many respondents indicated that the online application process should be improved to better guide candidates through the process. Regardless, this topic remained a spot of contention, with many having the opinion that if a candidate can not complete the appropriate forms and requirements then they should not be considered.

Overall the survey pointed out that the most significant delays in forming a search committee involved scheduling meeting dates, committee members’ ability to serve, and the inability to include direct reports on the search committee. Other suggestions for expediting the process included earlier access to applications, removing the time constraints for interviews if positions are open until filled, and an online hiring manual with all the needed forms.
**Survey of Search Committee Members**

Team members also conducted a survey of employees who had served as a committee member during the past year. The full results of the survey can be found in Appendix C.

The survey consisted of the following questions:

1. What type of position was your committee helping to hire?
2. At which CMC location was the position housed?
3. Do you feel you received adequate training to be a member of the search committee?
4. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “As a search committee member, I understood my role.”
5. Do you believe it helps the hiring process if supervisors can contact candidates who have not provided the required application materials?
6. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “As a search committee member, I understood my role”
7. Was too much, too little, or just enough responsibility expected of you?
8. Do you have anything else you would like to add? (Or: Based on your experience, can you suggest ways a search committee could more efficiently help to hire the most capable person for the job?)

For the most part, the survey administered to committee members confirmed many of the findings from the committee chair survey. While 84% of the respondents said that they understood their role as a committee member, 31% said that they did not receive adequate training. Towards the end of the survey, by mistake the same question was asked if the committee member understood their role, but this time 26% of the respondents said that they were either unsure of their role or did not understand their role. These inconsistent findings made the group wonder whether or not some respondents truly understood their role as a committee member. Regardless, it once again points to the need for some additional training and resources.

The number of written comments from the committee members’ survey further helped to inform the committee and the possible courses of action that could be pursued. Surprisingly, some respondents felt the need to revisit recruitment strategies as well as
the application process itself. One suggestion was to put the salary range in the position announcement, while another suggested that there might be some confusion over specific job responsibilities. With this in mind, it might be time to revisit how candidates have access to job description and ensure that they are available for the candidates’ review.

Some committee members admitted that they lacked a clear understanding of the process and wanted to be more informed about their responsibilities and appropriate timelines. These problems can be addressed by providing better training and resources to both committee members and chairs alike. A second matter of contention involved the actual formation and composition of the committee. Several people voiced the need for smaller committees and for the inclusion of direct reports on a committee while others wanted help with interview questions.

Several of the respondents commented on issues that were beyond the scope of the hiring process team’s five acres but were, nevertheless, insightful. In fact, there were many times throughout the process that certain topics or matters of interest arose that quickly got the team off-track. In the best interest of the group, we decided to make note of these problems for possible review at a later date.
**AQIP Criteria Addressed**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valuing People</strong></td>
<td>Provides a more timely and more effective response to applicants; streamlining process reduces workload for staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading and Communicating</strong></td>
<td>Through training efforts, engages involved parties to assist with the processes that will fill their vacancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Institutional Operations</strong></td>
<td>Provides an effective process that supports expeditious hiring of qualified candidates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improvement Theory and Implementation Plan

To determine improvement opportunities and recommendations, the Hiring Action Team reviewed available timeline data from recent hires, diagramed current processes and environmental factors, and surveyed staff to determine areas for process improvement.

Through these instruments, we identified several areas that are within our scope of work, and some outside our scope for other teams or current committees. Our guiding principles were to recommend improvements that would be quick, high-impact, and low cost, providing the greatest return on investment (ROI) for this project. We looked for places where we could reduce the “white space” between steps, create clearer communication, provide better training, streamline and modify processes, and collapse processes into fewer steps.

Some improvements, such as salary adjustments, fell outside the work of this team, or are being addressed by other committees. We also created a “bucket list” of items outside our five acres that could positively affect the hiring process and could be addressed by future teams. Following are the broad opportunities for improvement revealed by our research and within our five-acre field:

- Updated and revised hiring materials to guide staff through the process
- Online availability of materials
- Training for committee chairs and members
- Reduced “white space” through elimination of process steps
- Reduced “white space” by creating simultaneous rather than sequential workflows
- Reduced “white space” through use of smaller committees in some cases
- Increased applicant pool by allowing appointments of interim appointees
- Increased applicant pool through increased use of online ads.

Positive Impacts

We anticipate that improvements in the above areas will result in better service to our customers through a more fully staffed workforce. Service should also increase as a result of less staff time spent in the hiring process. These improvements should also lift morale as employees are required to work fewer hours filling in for vacant positions.
Implementation Plan

Process improvements within our scope of work were sorted into two categories:

1. Improvements that can be implemented immediately by Human Resources or other Central Services staff.

2. Improvements requiring CLT approval for budget or change in procedure.

The implementation Gantt chart shows a rapid deployment of most improvements by HR and other CS staff by February 1, 2009. Other improvements requiring additional funding or resources will be completed by September 1, 2009.
Study Results Plan

Many of the enhancements and changes will be implemented during the remainder of this fiscal year. One major component will be the development and implementation of the vacancy-to-hire tracking system. Although it will be difficult to correlate new data collected to data collected in the past, HR will be able to effectively track progress and identify areas that require improvements. The data collected is summary terms, will be compared to past data (as presented in this report) from advertising to start date to identify areas where improvement has occurred and areas that will need continued monitoring. This and other information will be collected and shared at the end of the fiscal year, June 2009 and, again, in December 2009. Results will be provided to cosponsors for dissemination to the College Leadership Team.

