

**AP7120A Addressing Remaining Questions and Concerns
18 February 2026**

Question: Why does the President not have to or cannot answer when the committee wants to know why the person they ranked one was not chosen?

Answers to Question One

Legal and Policy Basis

- The final selection authority for hiring lies with the District (typically through the Superintendent/President or designee) per Education Code §70902(b)(7), which grants the governing board authority to employ and assign personnel.
- The President makes the final hiring decision, not the screening committee. The committee's role is advisory, providing a list of qualified candidates.

Discretion and Privacy Limitations. The President is not legally required to justify or explain why one finalist was chosen over another. This is partly to preserve:

- Candidate confidentiality
- Institutional liability protection
- Discretion over factors beyond the committee's review (e.g., references, interviews with upper administration, diversity goals, broader fit with institutional priorities)

Precedent and Governance

- There is no provision in Title 5, the Ed Code, or AFA contract that requires the President to provide an explanation to the committee.
- Explaining non-selection could open the District to legal challenges from unchosen candidates, particularly in cases involving discrimination claims.

Therefore, the President may choose not to answer such questions—not out of disregard for participatory input—but due to legal and procedural boundaries. This practice aligns with standard California Community College governance procedures.

Members of a screening/interview committee are acting as agents of the District and are participating in a confidential process [Title 5, California Code of Regulations, section 53023 (a)]. Any disclosure of records or information of the evaluation process for any individual would amount to an unwarranted invasion of privacy as set forth in Section 6254 of the California Government Code.

Title 5 §53023(b) – Confidentiality Mandate

All participants in the hiring process, including screening and selection committees, shall receive training on the principles of diversity and the legal mandates of equal employment opportunity, including the requirement to maintain confidentiality throughout the hiring process.

Title 5 §53003(c)(4) – Confidentiality Mandate in the Hiring Process in the EEO Plan

Informing all hiring committee members of the need for and methods to ensure the confidentiality of the hiring process.

California Government Code §6254(c) – Privacy Protection of Confidential Personnel Information

Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Ed. Code §70902(b)(7) – Delegation of Authority is the Board/President

The governing board of each community college district shall...employ and assign all personnel not inconsistent with the minimum standards established by the board of governors.

**AP7120A Addressing Remaining Questions and Concerns
18 February 2026**

Addressing Concern Regarding Student Selection Processes for Hiring Committees

Relevant Information

Locally for AP7120C Managers and Classified: the policy is in draft form and will be sent to College Council with the following language:

1. One (1) member of the Associate Students (AS), selected by the AS President (if the AS chooses to participate)

Relevant Language from Napa Valley College

Student/Community Representative: One student representative, appointed by the Associated Student Body; or one community representative with expertise in an area as close to the discipline as possible, appointed by the committee chair.

Relevant Language from San Francisco City College

3. The administrators are selected by the Chancellor, the faculty are selected by the Academic Senate, the unrepresented classified are selected by the Chancellor, the classified staff are selected by SEIU Local 1021, and the student is selected by the Executive Board of the Associated Students. Unrepresented classified staff must also be considered to serve as the classified staff representative on administrative hiring search

Relevant Information We Received from SGA Advisors

[Insert here if possible/when received]

**AP7120A Addressing Remaining Questions and Concerns
18 February 2026**

What Is the District’s Definition of “Designee” Regarding the Administrative Co-Chair?

The term “designee” generally refers to someone appointed by the President, Vice President, or supervising administrator to act in their place. In practice, the District has flexibility in designating representatives to serve on hiring and screening committees.

Typical Practice at SRJC

- For screening committees, the administrative co-chair is usually the supervising administrator of the position.
- However, District procedure allows for a “designee” to serve in that role when:
 - The direct supervisor is unavailable
 - There’s a potential conflict of interest
 - Delegation is appropriate based on workload, structure, or qualifications

Comparable Practice on Other Committees

- While academic and governance committees (e.g., curriculum, hiring, program review) may restrict designees to individuals in the same classification (e.g., dean for dean), SRJC hiring procedures do not always impose this limitation for administrative co-chairs—unless restricted by department-level policy or custom.