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**Inclusion Advocates (IA) Initiative**

***Enhancing Hiring Practices & Processes through Inclusion Excellence***

**Lansing Community College**

1. **Our Why**

One of the College’s Guiding Principles states: “LCC will prepare those it serves to thrive in a diverse world by reflecting that diversity in its student enrollment, staffing, planning, and allocation of resources.” With the launch of a new approach to achieving equity and inclusion in LCC’s hiring practices and processes, an **Inclusion Advocates (IA) Program will take a significant step forward in upholding this important guiding principle.**

A foundational aspect of our program is an examination of unconscious bias. By becoming aware of the unconscious bias that influences our behavior and perceptions of others, we can begin to change it. We are most successful when we engage with others who bring different perspectives and experiences that challenge our own. **As such, the Inclusion Advocate Program** will become a formalized part of the hiring process and help committee members and hiring leaders fully embrace the value added from **Inclusion Advocates'** participation in search and screening activities.

**“Diversity, inclusion and equity require more than a daily commitment, but rather a long-term strategic vision for how we will cultivate and express them more fully.”**

**– *Tonya C. Bailey, Chief Diversity Officer, LCC***

**Overview:**

LCC's Inclusion Advocate Initiative (IA) enhances equity, validity, and diversity in the College’s hiring processes. Inclusion Advocates are LCC employees who have volunteered to serve in unpaid positions as Inclusion Advocates. IA’s are trained as search and selection process advisors. Their preparation includes a two-part workshop series addressing current research about implicit bias, diversity, the changing legal landscape in hiring, inclusive employment principles, practical strategies for each stage of the search process, and effective ways to be an Inclusion Advocate on a search committee. As a quality assurance measure, Inclusion Advocates who wish to remain eligible beyond the first year must engage in relevant continuing education and annual AI Update Sessions that is provided by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and staff of Human Resources.

The College President and Executive Leadership Team require that an Inclusion Advocate participate in any Provost's Hiring Initiative and Tenured Faculty Diversity Initiative search. They have committed to ensuring that designated Inclusion Advocates also be included on leadership search committees. Many administrative and academic divisions have adopted policies requiring search advocates on certain types of committees as well. These leadership decisions show their trust in the quality of OSU's Search Advocate program and their desire to have these searches benefit from search advocate contributions.

**Role:**

Each Inclusion Advocate is a consultant/participant who advances inclusive excellence by asking questions to help committee members test their thinking, identifying and promoting practices that advance diversity and social justice, and minimizing the impacts of cognitive and structural biases. As external committee members, advocates are able to explore assumptions, norms, and practices that an internal member might not question. The inclusion advocate plays a vital role in position development, recruitment, screening, interviews, references, evaluation, and integration of the new faculty or staff member into the institution. In partnership with the search chair, search committee members, and hiring official, the search advocate affirms LCC's commitment to inclusive excellence.

**Inclusion Advocates:**

Help guide the committee to make certain that the search process:

 ♣ Is free of bias or stereotyping of applicants in verbal or written communication

♣ Ensures that candidates are evaluated fairly

♣ Follows interview procedures which treats all applicants consistently

♣ Work to ensure diversity of the applicant pool

**How is this done:**

* Training, Training, and Ongoing Training - Complete training/Workshop (2 part training total of 6 hours) with HR and ODI – Workshop open to all employees to be offered quarterly; Continued education standards expected; and updated meetings and trainings throughout their tenure.
* Works closely with the Hiring Manager as a support and attends to job conceptualization, search, and recommendation process
* Recommend practices/process enhancements to (Enhance validity, Increase Equity and Achieve greater diversity
* Work with group to minimize unconscious bias
* Advocate effectively for diversity
* Help committee members test their thinking
* Coaching from CDO/Director CEI/HR
* Meet with hiring official & search Chair to clarify roles, offer examples, agree about working together
* First committee meeting – Hiring official provide charge, introduce (AI) and invite questions

**ELEVATOR PITCH**

What is an elevator pitch? *It’s a* ***30 second*** *memorable description of what you do and why. The goal is to earn the listeners interest and their desire to learn more about the Why of an IA.*

Why an elevator pitch? *You need a short, snappy, easy-to-grasp explanation of the role of an Inclusion Advocate (IA).*

The constructs of your pitch:

1. Who are you? Introduce yourself, write no more than 2 sentences to summarize who you are, where you are from, etc. This should be the component of your pitch that takes up the least space and time.
2. What is an Inclusion Advocate?
3. What is the value of having an Inclusion Advocate as a voting member (make sure to mention that) on the search committee?
4. Grab their attention. Share facts and data around the importance of a diverse, equitable, and inclusive search committee, higher education institution, etc.
5. Read, edit, and practice.
6. **PRE, DURING, AND POST SEARCH PROCESSES**

**Before the search begins – set‐up for success**

Once you have agreed to serve as a volunteer Inclusion Advocate you should request a meeting with the search chair and/or the hiring manager to discuss your shared work on the search. This conversation could cover several topics:

* Learn about the search context and goals from the hiring manager;
* Discuss your approach to the advocate role;
* Assist with language related to the position, the posting, interview questions, etc.;
* Plan the collaboration between you and the search chair to support the search process;
* Negotiate the use of key Inclusion Advocate strategies, including screening criteria development and management of known applicants and conflicts of interest; posting suggestion list
* Discuss periodic check‐ins between committee and hiring manager to ensure continued alignment and a successful search outcome;
* Clarify the parameters of the search and the work product;
* Plan or review the plan for the hiring manager’s charge to the committee at the first search committee meeting.

**Put together your Toolbox**

To ensure success in your role as an IA you should review:

* Your elevator speech
* The two bias videos
* The Inclusion Advocate Handbook
* Common types of biases
* Request mentoring, if desired, with the Director of the Centre for Engaged Inclusion, the Chief Diversity Officer, or one of the ODI staff.
* Have your Search Committee Checklist for each committee member ready to be completed after the first meeting of the committee.

**First meeting of the committee:**

The first meeting of the committee establishes a precedent for how the search will proceed.

Key ingredients of the first meeting include:

Hiring official charges, the committee and establishes parameters;

Committee members introduce themselves including roles, perspectives, experiences, relevant interests, and connection to the position being filled;

Group develops agreements about how they will work together collaboratively;

Inclusion Advocate shows unconscious bias videos and introduce key concepts such as potential impact of unconscious, cognitive, and structural biases on the search process;

Members bring calendars and develop tentative timeline;

Committee begins working on development/refinement of criteria rubric, questions and weigh in on the position description.