Additional Processes To Be Imbedded That Do Not Require College Leadership Team Approval

Once an applicant is moved to Level Two within Consensus, Human Resources will send an e-mail providing the applicant with the appropriate position description and the starting salary range.

With the assistance of the Marketing and Communications Department, additional online advertising resources and options will be identified. Once these resources are identified, a central list will be created and incorporated into the hiring manual.

The cosponsors will develop a best practices document to provide committee chairs options and shortcuts to running an effective search process.

The hiring manual will be fully reviewed, updated, and placed online.

The ongoing review of Consensus and processes will continue and, as appropriate, recommendations for improvements will be offered to the developer.

Phase 3 of the current hiring process, HR Applicant Screening, can occur simultaneously with Phase 4, Selecting the Committee. This reduces the white space.
Cost of Implementation and Return on Investment
(*see following page for calculations)

1. Revised position advertisement form
Cost: None
**Return on Investment:** Expedites the announcement of vacancy; assists supervisor with exploring options with the first advertisement; creates larger applicant pool; $3,971 could be a direct savings resulting from implementation of action item if position is filled during the first search.

2. Revised schedule for advertising deadlines
Cost: None
**Return on Investment:** Shortens the process for committee’s ability to begin the review of resumes; $3,971 could be a direct savings resulting from implementation of action item if position is filled during the first search.

3. Forming the search committee (checklist)
Cost: None
**Return on Investment:** Provides alternatives for formation of committees thereby expediting the process. Offers direct reports the ability to serve on search committees; $3,971 could be a direct savings resulting from implementation of action item if position is filled during the first search.

4. Develop required training for committee chairs and members
Cost: Minimal cost associated with duplication of material; can be absorbed through the HR budget.
**Return on Investment:** Training will provide committee chairs and members with the knowledge to expedite the hiring process, making it possible to hire the most capable candidate during the first search; $6,630 could be a direct savings resulting from implementation of action item if position is filled during the first search.

5. Develop process for including interim appointments
Cost: None
**Return on Investment:** May enlarge applicant pools; $3,971 could be a direct savings resulting from implementation of action item if position is filled during the first search.

6. Develop online training materials
Cost: $7,500 (approximately)
**Return on Investment:** Offers training in an online format when face-to-face training is not possible; $6,630 could be a direct savings resulting from implementation of action item if position is filled during the first search.

7. Develop HR intranet
Cost: $12,000
**Return on Investment:** Provides greater efficiencies in hiring process, thereby reducing the need for advertising and wasted committee time and resources; alleviates workload for existing staff. $3,971 could be a direct savings resulting from implementation of action item if position is filled during the first search.
**Calculations behind return on investment**

**Scenario:** The West Garfield Campus must fill an instructional chair position. The following costs could be incurred.

One ad placed for the position: **$1,700.00**

Human Resources invests 10 hours to process paperwork, screen applicants, and make offer:
10 hrs ($30.84/hr) = **$308.40**

The hiring committee consists of five employees: 1 administrative assistant, 1 division director, 1 campus CEO, 1 student advisor, 1 lead administrative assistant. Each committee member invests approximately 11 hours.

4 hours screening resumes
4 hour meeting to rate candidates
5 hours interviewing four candidates
1 hour meeting to choose candidate

AA - 14 hrs ($19.24/hr) = **$269.36**
DD - 14 hrs ($30.84/hr) = **$431.76**
CEO - 14 hrs ($40.00/hr) = **$560.00**
Advisor - 14 hrs ($30.84/hr) = **$431.76**
Lead AA - 14 hrs ($19.24/hr) = **$269.36**

Once the position is filled, the candidate requires 40 hours of training facilitated by a division director and 10 hours of training by other staff.

80 hrs ($30.84) = **$2,467.72**
10 hrs ($19.24) = **$192.40**

**Total Cost:** **$6,630.76**
Engrafting Improvements

Human Resources staff has agreed and supports being responsible for implementing or initiating the following items:
- Revised position advertisement form
- Revised advertising deadlines
- Forming search committees
- Develop required training for committee chairs and members
- Develop process for including interim appointments
- Develop online training materials
- Develop policy for internal promotions.

Human Resources will assist with development and deployment of developing the HR part of the new intranet. Information Technology and Marketing will also provide assistance.

