

Friday January 11, 2018
Bullhead City Campus, Room #508
At or after 10:30 a.m.

(Action Items are in **bold print**)

I. Call to Order (Julie Bare, Search Chair)

Dr. Bare called the meeting to order 10:30 a.m.

II. Roll Call (Amy Curley, Executive Assistant to the President)

Julie Bare	Present
Susan McAlpine	Present
Vance Miller	Present
Ashley Pascual	Present
Judy Selberg	Present

III. Audience of Any Citizen (Bare)

[NOTE: This is an opportunity for any citizen to address the Board on any matter of concern to the citizen. The Board will listen to the remarks, but may not respond or answer questions. Unless the matter is already on the agenda for action, no action can be taken other than to instruct staff to include the matter on a future agenda.]

The chair queried each campus individually. There were no citizens wishing to address the Board.

IV. Application Update (Jennie Dixon, Chief Human Resources Officer)(Appendix 1)

Ms. Dixon provided an update on the number of application packages submitted and generalized composition of the applicant pool. As of 5:00 p.m. on Thursday January 10, 2019, twenty-nine applications had submitted. Three applications are currently incomplete, meaning the required materials have not yet been submitted, even upon request. Ms. Dixon contacts each candidate with an incomplete package, notifying them of the omission.

The candidates have various employment backgrounds that include universities, community colleges, K-12, the armed forces and are from numerous geographical regions. The only candidate from Arizona is among the incomplete packages. There are currently no internal applicants. Four of the candidates are female. Ms. Dixon anticipates another significant number of applications to be submitted in the week prior to the start of application review, scheduled to begin February 1, 2019.

V. Application Review Process (Bare)(Appendix 2)

- A. Development of Application Package Rubric: Committee input into a final rubric for application review is required. Several examples have been provided in the appendix.

Susan McAlpine explained the rationale behind the three examples as she was responsible for submitting two of them. The first example (labeled APP2a_HR-Application Screen Rubric) did not seem comprehensive enough to her. The second (labeled APP2b_Maricopa_Hiring Tool, Full Report, FINAL) was very comprehensive but did not closely reflect the “Ideal Competencies” developed for the MCC Presidential Profile (APP1) that the candidates were asked to address in their cover letters. Ms. McAlpine developed the third example (labeled APP2c_McAlpine_MCC Presidential Interviews Draft 1 taken from Position Announcement) to correlate the comprehensive format of APP2b with requested competencies.

Using Ms. McAlpine’s document as the basis, the following suggestions were made for Ms. Dixon to incorporate into the next version of the rubric.

1. Ms. Pascual asked if a notation could be placed on applicants that failed to submit all or the correct materials with their packages originally, stating that attention to detail is an important character trait to her.
2. Ms. Pascual asked if scoring descriptors, similar to the ones in APP2b (page 7 & 8) be developed for each level of performance to enable more reliable and unbiased scoring. Dr. Bare offered to assist Ms. Dixon with developing the descriptors applying her ample experience with developing rubrics. Dr. Bare also stated that the initial review may not have to be as comprehensive as later stages of the process, especially due to the number of reviews that have to be accomplished.
3. Dr. Bare stated her preference for a 4 point rubric as opposed to the 5 point rubric provided in each of the examples.
4. It was suggested that a horizontal scoring layout, allowing for multiple applicants on a single page, would be preferable.
5. Slight language changes that Ms. Dixon tracked in real time.

Ms. Dixon suggested that reviewers mark their top three candidates. Dr. Bare disagreed. Ms. Dixon was directed to incorporate the recommended suggestions and distribute the second draft for review. It was suggested that possibly two applications be distributed with rubric as pilot to see if the document “works” for everyone. Ms. Dixon agreed to use redacted applications from the most recent Executive Vice President search.

The rubric will be set up in an Excel spreadsheet to facilitate confidentiality and security.

- B. Process for member review of applications: Committee input into how it will review application packages, either physically or virtually.

After discussion regarding confidentiality and security issues, it was recommended that application packages be downloaded to flash drives for distribution to the committee for review. Ms. Dixon stated that her office could have those ready for distribution by February 4, 2019. Completed rubrics will be due back to Ms. Dixon on Friday February 22, 2019. The search timeline will be updated to reflect these dates.

After discussion, it was recommended that social media checks would not be provided until the semi-finalist stage.

VI. Interim Transition Update (Board President)

The transition of duties and responsibilities from retiring President Kearns to the interim president Diana Stithem began on January 2, 2019. Dr. Kearns' last day was January 11, 2019.

VII. Adjournment (Bare)