**For the Inclusion Advocate,** the first committee meeting is an opportunity to introduce yourself, describe your role, and begin forming connections to the other committee members:

* Use your elevator speech on role and the Inclusion Advocate Program, bias risks, and your role as advocate. If not, you should plan to do this in order to establish shared context and integrate new search committee members who have not previously worked with an advocate (if any).
* In the committee charge, the hiring manager addresses the most important priorities for the search including the commitment to a diverse and inclusive process and outcome, and expresses support for your role as advocate;
* If the hiring official has not already done so, the search chair introduces you as the Inclusion Advocate for this search;
* Briefly tell the committee about your background, your commitment to their success, and how you hope to contribute to that success;
* Show the two videos and discuss all the common types of biases;
* Solicit questions and concerns from the committee. If concerns arise, try to validate each person’s perspective without defending or arguing. (Note concerns that need follow‐up and identify what you will do by when. Be sure to contact CDO or HR for coaching).
* Complete the Search Committee Checklist within 48 hours of the first meeting.

**During the search**

As the search progresses, your relationship to the committee and your influence over the process can be enhanced (or limited) through your participation:

* **Be present-**attend every meeting and try to be available.  If you must be absent, alert the search chair  and provide a substitute advocate.
* **Be professional—**of course you will arrive on time and prepared for each meeting as you would for any other  search. Engage with the group from developing the position through integrating the new hire.
* **Be proactive –**your purpose in joining the committee is to advocate for practices that improve equity, inclusiondiversity, and overall validity of the search process.  This requires active engagement with the   committee, providing Inclusion Advocate tools, raising questions that others don’t ask, etc.
* **Be mindful of your role—**anything you contribute to the search process will be seen as coming from the Inclusion Advocate program.  If you share ideas or strategies that don’t come directly from the program, be sure to let the committee know, and/or discuss with Inclusion Advocate program staff. Beware of asserting that something MUST be done a certain way.
* **Be a resource—**share quick checklists, tools, and other resources with the  committee as the search progresses; volunteer for tasks such as documenting the screening criteria the group develops,

drafting possible interview questions, recording applicant disposition reasons during the

screening process, or doing search‐related research

* **Bring clarity—**sometimes discussion outcomes are unclear, or certain perspectives are overlooked.  Provide  what is missing in the conversation, whether this means asking someone what they think, confirming your understanding of what’s been decided, or checking to be sure that everyone is clear about who is responsible for what by when.
* **Collaborate and facilitate—**actively participate in the work of the group using inclusive communication practices and other performance skills.
* **Tell candidates your role –**during the phone and site interviews, introduce yourself by name, institutional role and as the Inclusion Advocate for this search committee.

**After the search**

Your skills and expertise as an Inclusion Advocate will continue to develop with experience, information, feedback, and analysis.  As you become more familiar with this role, it will be important to understand where you are most effective, how you are making a difference, and where to focus your development.  The Inclusion Advocate Program also relies on feedback from individual advocates about what works well, what needs improvement, and what strategies could better the work. Please employ these assessment tools:

* Ask the hiring official, committee chair, and committee member to provide feedback to you or the Chief Diversity Officer or HR.
* Debrief your experience in writing or with another advocate. What did you notice in this search? What made a difference? What could be improved? What new ideas or possibilities do you see?
* Share your insights and feedback from your search participants with Inclusion Advocate program staff.
* Share your insights and observations with Inclusion Advocate peers at Community of Practice luncheons or at Inclusion Advocate workshops

**See Appendix 1. Inclusion Advocates Search Committee Checklist**

1. **DEFINTIONS, DISCRIMINATION, AND LEGALITES**

**Legal and Regulatory Environment**

As a college, we are also governed by Michigan law, Michigan Administrative Rules, and LCC  policy.  Finally, our institutional aspirations for diversity and other strategic goals can only be  realized when such considerations are central to our search, selection, and employment  practices.  By providing process expertise, Inclusion Advocates help search committees

recognize and balance these critical considerations.

**Protected status**

Each of us has many identity characteristics. Some characteristics are identified in law and policy as *protected statuses*; this means that each of us is protected from discrimination on the basis of those characteristics, which include:

Age

Sex

Color

Disability

National Origin

Race

Religion

Veteran status

Sexual Orientation

Gender identity or expression

Family relationship

Genetic information

Injured worker

Marital status

**Equal opportunity**

Equal opportunity (or equality of opportunity) is an umbrella term that refers to the absence of protected-status discrimination. Equal opportunity safeguards in employment include:

1. protection from *unfair treatment* based on protected status;

2. protection from denial of *reasonable accommodations* that are needed because of disability or religious beliefs; and

3. protection from *retaliation* for (a) complaining about discrimination and/or (b) assisting with a discrimination investigation or lawsuit.

**Theories of discrimination**

For the last four decades, the US legal system has recognized two forms of discrimination:

1. Disparate treatment is unfavorable treatment that is motivated in part by protected status. Unlawful motivations can include animus against certain protected statuses, stereotyped thinking, or other bias (conscious or unconscious) regarding protected status.

2. Disparate impact is a facially neutral policy or practice that results in a significant negative impact based on protected status—fair in form but discriminatory in outcome—and which is not justified by legitimate business necessity. Motivation/intent to discriminate is not required.

Potential evidence of disparate impact discrimination includes statistically significant disparity on the basis of protected status, and a specific policy or practice that is identified as the cause of this disparity.

These theories encompass the most prevalent forms of explicit/intentional discrimination that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was intended to address, but do not effectively address the range of unconscious/unintended discrimination (rooted in implicit bias) which is common today.

**LCC non‐discrimination policy**

1. Purpose Lansing Community College is an educational institution that embraces and promotes diversity, equity and inclusion in all aspects of its operations. Lansing Community College is committed to providing equal employment opportunities and equal education for all persons regardless of race, color, sex, age, religion, national origin, creed, ancestry, height, weight, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, familial status, marital status, military status, veteran’s status, or other status as protected by law, or genetic information that is unrelated to the person’s ability to perform the duties of a particular job or position or that is unrelated to the person’s ability to participate in educational programs, courses services or activities offered by the college
2. Scope This policy applies to employees, applicants for employment, students, and persons applying for admission to the college, vendors, visitors, volunteers, or any person or entity engaged in business or seeking to engage in business with the college.
3. Responsibility for the interpretation and administration of this policy is delegated to the Equal Opportunity Officer and the Executive Director Human Resources

**Working definition of “diversity”**

In a group, diversity is the array of important human differences—characteristics that affect people’s experiences within a social system—present in the members of a group. A diverse group includes members with many different life experiences and cognitive approaches related to their identities, cultures, abilities, circumstances, histories, and other characteristics.

As a value, diversity is also our desire to realize the richness of human difference and our commitment to pluralism. Those who value diversity strive to ensure that all people experience fairness, inclusion, hospitality, and respect. They work to increase their knowledge and understanding of different cultures, values, norms, and beliefs, while avoiding judgment or the temptation to evaluate other cultures against the yardstick of their own values and beliefs.

They explore the concepts of privilege, power, and oppression, and seek to rectify unearned privilege and oppressive systems. They advance people with different backgrounds and life experiences into opportunities throughout the organizations to which they belong, stimulating creativity and strengthening shared commitments to equity, inclusion, and justice.

In employment, advancing diversity may not be used as a basis for race- conscious hiring.