The tracking process will continue on an ongoing basis to ensure that efficient systems have been developed. As areas are identified for improvement, those too will be included in the tracking and reporting provided to the cosponsors. When an area is identified for improvement the larger group, as needed and appropriate, it will be included in providing solutions to address the inefficiencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise position advertisement form</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise schedule for ad deadlines</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise formation of search committee</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop required search committee training – f2f</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop online search committee training material</td>
<td>HR/Outsourcing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/update manual for consistency</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop vacancy to hire tracking process</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop best practices document</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going review of Consensus and processes</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop internal promotion policy</td>
<td>HR/Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop interim appointment policy</td>
<td>HR/Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop HR Intranet web presence</td>
<td>Marketing/IT/HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop online advertising resources</td>
<td>Marketing/HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create online PDF version of hiring manual</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# College Leadership Team Feedback

**Team Name:** Hiring Process Team  
**Date:** December 3, 2008  
**Co-Sponsors:** Joe Maestas and Alton Scales

## Idea for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea for Improvement</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Revised position advertisement form (Exhibit 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Revised schedule for advertising deadlines (Exhibit 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Forming the search committee (checklist) (Exhibit 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop required training for committee chairs and members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop process for including interim appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Develop online training materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop HR intranet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggestions for Future AQIP Teams

- Develop an internship program
- Develop a process to establish a pool of trained search committee members
- Automate position opening authorizations using work flow management in Site Publish
- Analyze other steps in the hiring process (from committee work through closure with other candidates)
- Analyze the hiring process for full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and part-time non-faculty
INSTRUCTIONS: This form is to be completed whenever you want to fill an anticipated vacancy.

PLEASE COMPLETE SECTION I, AND THE REVERSE SIDE, PRIOR TO FORWARDING FOR APPROVAL. SECTION II IS FOR DISTRICT OFFICE APPROVAL BY THE APPROPRIATE INDIVIDUAL. THANK YOU!

I. Job Title______________________________
Location___________________

Requested by______________________________
Date_____________

Action of Vice President, Chief, CEO or President: ( ) Approved ( ) Not Approved

Signature__________________________________
Date_____________

II. Action of Chief Human Resources Officer

Signature__________________________________
Date_____________

Replacement__________ New__________
Fund______________________________

OVER
**POSITION/ADVERTISING INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Only: □ Yes □ No (see page XX of the Employment Manual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Position: □ Yes □ No (see page XX of the Employment Manual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITION**

**TITLE:**____________________________________________________________

**LOCATION:**___________________________________________________________

**START DATE:**_________________  **ACCOUNT NUMBER:**________________________

**SUPERVISOR:**__________________________________________________________

**APPLICATION PROCEDURES:**

Special position requirements and functional responsibilities in addition to the job description:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

**Newspaper(s) in which you would like to advertise:**________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

**Deleted:** ☑
## Exhibit 2 - Recommended Advertisement Schedule (revised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Level</th>
<th>Advertising Level and Publication Example</th>
<th>Application Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrative | National  
| Professional   | State  
Publication Example: The Denver Post | Three to Four Weeks |
| Faculty        | National  
| Clerical/Technical | Local | Two Weeks |
| Labor Trades   | Local | Two Weeks |

Online versions of these and other publications are routinely used, for example:  
The Online Chronicle of Higher Education  
Higher Ed Jobs.com

Other publications, such as trade publications and other advertising avenues such as specific web sites appropriate for the position can and should be suggested by the hiring supervisor in the advertising section of the Position Advertisement Form.

Human Resources will pay for advertisements in three publications/sources.
Exhibit 3 - Forming the Search Committee

☐ Determine whether you, as the hiring manager, should also be the chair. If not, select a person to chair the committee.

☐ Form the committee and select the chair, if appropriate, as soon as the position is advertised. There is no need to wait for the position to close before this process is started.

☐ Work with the committee chair or provide to the chair the preferred characteristics, develop rating sheets, etc., before the position closes.

☐ Establish as many meeting dates as possible so when soliciting members for the committee, you can share these times.

☐ The size of the committee should reflect the level of the vacant position; for example, an administrative position would have a larger search committee. Keep the committee size manageable. Although it is encouraged, it is not a requirement that a search committee be formed for clerical/technical or labor trades positions.

☐ Form a diverse committee in terms of gender, race, and types of positions.

☐ Select committee members that have a representative view and offer a variety of perspectives on the role and function of the position.

☐ An odd number is always helpful when there is a need to “break a tie” during the selection process. This certainly is not a requirement.

☐ One direct report to the position may sit on the screening committee. Input from the individual’s reporting directly to the position is vital; ensure you form and schedule a separate process to include these individuals.

Forming a subcommittee from the larger group may be helpful when schedules conflict making it difficult to schedule meetings. For example, this subcommittee could be responsible for screening and identifying the individuals for the full committee interviews.

* Note: Highlighted text above indicates suggested revisions to current process.
Appendix A
List of all full-time non-faculty positions, by type

COLORADO MOUNTAIN COLLEGE
ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

APPLICATIONS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
ASSISTANT CAMPUS DEAN - INSTRUCTION
ASSISTANT CAMPUS DEAN - STUDENT SERVICES
BUDGET FINANCE MANAGER
CONTINUING EDUCATION DIRECTOR
DEAN OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
DEAN OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY TRAINING
DEAN OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATIONS
DEAN OF ENROLLMENT SERVICES
DEAN OF STUDENTS
DIRECTOR OF COLLEGE FACILITIES
DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION
DIRECTOR OF EMS AND RISK MANAGEMENT
DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL AID
DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
DIRECTOR OF LEARNING TECHNOLOGY
DIRECTOR OF MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS
DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL AND NETWORK SERVICES
DIVISION DIRECTOR II
INSTRUCTIONAL CHAIR (paid from faculty salary matrix)
NETWORK ENGINEER
PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER
PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS MANAGER
CLERICAL/TECHNICAL POSITIONS
ACCOUNTING CLERK
ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN I
ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN II
ACCOUNTS MANAGER
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I
ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK - REGISTRAR
ADMINISTRATIVE TECHNICIAN
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II
ADMISSIONS ASSISTANT
BOOKSTORE ASSISTANT
CLERK I
CLERK II
CLERK TYPIST
DISTRICT MEDIA TECHNICIAN
EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
LEAD ADMINISTRATIVE TECHNICIAN
LIBRARY CLERK
LIBRARY TECHNICIAN
PHOTO LAB TECHNICIAN
PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST
RECEPTIONIST
REGISTRATION TECHNICIAN
STUDENT RECEIVABLES CLERK
VIRTUAL LRC TECHNICIAN

LABOR TRADES POSITIONS
MAINTENANCE MANAGER
MAINTENANCE MECHANIC
SECURITY GUARD
CUSTODIAN
GROUNSKEEPER
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER
HVAC TECHNICIAN
LEAD CARPENTER
HVAC SUPERVISOR
JOURNEYMAN CARPENTER
PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL POSITIONS

ACADEMIC SERVICES SPECIALIST
ACCOUNTING FINANCE ANALYST *
ADMISSIONS COUNSELOR
ALUMNI AND ANNUAL FUND SPECIALIST
ASSISTANT COORDINATOR STUDENT LIFE
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR *
ASSISTANT TO THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT *
BOOKSTORE MANAGER
CAMPUS FINANCIAL AID SPECIALIST
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE MANAGER *
COORDINATOR OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS *
COORDINATOR OF STUDENT ACTIVITIES/SUMMER CONFERENCE
COORDINATOR OF STUDENT LIFE *
CUSTOMER SUPPORT ANALYST
DATABASE ADMINISTRATOR *
DISABILITY SERVICES SPECIALIST *
DISTRICT MEDIA CENTER SUPERVISOR
DIVISION DIRECTOR DISTANCE LEARNING *
DIVISION DIRECTOR I *
EMS TRAINING COORDINATOR
ENROLLMENT SERVICES SPECIALIST
FINANCIAL AID ADVISOR
FOUNDATION SPECIALIST/CAPITAL CAMPAIGN
GRANT DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR
HELP DESK MANAGER
HUMAN RESOURCES GENERALIST *
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ANALYST I
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ANALYST II *
LIBRARY COORDINATOR *
MARKETING AND PUBLICATIONS EDITOR *
NETWORK ADMINISTRATOR I *
NETWORK ADMINISTRATOR II *
PAYROLL SPECIALIST
PHYSICAL PLANT MANAGER *
SCIENCE LABORATORY MANAGER
SKI TEAM COACH
SMART CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST
STUDENT SERVICES COUNSELOR *
SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR I – NETWORK *
SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR II – ERP APPLICATIONS *
SYSTEM ANALYST I *
SYSTEM ANALYST II *
TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT SPECIALIST I
TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT SPECIALIST III *
TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT SPECIALIST II
TECHNOLOGY TRAINING COORDINATOR *
TELECOMMUNICATION ANALYST *
TELECOMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST
VET/TECH RANCH MANAGER
VIRTUAL LEARNING RESOURCE COORDINATOR *
WEB CONTENT EDITOR *
WEB DEVELOPER AND SYSTEM INTERGRATOR *
WORKFORCE TRAINING COORDINATOR *
YOUTH OUTREACH COORDINATOR

It may not be effective for many of the positions listed to advertise on a national or statewide basis. That determination is made based upon several factors, including:

- Position’s eligibility for relocation benefit
- Ability to attract the most qualified applicant pool

For example, it is appropriate to advertise a Student Services Counselor on a national basis (largest qualified applicant pool and relocation benefit) but it may not be for the Payroll Specialist. In all probability, we should be able to successfully recruit a Payroll Specialist within the District.

*eligible for relocation benefit
Appendix B

Survey Results: Search Committee Chairs

The team created surveys to obtain input from both search committee chairs and committee members. We continued to focus on our five acres and only asked questions that related to the first four phases of the hiring process. The survey on the following pages was administered to employees who’d served as search committee chairs during the past year.