Permissible diversity efforts include:

* **Race‐neutral practices** – for example, recruiting for a set of performance skills and experiences to enhance the organization’s capacity to benefit from a diverse workforce

or serve a diverse clientele. Candidates of any race may meet these qualifications, which should be evaluated based on relevance to the position (not on the basis of the candidate’s race).

* **Race‐based non‐allocation practices** – such as extra recruiting efforts to ensure that members of historically underrepresented groups are made aware of an employment opportunity. No benefit or resource is allocated to an individual on the basis of race or any other identity; rather this practice works to broaden the applicant

|  |
| --- |
|  pool via reaching out to members of underrepresented groups. |
| **DO** | **DON’T** |
| **Trust the process** | Try to control the outcome |
| **Help the group test its thinking** | Substitute your judgment for theirs |
| **Explicitly acknowledge that you have biases** | Assume that your biases are no longer a problem |
| **Represent the Inclusion Advocate program as a process resource** | Impose your personal beliefs and favorite practices on the process |
| **Listen actively, affirm others’ views, and identify commonalities** | Debate, defend, or engage in “win/lose” interactions |
| **Ask open questions to expand the conversation** | Blame, judge, or attempt to trap people |
| **Listen and ask questions for deeper understanding** | Interpret or assume others’ motives, goals, or objectives |
| **Be a neutral resource** | Take sides if you can avoid it |
| **Offer resources and facilitation to help advance the search** | Use your advocate standing to advance your preferred practices |
| **Be selectively assertive** | Be too pushy OR deferential |
| **Welcome input** | Resist feedback |
| **Remain open to possibilities** | Embrace certainty too soon |
| **Seek feedback and support from OEI and other advocates** | “Go it alone” if you’re frustrated, confused, worried, or concerned |

1. **Developing Screening Criteria**

Discuss each required/preferred qualification to decide ***“How will we know it when we see it?”***

**Relationship to job**:

How is it directly related to the duties of the position?

What will the appointee be able to do if they meet this qualification that they might not be able to do otherwise?

Do you expect that meeting this qualification means a candidate will bring a specific set of skills and experiences? If so, what are those skills/experiences?

Why is this qualification important?

**When** – at what point in the information gathering/analysis process will we be able to evaluate this qualification fully?

**Importance** – how important is it compared to the other qualifications? (*not* a numeric factor)

**Criteria**:

What are all the different ways someone might demonstrate that they meet this qualification? The “ways we’ll know it when we see it” are the screening criteria.

What unconscious or structural biases might be limiting these criteria?

Are there people who could do the job well, but who would be screened out based on the criteria we’ve developed for this qualification?

How can we expand the criteria to be more inclusive while still meeting the need this qualification is intended to address?

Develop a detailed criteria matrix for recruiting candidates and screening applications as provided in Table 1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **Table 1** **Group Consensus Screening Tool**  |  |  |  |
| **Job Title:**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **List committee members who attended screening meeting:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Date:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | \*Did the applicant answer “Yes” to the question “Will you now or in the future require sponsorship of employment visa status (e.g. H-1B visa status)?” (If Yes, the applicant is not eligible for hire) | Add Minimum Qualifications - Y/N | Add Minimum Qualifications - Y/N | Add Minimum Qualfications - Y/N | Add Minimum Qualifications - Y/N | Add Preferred Qualfications (if using them) Y/N | Add Preferred Qualifications (if using them) Y/N | \*\*Required documents are attached (applicants cannot be considered if required documents are not attached) | *Teaching Positions Only*Transcripts are attached (applicants cannot be considered if a transcript is required and it is not attached. Unofficial transcripts are acceptable) | Advance for interview **(Group Consensus)** Y/N | If **no**, provide rational | If **yes**, provide justification |
| Candidate #1 (Enter Name) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Candidate #2 (Enter Name) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *\*Lansing Community College does not provide sponsorship for employment Visa status.* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *\*\*The required documents column is a* ***required*** *column and cannot be removed.*  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *The transcripts column may be removed* ***only*** *if transcripts are not required. Other columns may vary based on individual posting requirements.*  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***For Minimum Requirements where an equivalent combination of education and experience is acceptable, please define below what the search committee considers the appropriate combination(s), i.e. For a “Bachelor’s Degree or equivalent combination of education and experience”; the equivalent would/could be an Associate’s Degree and 2 years of experience.*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Position Description & Qualifications**

The greatest opportunity to move beyond the status quo in hiring occurs when the search and screen committee participates in designing, developing and/or refining the position description and screening criteria matrix, and recruiting materials/search plan before they are forwarded

for approval.

**Bias Risks**

Writing the position description like a scientific article or a grant proposal—formal, concrete,

third person, “just the facts,” bland, generic, academic… producing a document that may be boring, uninviting, uninspired!

• Holding a narrow position view based primarily on past incumbents

• Basing position description and qualifications on unexamined assumptions about merit and excellence

• Overlooking/failing to provide important information like context, roles,

contributions, opportunities, challenges, future initiatives, emerging interests, etc.

• Thinking and writing from the privileged/dominant perspective only

• Expressing ideas in ways that may be offensive to potential applicants, especially based on identity group memberships

• Establishing needlessly rigid/exclusive qualifications or qualifications that may produce disparate impact on the basis of protected status (e.g. requiring

 a driver’s license when driving is not an essential function)

 • Establishing qualification thresholds that are higher than necessary for the position,

so that the qualifications (rather than the committee) will screen the pool

**Principles for Developing the Position Description**

* **Approach** announcements and ads as informative documents and marketing tools, using a more conversational style and interesting language;
* **Develop**a clear statement of the mission of the position, attending to diversity and the current and future role of the position in the work of the unit and institution (see Diversity Aspects of the Position Description below);
* **Emphasize**aspects of the position likely to attract people from identity groups you have missed before:
* **Identify and describe needs**/opportunities for the person in this position to connect with historically underrepresented or under‐ served communities;
* **Highlight position**, unit, and community features beyond just those

that will appeal to the “dominant culture;”

* **Be aware of challenges** that someone from a historically underrepresented group may face in this position, and be certain you know how the unit is addressing those challenges;
* **Describe the position**, the college, the department, the university, and the community. Articulate the unit’s commitment to teaching, advising, diversity/inclusion/justice, and community connections as well as to building a peer‐reviewed publication record (if relevant);
* **Review** each draft for statements or language that may inadvertently discourage, offend, or raise concerns for some candidates based on their identities. Pay attention to implied assumptions about age, gender, race, religion, family status, ability status, first language, sexual orientation, social/economic class, etc. (both for candidates and for stakeholders/students/colleagues/clientele);
* **Seek ideas** from other institutions and from current faculty and staff.

**Discuss the Position**

**Begin your discussion by exploring these framing questions:**

1. What is the mission of LCC and of the hiring unit?

2. What is the current context at the university and in the hiring unit—what is new, what is changing, what is challenging, what is exciting, what is needed to realize our vision?