1. What type of position was your committee helping to hire?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Labor Trades (Custodian, Maintenance)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerical/Technical (Administrative Assistant)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional (Counselor)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administrative (Campus CEO or Director)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. At which CMC location was the position housed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Breckenridge (Summit)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carbondale (Roaring Fork)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Central Services</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chaffee (Timberline)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dillon (Summit)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glenwood Springs (Roaring Fork)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Did you rely on your Employment Manual?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Yes                     | 14       | 58%
| 2 | No                      | 9        | 38%
| 3 | If no, why not?         | 8        | 33%

**If no, why not?**

- HR answered questions via emails
- HR answered by phone
- Familiar with Process
- Previous experience as a committee chair
- Very familiar with manual
- used is as reference and for copies of forms, also other sources, calls to HR, have been through the process many times
- I’m familiar with the process
- Kind of know the process

### 4. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “The Employment Authorization form was easy to complete.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Strongly Disagree | 0        | 0%
| 2 | Disagree        | 2        | 8%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistic** | **Value**
--- | ---
Mean | 1.52
Variance | 0.26
Standard Deviation | 0.51
Total Responses | 23

6. Did the ad adequately capture the requirements related to the position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistic** | **Value**
--- | ---
Mean | 1.22
Variance | 0.18
Standard Deviation | 0.42
Total Responses | 23
7. Was the amount of time too long, too short, or just right for the review date of resumes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Too Long</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Too Short</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Just Right</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Has the practice of keeping a position open until filled vs. advertising a closing date provided flexibility or hindered your work as a search committee chair?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provided Flexibility</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hindered Work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Did you receive access to the applications within one to two days after the review date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Do you believe it helps the hiring process if Supervisors or Committee Chairs can contact candidates who have not provided the required application materials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If no, why not?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, why not?

We should not have to contact those incomplete folks. The on-line application process is obviously not clear enough to walk through even a savvy current CMC employee navigate it to completion. This is a BIG problem!!!!!!

I believe it’s better to allow HR to gather information, rather than to be in direct contact with prospective candidates before their information has been thoroughly reviewed by committee.

If they have not provided the information we need, they should not be qualified to move ahead.

11. Have any of the following delayed your formation of a search committee? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Committee members’ willingness to serve</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Committee members’ availability to serve</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Size of committee (number of members required)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Composition of committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inability to include direct reports</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Scheduling meeting dates</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other (please elaborate)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “As the hiring manager or search committee chair, I understood my role.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value
---|---
Mean | 3.70
Variance | 1.58
Standard Deviation | 1.26
Total Responses | 23

13. Do you have anything else you would like to add? (Or: Based on your experience, can you suggest ways a search committee could more efficiently help to hire the most capable person for the job?)

Text Response

Just to reiterate my comments from above: In my experience, both direct or indirect, the on-line application process DESPERATELY needs to be improved so as to walk each applicant VERY SPECIFICALLY through the completion of each step required to be considered for an interview. I believe that far too many high-quality candidates THINK they have done everything they need to do, but haven’t. The candidate we eventually hired for the position I chaired was a very experienced CMC employee with a very high computer/technology “IQ”. Originally, she didn’t qualify for an interview!!!!! So I had to tell her (and EVERYONE ELSE on the candidate list) and ask them to “finish”! VERY BAD!!!!!

In my opinion, the most important issues regarding ability to employee qualified individuals does not fall to the committees, but falls to the job classifications and most importantly rate of pay offered. In many positions rate of pay while not advertised is far below the norm, especially in the labor trades. Generally, would recommend including itemized benefits within the advertisement, however with rate of pay being over 20% below the norm effectiveness would still be limited.

Have the ability to re-write the ad for target candidates/populations for needed
qualifications that are not demonstrated in the pool of current applicants. Broaden applicant pool to be able to include eligible candidates with work visa, an opportunity to contribute to future global employment perspectives.

Include salary range in the advertisement

I think chairs need to shrink the timeline. I believe we lose candidates because our hiring process is so slow. They should have their committee set up before the position is advertised. They should communicate what the timeline will be for reviewing resumes, phone interviews, live interviews with dates that are agreed to by the committee.

Allow access to those that did not meet the minimum qualifications as sometimes decisions have been made by HR where a potential candidate could be included in the pool. It is worth at least having the ability to review them.

The ongoing challenge is to make selection processes happen as quickly while managing a multitude of other priorities/issues. At times this can be easier than others, however, to have the application/interview be process be successful AND an expeditious, friendly, professional experience for applicants requires a good bit of time, administrative assistance, and follow through. While quickly filling positions with the best candidates is a top priority, when added to a list of many other high priorities we do the best we can while maintaining a focus on critical student and learning issues. I’m not certain of the solution. Of course not being short staffed would be a good place to start :) If there were a way to have access to applications as soon as they are received/processed by HR rather than waiting for a close date, that would be helpful. (On faculty and IC searches, the amount of time to closing the search or being able to access applications is too long. We lose good candidates, who applied early, because we wait too long to begin reviewing the applications.

This was first time in the new consensus program, so it took me time to get a good understanding of how it worked. Several of my committee members printed out documentation instead of simply reading it online and keeping it paperless. We had a very diverse committee, which made for an excellent forum to interview and review prospective employees. I much prefer the committee method to 1 or two people making the analysis and decision to hire.

I think we need to be able to have people who are involved with the position on the committee - like people who report to that person. I believe there is not a buy-in if the committee does not work with the person.

I would like to see jobs left open until filled and then the resumes just keep coming to the committee. And, if you want to run the ad again you should not have to wait another two weeks before you can interview other candidates if it is truly open until filled. I have experienced the frustration of thinking it was open until filled but would only receive apps if there was a two week “posting” of the job period.

An online hiring manual that is easy to navigate. Also a table of contents for the paper version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Survey Results: Search Committee Members

The survey on the following pages was completed by employees who had served as a committee member during the past year.

1. What type of position was your committee helping to hire?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Labor Trades (Custodian, Maintenance)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clerical/Technical (Administrative Assistant)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional (Counselor)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administrative (Campus CEO or Director)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value
---|---
Mean | 2.86
Variance | 1.08
Standard Deviation | 1.04
Total Responses | 64

2. At which CMC location was the position housed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Breckenridge (Summit)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carbondale (Roaring Fork)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Central Services</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chaffee (Timberline)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dillon (Summit)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glenwood (Roaring Fork)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rifle (West Garfield)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Spring Valley (Roaring Fork)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Steamboat (Alpine)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Do you feel you received adequate training to be a member of the search committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “As a search committee member, I understood my role.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Do you believe it helps the hiring process if supervisors can contact candidates who have not provided the required application materials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If no, why not?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, why not?

No. The on-line process should be improved in order to be sure that each applicant is SURE that they are complete in order to be considered. The chair/supervisor SHOULD NOT have to conduct this often awkward communication. It gives insight on attention to detail which may be critical to the position. Reflects on the position being hired for. I think if a candidate does not complete the application and provide adequate support documentation, they are not serious about the position. Waste of time to contact an applicant who lacks follow through skills. If someone doesn’t send the required material I don’t believe they should be in the pool - it’s a good indication that they don’t want the job bad enough, cannot follow directions or think their too good to have to provide what we’re asking for. If I am understanding this questoin correctly, you are asking about candidates with incomplete application packets? I think any candidate needs to submit a complete application, incomplete packets indicate unprofessionalism. Candidates who cannot provide the required materials should not be considered. If the candidate has not provided the required application material, I would have concern about their skill sets to perform the job to which they are applying. This tells me something about the applicant. The application should be complete. If the can’t follow instructions, we don’t need them. I believe that completion of all of the required application materials is an indicator of the candidate’s work style. I have doubts about a candidate who does not take the time and make the effort to ensure that all materials are provided. Applicant responsibility what would be the purpose? I believe that a candidate who provides a completed application shows a level of conscientiousness and attention to detail that most of our positions require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “As a search committee member, I understood my role...”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Strongly Disagree             |          | 6  | 9%
| 2 | Disagree                      |          | 7  | 11%
| 3 | Neither Agree nor Disagree    |          | 4  | 6%
| 4 | Agree                         |          | 40 | 63%
| 5 | Strongly Agree                |          | 7  | 11%
|    | Total                         |          | 64 | 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was too much, too little, or just enough responsibility expected of you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Too Much     |          | 2  | 3%
| 2 | Too Little   |          | 5  | 8%
| 3 | Just Enough  |          | 57 | 89%
|    | Total        |          | 64 | 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you have anything else you would like to add? (Or: Based on your experience, can you suggest ways a search committee could more efficiently help to hire the most capable person for the job?)

Text Response

I have now sat on three committees, two for instructional chairs and one for a counselor position. I think a lot of the process is dependent upon the person chairing the committee. For my first committee I did not receive any training or orientation to my responsibilities. I learned by doing, which for me is a good way to learn. Thankfully, the person chairing the committee was organized and timely with the process. On another committee I am having the exact opposite experience. In the first round I was asked to review 15...
applicants’ material in a matter of less than 24 hours, which infuriated and frustrated me. It was disrespectful of my time and responsibilities. Moreover, it was disrespectful to the candidates insofar as I was not given adequate time to review their materials. I question our college’s hiring practices on a number of fronts. First, I do not think we need to do a selection committee for every position at CMC—I think that we could allow supervisors to interview and hire administrative aides, custodians, i.e. non-exempt staff positions. Second when hiring professional, faculty, and administrative positions, I think we need to look at our recruiting practices. We cannot just advertise and see who we get. We need to be strategic about how we recruit for positions and cater to top individuals in community college higher education and then being willing to negotiate and invest in the starting salary for these top positions. Two of the committees I am serving on have lost numerous candidates due to cost of living in this district. In both instances, we are on our second and fourth rounds of searching again. The amount of resources to do searches over and over is incredulous, ineffective, inefficient and not representative of our president’s vision to be the first choice in education. Money sinks with each round in travel, staff and faculty time, lodging, etc... Negotiations for top candidates should be given to the campus/ceo and/or supervisor. Human Resources should provide an advocacy and support role. Policies for hiring should not be under the control of Human Resources but rather should always be vetted and decided by the College Leadership Team. Human resources has had far too power within this institution for far too long. This department is holding CMC back rather than propelling forward with the guiding light of anticipation.