3. What is the present context for diversity at OSU and in the hiring unit—what is new, what is changing, what is challenging, what is exciting, what is needed to realize our vision?

4. What is the mission of the position you are filling?

a. What is the purpose of the position—why does it exist?

b. What are the position’s top priorities?

c. How does the work of the position contribute to the mission of the

unit and the university?

d. How does it impact colleagues, students, the university, and the

community?

5. How is diversity related to the work of the position? For example,

a. Will the appointee interact with a diverse group of colleagues, students, stakeholders, clients, and/or customers?

b. Will the appointee engage in teaching, scholarly inquiry, service, or other job duties that are directly or indirectly related to diversity and inclusion?

c. How frequently will the appointee need to understand and work respectfully/effectively with multiple aspects of human difference? In what kinds of situations?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ***Staff*****JOB DESCRIPTION**Form: HRF5005, Ver. 1, Revised 08/10/2018 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DATE: | 9/13/2018 |  | POSITION #: | NEW |
| JOB TITLE**:** | Occupational and Environmental Health and Safety Manager |
| DIVISION: | Finance, Administration & Advancement |
| DEPARTMENT: | Risk Management |
| PAY TABLE/LEVEL/GRADE: | ADM III | REPORTS TO: | FA9802 |

**STATUS**: *Please click the appropriate boxes that apply*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |       |  |   | \_\_\_\_ | Hours/Week |
|  |  |  |
|  |        No. of Employee if this position is pooled. |

**JOB SUMMARY**: (*This section should summarize the overall purpose (“mission”) of this job in 1-4 sentences. Briefly describe the primary reason the job exists at LCC.*)

The Occupational and Environmental Health and Safety Manager is responsible for enforcing, maintaining, and ensuring compliance with local, state and federal regulations as it relates to occupational safety under the United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Michigan’s Occupational Safety and Health Administration (MIOSHA), building and fire codes under the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) and Michigan’s Bureau of Fire Services (BSF), environmental regulations under Michigan’s Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Michigan’s Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and health regulations as applicable to all college students and employees under Michigan’s Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA).

**DIRECT REPORTS:** (*If this is a supervisory position* *(authority to hire, assign, discipline, approve timesheets), list position #s of those supervised).*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Direct Report(s):** |  *Click here to enter position numbers. Use comma to separate*  |

**ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:** *Identify and describe the essential duties and responsibilities, i.e., what actions are done and what are the expected results. Most jobs can be described using 5-10 statements. List in priority order, beginning with top priority/must get done, with approximate percent for each (e.g. 20% 1. reconciles grant fund expenditures to balance monthly budget). “Other duties, as assigned,” are implicit in all position descriptions.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **%** | **No.** | **Essential Duties and Responsibilities** |
| 45 | 1 | The Occupational / Environmental Safety Manager is responsible for enforcing, maintaining, and ensuring compliance with local, state and federal regulations as it relates to occupational safety under the United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Michigan’s Occupational Safety and Health Administration (MIOSHA), building and fire codes under the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) and Michigan’s Bureau of Fire Services (BSF), environmental regulations under Michigan’s Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Michigan’s Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and health regulations as applicable to all college students and employees under Michigan’s Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA). |
| 20 | 2 | This position also evaluates potential hazards and takes mitigation actions; develops and executes safety plans designed to eliminate health and safety risks; prepare and enforce guidelines and practices to establish and maintain a college wide culture of health and safety; ensure appropriate and required safety training is complete and properly documented; functions as the college spill control officer; facilitates disposal of college hazardous waste while maintaining related records and compliance with local, state and federal regulations (DEQ/MDNR); assists with the college risk management program as needed. |
| 10 | 3 | Conduct and document periodic inspections of all College facilities, especially classrooms, laboratories, chemical storage areas, for compliance with federal, state and local occupational safety and environmental health regulations, including but not limited to OSHA/MIOSHA, DEQ, EPA, NRPA, BFS building and fire codes; conduct/create job hazard analysis (JHA) and ensure all employees are provided and trained in the use of PPE appropriate to their job(s), dispose of hazardous materials and waste, such as biohazards sharps, waste chemicals. Function as the college’s “Spill Control Officer” as per the college Health & Safety plan. |
| 10 | 4 | Respond to and investigate illnesses, injuries, and other accidents at all College facilities; conduct and document required employee training in Blood borne Pathogens, Right-to-Know, First Aid/CPR/AED, powered industrial truck, respirator FIT program, fall protection, and other occupational/environmental health & safety related topics such as accident prevention. Development and deployment of relevant training materials utilizing current methods. |
| 3 | 5 | Chair safety committees College-wide, aiding in the development and maintenance of written safety plans including the college Health and Safety Plan. |
| 2 | 6 | Serve as a “Safety Officer” on the College’s Incident Command Team. |
| 10 | 7 | Other duties as assigned. |

**CORE COMPETENCIES.** *Record the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to perform the essential functions of this position. Provide descriptions of core competencies below (e.g. communication, customer service, decision-making, leadership, problem-solving, etc.). An incumbent or applicant must be able to demonstrate and results must be measurable.*

* Working knowledge of current federal, state and local codes, laws and regulations relating to environmental and occupational health to include but not limited to: United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Michigan’s Occupational Safety and Health Administration (MIOSHA), building and fire codes under the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) and Michigan’s Bureau of Fire Services (BSF), environmental regulations under Michigan’s Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Michigan’s Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and health regulations as applicable to all college students and employees under Michigan’s Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA).
* Excellent problem solving and leadership skills.
* Able to identify and resolve systems problems.
* Able to facilitate committee meetings to bring consensus and direction to the development of campus wide safety programs and plans.
* Ability to foster trust, rapport and develop collegial relationships with persons from all levels of the College community.
* Working knowledge and experience in the following, but not limited to:
1. Eye wash and emergency shower stations
2. Hazardous material clean-up, handling and disposal
3. Injury and accident investigations
4. Chemical Right-to-Know and Material Safety Data Sheets
5. Asbestos detection and abatement processes
6. Mold detection and abatement process
7. Air quality monitoring water quality monitoring process
8. Audio level monitoring
9. Fall protection program development, training, and enforcement
10. Powered Industrial Truck training and program maintenance
11. Respirator training and program maintenance
12. Hydrogen safety

**EDUCATIONAL/EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS:** *Identify the education and/or equivalent combination of education and experience, plus additional specific years of experience, certifications, licenses and/or special training required to perform the essential functions of this job.*

**Required**

* Bachelor’s Degree required, preferably in occupational or environmental health, safety related discipline and 3 years work experience occupational or environmental health, and safety related capacity.
* Working knowledge of Federal, State, and Local occupational and environmental health and safety regulations.

**Preferred**

* Certified Industrial Hygienist and/or Certified Safety Professional

**PHYSICAL AND MENTAL REQUIREMENTS:** *Complete the physical and mental demands on the attached ADA Checklist that must be met to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Mobility around the LCC campus is a normal part of the position’s functions.* *Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.* **Go to the ADA Checklist.**

**WORK ENVIRONMENT:** *Complete the work environment characteristics on the attached ADA Checklist that must be met to successfully perform the essential functions of this job.* *Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.* **Go to the ADA Checklist.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Supervisor’s Name** |  | **Supervisor’s Signature\*** |  | **Date** | **11/5/18** |
| **Dean/ELT’s Name** |  | **Dean/ELT’s Signature** |  | **Date** |  |
| *Note: Signature means approval, otherwise return for signatures.* |
| **Human Resources Rep.** | **Sydney Glasscoe** | **HR Rep Signature** |  | **Date** | **11/5/18** |
| *Note:**Position description to be reviewed annually, upon posting or transfer of person or position.* |

**Lansing Community College ADA Compliance Job Description Checklist**

*The immediate supervisor is responsible for completion of this form. Fill in more information as needed that apply to the essential job duties of the attached job description.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Position #:**  *Enter Position #.* | **Date:** 9/13/2018 | **Supervisor’s Position #:** FA9869 |

**Materials Used:**

 **Standard Office Equipment**:

  

  

 

Others, please list: Smart software, weather radar system, Siemens insight/apogee software

**Standard Trades Equipment:**

   

Others repair/maintenance tools, please list: College vehicle fleet, AED’s, Life Safety Systems and related equipment

**Mental Functions:**

  

  





**Auditory Functions**:

 

 

**Visionary Functions**:

 

 







**Smell and Tasting Functions:**



**Movement, Strength, Repetition Functions:**

     

   











**Environmental Conditions**:

  

  

  

  

*Based upon www.job-analyis.net*

1. **IA Requirements**

The role of Inclusion Advocate is complex and requires appropriate preparation; therefore completion of the 2‐part workshop series is a prerequisite to service in this role. Inclusion Advocates are also required to complete annual continuing education in order to remain eligible to serve in this role. Details of the continuing education requirement will be provided by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion.

**The following suggestions are offered to help guide the selection of advocates:**

If the search is for a Provost’s Initiative position or a Tenured Faculty Diversity Initiative position at the assistant, associate, or full professor rank, the advocate is typically a tenured associate or full professor; If the search is for an assistant, associate, or full professor (tenure‐track, clinical, extension, or senior research), the Inclusion Advocate is often an associate or full professor, though advocates in other employment categories are also successful in this role; If the search is for a leadership position, the Inclusion Advocate should be a mid‐ to upper‐level administrator/leader or a tenured associate or full professor; If the search is for an advisor or other position with significant impact on the student experience, the Inclusion Advocate is typically any ranked or professional faculty member appropriate to the search; If the search is for any other position, the advocate may hold any rank, position, or classification.

An important aspect of the advocate role is to ensure that diverse perspectives are present at every stage of the process. The advocate needs to avoid potential or perceived conflicts of interest, and to minimize the impact of considerations which might limit their abilities to fully discharge the advocate responsibilities.

Advocates are most effective when they are relatively unfamiliar with the position being filled, as they are more likely to ask questions that might not occur to an organizational insider. Therefore, advocates should only serve on search committees outside their own departments/work units and when they are not stakeholders of the position. In the case of an academic faculty search, the advocate’s academic home is usually in a different department or even a different college; in the case of a leadership search, the advocate often comes from a different college or administrative unit.

**Building Inclusion Advocate relationships**

The Inclusion Advocate works collaboratively with the hiring official, the search chair, and the search committee. In the following pages you will find ideas about setting up your participation in the search, performing effectively during the search, and enhancing your ability an advocate during the search experience.

**CASE STUDY # 1**

The search committee is meeting for the first time to discuss their tenure-track assistant professor search. The goal is to screen the applicant pool in order to identify a “short list” for phone interviews.

The job announcement included the following information:

Position duties:

* 40% - teaching, advising, and other assignments
* 50% - research and creative activities leading to scholarly outcomes
* 10% - service activities

**Required qualifications:**

* Ph.D. in *discipline A, discipline B, discipline C*, or related field
* Ability to develop original, extramurally-funded program of research & scholarship
* Potential or demonstrated excellence in teaching
* Superb oral and written communication skills

**Preferred qualifications:**

* Ability to participate in/lead interdisciplinary projects
* Demonstrated commitment to diversity and educational equity

**To apply, submit:**

* Current CV
* Letter of interest
* Names and contact information for 3 professional references

Five departmental faculty members make up the committee. The search chair, a tenured full professor named Marcus, starts the meeting by asking everyone to indicate their rating of each applicant. The options are *not qualified, qualified, or outstanding*. After tallying the results, he announces that members agree about who is *not qualified*, but there are some differences of opinion about who is *qualified* or *outstanding*. Marcus suggests that the committee focus on applicants who were ranked *outstanding* by one or more people, and eliminate the rest. He asks, looking around the table, if there are other ideas, but no one offers any suggestions.

Alice is an associate professor in the department who was hired (with tenure) after a national search the previous year. She is the only person who gave an *outstanding* ranking to applicant

#1. The others tell Alice that #1 was a finalist for her position and that he is a “disaster.”

His record of grants and publications is reasonably strong, but he is awkward, has a “terrible personality,” and would be a terrible fit with the department culture. Several people tell stories from his campus visit to illustrate this, with much eye rolling and laughter. A senior faculty member says it’s unlikely that #1 could be tenured anywhere given his limited social skills and asserts that he should just remain a technician. The committee agrees to screen him out.

Applicant #2 and #3 have similar credentials, and both are finishing up postdoctoral fellowships in the department. There is lively discussion about the benefits and risks associated with hiring a departmental Ph.D. or post doc directly into a tenure-track position.

Jane, a tenure-track assistant professor on the committee, is the postdoctoral advisor for applicant #2. She speaks very strongly in favor of applicant #2 (her protégé) and the committee decides to advance him.

Several search committee members know applicant #3, but are not involved in his postdoctoral work, and no one speaks on his behalf. Since it is clear that #3 will not make the short list,

Alice asks how they will respond if he asks for feedback on his application.

Jane answers that his statement of research interests was “not at all what we were looking for, and very unprofessional.” Alice points out that the committee didn’t ask for a statement of research interest and asks whether any others are being advanced to phone interviews with equally brief research statements in their cover letters. Another senior faculty member comments that it’s a matter of professionalism, and that a well-prepared applicant who had done their research would have known to go the extra mile. Jane makes several other observations about deficits for applicant #3, comparing them to the strengths she has identified for her protégé, applicant #2. Despite her concerns that these considerations have not been discussed as screening criteria, Alice drops the topic, reluctant to provoke a conflict so soon after joining the department.

Applicants #6 and #8 both meet the minimum requirements for the position. Several committee members are interested in #6 despite her lack of teaching experience because she comes from a prestigious PhD program where they know several senior faculty members whom they consider to be excellent scholars. Applicant #8 has more teaching experience than #6, but completed his PhD at a university that is not as well known in this field, and none of the committee members have personal connections with faculty there. Neither applicant has completed a postdoc.