We lost some candidates because the process of receiving and forwarding the resumes took a while - they had found other work by the time we contacted them. Since we’re in such a competitive environment it would be helpful if we were able to start contacting candidates sooner.

Again, please upgrade the on-line application process in order to be sure that each candidate knows that they are truly, completely eligible for an interview! We may be losing a lot of good candidates.

This was the first time I used the computer based system. I had difficulty accessing it. I did not think the levels & what was to be done at each one were clear enough. Each time I opened a document there were odd interfaces to close. I think our access system should permit direct opening etc. It would be nice to have a place to add notes & comments for later reference in discussions or for structuring questions for the interview. Overall I do not like the computer system for ALL applications. (Custodians, etc.) I think salary ranges have a significant impact on who is interested in applying for a position & it is a waste of time to have overqualified candidates or those already employed over the salary limit submit applications. Our process is slow enough that the good ones drop out of the running before we even let them know we are interested. In the hiring process I was directly involved in, there were at least 3 top candidates who could not afford the job.

I don’t believe our pool represented the most qualified candidates for this position. Although the position had been open for months, interviews were late in the summer. Many candidates had already dropped out. CMC seems to be totally unaware that there is an academic calender that requires that we look for candidates early in the Spring term (January and February) before the spring term is over when the best job candidates are out looking for jobs. If we wait until late summer the best already have jobs and we get the left overs. Also, I feel it isn’t effective policy to have Human Resources contacting the candidates with job offers. I have worked at other institutions where the search
committee contacted the candidates to negotiate offers. We know these candidates and they may be more open to express concerns and needs with committee members rather than an HR person they don’t know.

search chairs should be able to screen applicants and decide if they can be in the pool.

This survey needs to be reviewed. One question “As a search committee member, I understood my role...” was asked twice. The search committee pulled together and I believe that we did an admirable job. I would recommend that logistics need to be worked out -- either the lead of the committee or someone else MUST be assigned and communicate with other committee members about EVERY thing -- sometimes on a daily basis.

I experienced that some members chose not follow what the chair had set up which caused confusion for the committee and the applicant.

I think it puts a committee at a disadvantage when Human Resources is in charge of notifying the candidate selected. I think it should be offered by the committee chair in order to answer relevant questions at the time and increase the chance that the candidate accepts the position. Human resources has too much power in the selection process. I also think our selection process takes way too much time.

Perhaps CMC could have an inservice to go to as to the expectations that CMC has for hiring employees.

We did have to rely on our collective understanding of proper questions that the committee could (and could not) ask the candidates. I think there should be more training with all employees about current laws related to appropriate interviewing procedures. Salaries should be posted in the ads; it would create a more open discussion about the stress of the cost of living in the CMC districts.

The process takes too long from the posting of the position to the hiring of the candidate. With all of the steps, ranking the applications, phone interviews, in-person interviews, reviewing the interviews), as a committee member I am concerned about the candidates being left in limbo and then finding a new position in the meantime. For the committee that I was on we started app. review on July 8th and didn’t get the person hired until mid-August. Luckily, the person could start immediately but that is not always the case.

The website for employment is a little confusing when you are filling out the information. You have to provide a hard copy as well as online copy, which can be mistaken for one or the other by potential candidates. Most people are use to providing information at different stages of the interview process as well, so having the supervisor approach candidates based on our interest in them for more information doesn’t hurt it actually helps create a richer pool to decide from.

I believe a strong chair significantly helps a hiring committee. Communication on the part of the chair to the members with clear expectations is a must. I also believe the size of the committee is important (large enough for differing views but small enough for efficiency). I think the best size would be between 4 and 6.

The concept of search committee is good and valid - but our implementation is absurd. Too slow, too awkward, way too devoted to “consensus” to get things done. Members (and the chair!) should commit to and be held to a tight schedule that keeps the process moving forward. It is inexcusable to spend so long on the selection that all the viable candidates must take other positions, and yet this happens all the time. Maybe a much smaller committee would be more active?
I like the objectivity of the electronic hiring process. It takes the human element out until it is needed in the interviewing process.

While I understood my role I do think guidelines should be reviewed with the committee regarding ethics, legalities, confidentiality etc. In my ten years at CMC I have seen a lot of people sitting on hiring committees that have personal relationships with a candidate and I feel this is ethically wrong and people were hired possibly not for the right reason. I also believe the process takes too long. I think committees should be given a time frame in which to complete the process and the candidates should be made aware of it so they don’t take other positions.

Our system should favor the applicant more. After 20 years of management and executive experience, I do not believe that we should put applicants for lower level positions in front of committees with 6-10 members. Also our questioning should be more behavioral. CMC managers need training on how to conduct an interview and how to “recruit” the folks we want to work here.