Applicant #7 is from Kuwait, and was considered to be outstanding by several committee members. After some excited discussion, a faculty member who met him at a conference jumps in to explain that he ‘got a strange vibe’ when he met #7, and isn’t certain how well he’ll be able to connect with university and regional stakeholders….After a lull in conversation, someone brings up applicant #9 who is known to several of the committee members. One person has heard that she recently resigned a great position to follow her spouse who had a job in another state. Another person believes that the spouse’s research interests do not align with the department’s focus, and suggests that it will be almost impossible to “close the deal” with #9 should she be selected.

By the end of the meeting, fifteen applicants have been discussed. The results for those applicants are:

* five applicants (including #2, the first departmental post doc and #6, from the prestigious program) are selected for phone interview
* four applicants (including #7 from Kuwait, #8 from the less known program, and #9 with the spouse) are held in reserve
* six applicants (including #1 with the bad personality and #3, the other departmental

post doc) are eliminated

All other applicants (those not rated as outstanding by any committee members) have also been eliminated from consideration. All applicants who have been eliminated will receive an email from Marcus, thanking them for their application but informing them that they are no longer under consideration.

1. **Types of Biases**



**The 13 most common types of unconscious bias in the workplace**

When it comes to hiring, there are some biases that are more common than others. Some need no explanation – gender bias, ageism, racism, name bias – however psychologists and researchers have identified over 150 types of bias that impact the way we engage and interact with others. Here, we look at just a few. Chances are you’ve let one or more of these biases influence your decisions and, as a result, missed out on a perfect candidate.

1. **Confirmation bias**– where an opinion is formed quickly on a single detail (bad suit, good school) and the interviewer ‘fills in’ their own assessment of the candidate with questions that they believe confirm or justify their initial impression or judgement.
2. **Overconfidence bias** – can be closely connected to confirmation bias, when the recruiter lets their confidence in their own ability choose the best candidate in the way of objective assessment.
3. **Illusory correlation** – where a recruiter believes certain questions are revealing insights about the candidate that actually don’t exist or are not relevant to their ability to perform in a role.
4. **Beauty Bias** – this one speaks for itself. Will a great looking person necessarily be the most successful choice for the role? The simple answer? No.
5. **Conformity bias** – this bias can occur with group assessments when recruiters fall in with the majority even if their opinion about a candidate differs. Peer pressure can have a lot to answer for.
6. **Contrast effect** – also called judgement bias, this is where a candidate is compared with the resume and candidate that went before, rather than being reviewed on their own skills and merit against the requirements of the role.
7. **Affect heuristics –**this unconscious bias sounds very scientific, but it’s one that’s being a very human survival mechanism throughout history. It’s simply about making snap judgements on someone’s ability to do a job based on superficial and irrelevant factors and your own preconceptions – someone’s appearance, tattoos, the color of their lipstick.
8. **Similarity attraction –** where hirers can fall into the trap of essentially hiring themselves; candidates with whom they share similar traits, interests or backgrounds. They may be fun to hang out with, but maybe not the best match for the job or building diversity.
9. **Affinity bias** – so you went to the same school, followed the same football team and maybe know the same people. That’s nice, but is it really of any relevance to the hiring decision?
10. **Expectation anchor** – where the hirer is stuck on what’s possibly an unrealistic preconception of what and who the candidate should be
11. **Halo effect** – Your candidate is great at one thing, so that means they’re great at everything else, right? Judging candidates on one achievement or life experience doesn’t make up for a proper assessment of their qualifications and credentials
12. **Horn effect** – It’s the devil’s work. The opposite of the halo effect where one negative answer or trait darkens the hirer’s judgement and clouds the assessment process.
13. **Intuition** – going with that gut feeling again? While the emotional and intellectual connection may come into the process, it’s largely irrelevant. Focus on their actual experience and capabilities instead.

**You’re More Bias than You Think**

Every day we make countless decisions without realizing it. Researchers call this “unconscious bias.” It’s happening right now as you read this.

You’re faced with around 11 million pieces of information at any given moment, according to Timothy Wilson, professor of psychology at the University of Virginia and author of the book *Strangers to Ourselves: Discovering the Adaptive Unconscious.* The brain can only process about 40 of those bits of information and so it creates shortcuts and uses past knowledge to make assumptions.

How and why our brains choose the way they do has been generating lots of conversation at Google, which recently announced a workshop focused on unconscious biases. Sure, studying the unconscious decisions we make can be critical when it comes to designing products or software people use, but more importantly, it’s critical when trying to uncover precisely what’s wrong with our workplace today.

“We are so powerfully guided by the things we expect to be true in the world,” [says Brian Welle](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=NW5s_-Nl3JE), director of people analytics at Google, in a video promoting the initiative.

This initiative is clearly strategically timed given that Google and other Silicon Valley tech companies have come under fire recently for the lack of diversity in their ranks. Still, challenging unconscious biases is one attempt at making hiring managers aware of the hidden preferences they bring to decision making–ones that stand in the way to hiring the best people for the job.

“Most of us believe that we are ethical and unbiased. We imagine we’re good decision makers, able to objectively size up a job candidate or a venture deal and reach a fair and rational conclusion that’s in our, and our organizations, best interests,” [writes Harvard University researcher *Mahzarin Banaji*](http://hbr.org/2003/12/how-unethical-are-you/ar/1) in *Harvard Business Review*. “But more than two decades of research confirms that, in reality, most of us fall woefully short of our inflated self-perception.”

Most of us believe that we are ethical and unbiased. But in reality, most of us fall woefully short of our inflated self-perception.

Take the [study out of Yale University](http://www.pnas.org/content/109/41/16474) that asked science researchers to rate two candidates for a lab manager position–a male and a female–both with the same qualifications. Participants, including both men and women, rated the male candidate as more qualified and were willing to pay him a higher starting salary than his female counterpart. “Despite efforts to recruit and retain more women, a stark gender disparity persists within academic science,” the researchers wrote. And the disparity isn’t just happening in academia.

This translates into a huge issue in the workplace. “Those of us who are raised in a cultural context have those implicit associations,” [says Welle in a Google workshop](https://www.gv.com/lib/unconscious-bias-at-work) on the topic. “It doesn’t matter if you’re male or female. We all have them.” Is there a way to change unconscious biases that influence who we hire, promote, and most value at work? There’s certainly no simple approach, but according to Welle, there are four places you can begin.

[A study through the Clayman Institute of Gender Studies at Stanford](http://gender.stanford.edu/news/2013/leveling-playing-field) found that the number of women musicians in orchestras went up from 5% to 25% since the 1970s–a shift that happened when judges began auditioning musicians behind screens so that they could not see them. This isn’t to say that all interviews have to be done blind of course, but that refocusing on the skills that define a candidate can help eliminate biases we may be bringing with us to our decision-making.