The process seems very slow and we lose many candidates who would have been excellent in the position because they can’t wait that long - so any way we could refine the process. Also, it can be very confusing for candidates if they are still included in the pool yet didn’t make the first round of interviews and then the position is re-advertised. I really hope the college looks at training and promotion from within the organization. It would help with morale and possibly speed up the process.

I think our current system works well, although I have heard of considerable delays when candidates are waiting for HR to call them and let them know about interviews, search results etc.

raise the salary range for counselors. Several of the candidates expressed to the committee chair that they could not make it work living in our community on the salary offered. We went out three times and the pool of candidates was very shallow with only a few exceptional candidates.

publish the salary range in the job announcement and raise the counselor salary so that the college can attract larger pools of applicants. Mark

The process must move along quickly so that we do not lose qualified candidates to other offers.

I am very glad that the West Garfield Campus was allowed to hire an applicant that had not yet received her Master’s. She was the right person for the job, and I am very happy that she was not kept out of the running because she was a couple of months shy of receiving her diploma.

The hiring process at CMC is appallingly slow. Search committees are too large, forcing the committee to work around the schedules of numerous people. The hiring process should not stop just because someone is on vacation. If someone is scheduled to be on vacation during the search, then they shouldn’t be on the committee. It’s time we start moving at the pace of business instead of at the pace of government.

Recruitment strategies rather than just advertising and waiting. Hiring firms.

The process is laborious. How a hiring decision is actually made is a bit confusing. The committee selects the best candidate from a pool then passes the candidate, with whom a lot of time had been spent and a relationship developed, to the HR department. I understand there is a set of rules, by which this department must function, but there is no flexibility. It can be a little frustrating for the committee to guess what the salary and
benefits offer will be for each candidate and whether or not the candidate will accept based on the committee’s conjectures. I guess the process is a little detached.

I was only on one committee - to hire our tech support person here. It was a very good experience. Not only did I learn more about the process, I met others within the college I may not have otherwise known, and it was the first step in an excellent relationship with the excellent person chosen. It would be great to be included in other hiring committees, but we are considered peripheral to CMC and even though the position may really affect us, we are not thought of when a team is assembled. We would like to be included and can offer an additional perspective. There were not enough choices above - the position category did not include IT - and as to ‘training’ - not sure what that means. I got the information I needed to get - but ‘training’ seems a bit too big a concept for this.

Why ask “Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: “As a search committee member, I understood my role.” twice in the same survey? Ok, the second question ended with ‘...’?? I would have a question bank available online geared to specific positions. The chair can pull these & tailor to site specific needs of the job. Also each campus can add to the question bank, easy way to maintain history & learn. Aids viability & freshness too.

I was not involved with on-line procedure now used. It seems frustrating for everyone, and did not really produce great results. Not sure what the advantage is.

the Committee chairs should be coached on professionalism as hiring the right candidate is one of the most important things we can do to enhance our organization. Sure, there will always be a few glitches here and there but we need to be professional as a committee/team when on the phone and especially in-person interviews. It’s becoming the rule of thumb that you can expect your hiring committee is going to go out at least twice to find a viable candidate who will accept the position. We are in a crisis situation here at CMC - it’s more than difficult to attract outsiders to our unaffordable communities - we are relying heavily on the people who “are already here” - what happens when we can’t count on that anymore? At present, there’s an untold amount of resources (time and effort) put forward in hiring - there should be a monetary value assigned to the necessary work hours it takes to hire a person. Perhaps higher salary bases would cut down on the need for a search committee to spend additional hours on two to three additional rounds of interviews, plus create less stress on employees that must bear the brunt of the unfilled position’s workload.

It’s too bad the pay can’t be increased until the 3rd round of interviews.

I think the rating process was too combersome and I spent a long time rating candidates who I already knew I would not consider. Some of my fellow committee members did not follow this process as they also discovered how long it took and how ineffective the process was.

This is my first experience on a search committee since the implementation of the on-line component for the application review and rating. My committee is in the middle of this process now, so I don’t really have a feel for the entire process yet.

When I’m on a search committee, I would like to know up front if the decision of whom to hire will be up to the search committee, or just a recommendation to the CEO, who will then decide. I don’t mind either one, I just want to know up front. This time, it worked fine since the CEO and the committee agreed. In my long tenure at CMC, this has not always been the case.
I would like to be able to check references. Twice I have been on CEO search committees where reference check was hired out to a company, who would then give us a report. I do not like this method. I feel the we can’t the most accurate impression this way.

I understand full job descriptions are not available online (just the advertised verbiage is available) and that applicants do not automatically receive full descriptions in advance of going through the entire process. I think this wastes everyone’s time if applicants are not fully informed of the job duties and responsibilities in addition to being fully informed of pay range.

Questions 4 and 6 above were the same - was this a trick question I have to ask?

I think the search committe went well and the process was smooth. HR waited weeks before they followed through with the offer; it should have been more timely.

Keep committees small and get the interviews turned around quickly so we do not lose candidates. Having to wait two weeks for “re-posting” is absurd - we should be able to just keep on interviewing. Don’t bend over backwards for a candidate - that does not work out very often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>