One way to do that, the Stanford researchers found, is to create clear criteria for evaluating candidates before looking at their qualifications. They found that gender biases in choosing between a male and female candidate for a police chief position, for example, were reduced when those making the selection had set up criteria before reviewing applicants. Welle sites the study as a case for standardizing interview questions. “Make sure all people answer the same exact questions,” he says. “All the research out there shows unstructured interviews are the worst way to make a hiring decision.”

**LET THE NUMBERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES**

It’s easy to deny personal biases, but disproving data isn’t so simple. Even Google makes mistakes. After a [research report by Spark Summit](http://www.sparksummit.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/doodle-research-summary-2.pdf) called out the company for over-representing white men in its Google Doodles with only 17% of doodles honoring women and less than 5% honoring women of color, the company realized it had to be more conscious of the decisions it was making.

To better understand how you and your workplace are handling such issues, look at the data available and what it’s telling you.

**ACKNOWLEDGE MICROAGRESSION**

All throughout the day, we send subtle messages to the people around us through our body language, word choice and behavior. Derald Wing Sue, professor of counseling psychology at Columbia University calls these signals “microaggressions,” which can have a profound and detrimental effect on the people around us.

“Microaggressions are the brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial, gender, sexual-orientation, and religious slights and insults,” Sue writes in his book, [*Microaggressions in Everyday Life.*](http://www.amazon.com/Microaggressions-Everyday-Life-Gender-Orientation/dp/047049140X)

Becoming hyperconscious of the language you use, who you choose to interact with and how during the day can cue you into how your language and behavior affects the people around you. Small details can make a difference. At Google, for instance, a number of conference rooms, which have traditionally been named after scientists, were renamed after women scientists to balance out the gender representation.

**TALK ABOUT IT**

[Calling out someone on his or her biases](https://www.fastcompany.com/3034895/strong-female-lead/the-one-word-men-never-see-in-their-performance-reviews) can help people become more conscious of the decisions they are making. Promoting that kind of open discussion at work is an important step in actually making a change. When a hiring decision is made, for example, what are the reasons for making that decision? Taking a group approach to decision making can also help point out those unconscious biases out there.

It’s not just Google that has a long way to go in getting there–across industries and workplaces, becoming more aware of the unconscious decisions we’re making could help slowly move the needle in the right direction. “You have to create that openness in your culture in order for these concepts to take route,” says Welle.

**NASPA Course (free to members) on Recruiting, Hiring, and Retaining Persons of Color and LGBTQ+ Individuals in Higher Education. One-hour long course**

<https://www.naspa.org/course/recruiting-hiring-and-retaining-persons-of-color-and-lgbt-individuals-in-higher-education>

**APPENDIX A**

 **Search Committee Checklist for Inclusion Advocates**

As a component of reviewing our search process IA should review the 3 areas below and indicate if any of the subsections occurred during the search process. The Office of Diversity and Inclusion requests this assessment in order to understand where there are negatives and positives within the search committees at Lansing Community College. Thank you for your work as an Inclusion Advocate, YOU are making a significant difference in the diverse, equitable, and inclusive community at Lansing Community College.

**Inclusion Advocates Name:**

**Position Being Searched:**

**Date IA started and ended:**

**Email this form to the Director of the Centre for Engaged Inclusion within one week of search committee concluding. If the search is failed and another search is needed, please submit this form for each search committee undertaken for the position.**

**Rising above Cognitive Errors**

**Guidelines for Search, Tenure Review, and Other Evaluation Committees**

JoAnn Moody, PhD, JD

[www.diversityoncampus.com](http://www.diversityoncampus.com)

***I. Common Errors of Individual Members***

*Not errors just made by the ‘bad guys' but things we all tend to do*

*if we are not motivated to avoid them.*

1. **Negative Stereotypes**. "A stereotype can he defined as a broad generalization about a particular

group and the presumption that a member of the group embodies the generalized traits of that group."

Negative stereotypes are negative presumptions such as presumptions of incompetence in an area, or

presumptions of lack of character or trustworthiness.

2. **Positive Stereotypes**. A halo effect where members of a group are presumed to be competent or

bonafide. Such a member receives the benefit of the doubt. Positive achievements are noted more

than negative performance, and success is assumed.

3. **Raising the Bar**. Related to negative stereotypes, when we require members of certain groups to

prove that they are not incompetent by using more filters or higher ones for them.

4. **Elitism**. Wanting to feel superior through certain attributes or selectivity that highlights how we

characterize more positive stereotypes (accents, schools, dress, and ratings).

5. **First Impressions**. Drawing conclusions in a matter of seconds based on our personal likes/dislikes.

6. **The Longing to Clone**. Devaluing someone who is not like most of 'us' on the committee, or

wanting someone to resemble, in attributes, someone we admire and are replacing.

7. **Good Fit/Bad Fit**. While it may be about whether the person can meet the programmatic needs for

the position, it often is about how comfortable and culturally at ease we will feel.

8. **Provincialism**. Similar to cloning, this is undervaluing something outside your own province, circle,

or clan. For example, trusting only reference letters from people you know.

9. **Extraneous Myths and Assumptions**. Undermining the careful collection and analysis of

information, such as we can't get a person like that to come here, or we have all of them we need.

10. **Wishful Thinking**. Opinions rather than facts and evidence. Examples are assumptions that we, and

certain other institutions, run on objective meritocracy, or we are colorblind.

11. **Self-Fulfilling Prophecy**. Some call it ‘channeling,’ where we structure our interaction with

someone so we can receive information congruent with our assumptions, or avoid information

incongruent with our assumptions.

12. **Seizing a Pretext**. Hiding one's real concern or agenda (e.g., excessive weight) behind something

trivial, or focusing on a few negatives rather than the overall performance.

13. **Character over Context**, or **Attribution** errors. For example, failing to recognize the context of a

situation—was it social, late in the day, outside of the professional arena, or an attribution of

responsibility for a situation that is misplaced on one person rather than others.

14. **Premature Ranking/Digging In**. Rush to use numbers, as if they are objective, to drive a decision.

15. **Momentum of the Group**. It is difficult to resist consensus when the majority seems to be heading

one way without a full hearing on other considerations.

***II. Organizational Dysfunctions***

***that exacerbate cognitive errors.***

1. Overloading and Rushing. Undertaking complex tasks without appropriate time, resources, or relief

from other loads.

2. No Coaching or Practice. No training in searching and interviewing practices, so people default to

what they have seen or experienced before.

3. No Ground Rules. Before filtering applicants, have we established the needs and priorities for the

program? How the committee will function, process and help each other? Gathered information on

who else they can call upon?

4. Absence of Reminders and Monitoring. For example, reminders of common errors, highest priorities,

and a process monitor on the committee.

5. No One is Accountable. No updates or disclosure is required.

1. Lack of Debriefing for Systematic Improvement. Committees start from scratch over and over again.

***III. Rising above Cognitive Errors***

***Remedies for Dysfunctions***

1. Clear intentions by individuals to avoid errors. Dialogue followed by visual reminders and

intentional checks for errors in every stage.

2. Coaching, preparation, reminders. Toolkits and workshops before process begins, chair coaching and

equity advisors

3. Ground Rules and Preparation for Process- set out problems of past and establish ground rules to

avoid these and sharing of lessons learned from past efforts

4. Non-voting process person for Quality Control- to avoid unintentional contaminants

5. Use a visual matrix to stay focused on agreed upon evaluation and evidence to consider

6. Slow down, don't overload, and provide appropriate assistance

7. Incorporate Accountability- whether to administration or constituents

8. Gather and highlight non-stereotypical evidence (not raising the bar though)

9. Avoided rush to numerical ranking - filter not ranking

10. Avoided solo situations

11. Practiced or discussed interview

12. Personal Relations to Diminish Social Distance

13. Courage and Leadership to insist on evidence being shown

14. Constant attention to improvement debriefings.

Below please provide any further information as you deem appropriate.

**APPENDIX B 2021 JOB TEMPLATE**

| Date | Position # | Position Title  | Reports To: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Click or tap to enter a date | Type here | Type here | Type here |

| Division | Department | Pay Table/Level/Grade | soc code | employment code |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type here | Type here | Choose an item. | Type here | Choose an item. |

# Status: Please select the appropriate boxes that apply.

| **Regular/Continuing:**[ ]  | **Bargaining Unit:** Choose an item. | **Non-Bargaining:** [ ]  | **Provisional/Grant Funded:** [ ]  | **Temporary/Limited Duration:** [ ]  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| **Individual Position:** [ ]  | **Full-Time (40 hrs/wk):** [ ]  | **Part-Time:** [ ] \_\_\_\_ Hrs/Week | **Pooled Position:** [ ]  | Type here **# of Employees if this position is pooled.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| **JOB SUMMARY:** This section should summarize the overall purpose (“mission”) of this job in 1-4 sentences. Briefly describe the primary reason the job exists at LCC. |
| --- |
| Type here |

| **Direct Reports:** If this is a supervisory position (authority to hire, assign, discipline, approve timesheets), list position #s of those supervised). |
| --- |
| Type here |

| **Essential Duties and Responsibilities:** Identify and describe the essential duties and responsibilities, i.e., what actions are done and what are the expected results. Most jobs can be described using 5-10 statements. List in priority order, beginning with top priority/must get done, with approximate percent for each (e.g. 20% 1. Reconciles grand fund expenditures to balance monthly budget). “Other duties, as assigned,” are implicit in all position descriptions.  |
| --- |

| **%** | **NO.** | **Essential Duties and Responsibilities** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | Type here |
|  | 2 | Type here |
|  | 3 | Type here |
|  | 4 | Type here |
|  | 5 | Type here |
|  | 6 | Type here |
|  | 7 | Type here |
|  | 8 | Type here |
|  | 9 | Type here |
|  | 10 | Type here |

| **Core Competencies:** Record the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to perform the essential functions of this position. Provide descriptions of core competencies below (e.g. communication, customer service, decision-making, leadership, problem-solving, etc.). An incumbent or applicant must be able to demonstrate and results must be measurable.  |
| --- |
| Ability to work effectively with a diverse community |

| **educational/experience requirements:** Identify the education and/or equivalent combination of education and experience, plus additional specific years of experience, certifications, licenses and/or special training required to perform the essential functions of this job.  |
| --- |
| **Required**Type here**Preferred**Type here |

| **Physical and mental requirements:** Complete the physical and mental demands on the attached ADA Checklist that must be met to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Mobility around the LCC campus is a normal part of the position’s functions. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.  |
| --- |
| Go to the ADA Checklist |

| **work environment:** Complete the work environment characteristic on the attached ADA Checklist that must be met to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.  |
| --- |
| Go to the ADA Checklist |

# SIGNATURES

**Supervisor’s Name:** Type here **Supervisor’s Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Dean/ELT’s Name:** Type here **Dean/ELT’s Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**HR Rep:** Type here **HR Rep Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ADA COMPLIANCE JOB DESCRIPTION CHECKLIST** (*The immediate supervisor is responsible for completion of this form. Fill in more information as need that apply to the essential job duties for the attached job description.)*

**Position #:** Type here **Date:** Click or tap to enter a date. **Supervisor’s Position #:** Type here

## **Materials Used:**

[ ]  Computer keyboard, mouse, screen

[ ]  Various software

[ ]  Telephone, cell phone, mobile device

[ ]  Paper and pencil/pen

[ ]  Projector or other audiovisual equipment

[ ]  Copier, scanner, fax

[ ]  Carpentry equipment

[ ]  Electrical equipment

[ ]  Plumbing equipment

[ ]  Other: Click or tap here to enter text.

## **Mental Functions:**

[ ]  Comparing (compare/contrast data, people, other data)

[ ]  Synthesizing (combine data, concepts, interpretations)

[ ]  Computing (math calculations or carrying out formula operations)

[ ]  Compiling (gathering, classifying, evaluating data, people, other data)

[ ]  Copying (entering, posting, transcribing data)

[ ]  Analyzing (examining, testing data, presenting alternatives)

## **Audio/Visual/Aural Functions:**

[ ]  Talking (expressing ideas, thoughts, language, conveying details accurately and clearly)

[ ]  Hearing (receive details through oral communication, make fine differences in sound with other sound interference)

[ ]  Near acuity (at 20 inches or less when accuracy is essential)

[ ]  Far acuity (more than 20 inches when day and night/dark conditions are essential)

[ ]  Depth perception (3 dimensional vision, judge distances, space)

[ ]  Color vision (distinguish colors)

[ ]  Field of vision (up/down and right/left)

[ ]  Flavors & odors (distinguish similarities, differences, intensities, qualities using tongue & nose)

## **Movement, Strength, Repetition Functions:**

[ ]  Climbing

[ ]  Kneeling

[ ]  Reaching

[ ]  Balancing

[ ]  Crouching

[ ]  Grasping

[ ]  Stooping

[ ]  Crawling

[ ]  Picking/Typing/Keyboarding

[ ]  Sedentary (exert up to 10 lbs of force to lift, carry, push, pull, move objects; sit most of time)

[ ]  Light (exert up to 20 lbs of force to lift, carry, push, pull, move objects; walk/stand occasionally)

[ ]  Medium (exert 21-50 lbs of force, walk/stand frequently)

[ ]  Heavy (exert 51-100 lbs of force, walk/stand routinely)

[ ]  Very Heavy (exert over 100 lbs of force, walk/stand routinely)

## **Environmental Conditions**

[ ]  Weather (rain, snow, wind)

[ ]  Extreme cold (inside, outside)

[ ]  Extreme heat (inside, outside)

[ ]  Confined/restricted spaces

[ ]  Hazards (fumes, odors, dust, toxic chemicals, allergens, poor ventilation)

[ ]  Vibrations

[ ]  Extreme noises