

February 5, 2020

DISCUSSION

Board Policy 4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring: Regular and Adjunct

Context of the policy was updated and passed by the Academic Senate in 2018, but the policy was never presented officially to the board and approved. A marked-up and clean version of the policy are available for review. It would take 2/3 Senate vote to reverse the 2018 policy passed by the Senate.

There was appreciation expressed for the prior work on the policy and the deliberations that resulted in the current form.

Language related to “Emeritus” faculty, adjunct faculty and students was discussed.

Support for all possible participants exists as different departments may choose different members. However, there are concerns related to possible conflict of interest for adjunct faculty, but it was pointed out that full-timers could also have conflicts of interest.

Some senators feel that students should not be involved due to confidentiality issues.

Retired faculty can serve as an Emeritus member if a department chooses.

Smaller departments may need all options on the table to provide a full hiring committee.

There may not be enough faculty for the hiring committee work in general.

Addressing the EEO plan is important.

Emergency hires – faculty hired in exigent circumstances, is a topic that warrants further review and discussion.

This item will be brought back for further discussion.

January 15, 2020

DISCUSSION

Board Policy 4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring: Regular and Adjunct

A. Donegan provided background on the policy and procedure for Faculty Hiring: Regular and Adjunct, and also provided recommendations to make the documents clearer and more concise. There was a question in that Board Policy 4.3.2/P had been approved by the Senate on the Consent Calendar at the May 2, 2018 Academic Senate meeting. The policy and procedure had been approved by the Senate but had not gone to the Board of Trustees for approval. It was also pointed out that the time was right to update the policy and procedure due to the recent college reorganization.

Senate discussion included the following comments: Deans should not be on adjunct hiring committees; ranking for the second interview now allowed for greater transparency and faculty purview; due to State hiring mandates, students should not serve on hiring committees because of confidentiality—non-employees shouldn't be used in confidential procedures; student

“training documents” questioned; in section 1-E, interest in reviewing “authority to suspend the screening and interviewing process”; in final stage of hiring, Department Chairs should be included to make sure all information/communication is correct; several comments around diversity in general, diversity used in hiring, and the EEO plan; possibility of hiring a dedicated district compliance officer.

Concern: having any policy and/or procedure linked to an outside document. If that linked document is updated, which can happen without a thorough vetting through the shared governance process, those updates can significantly change the policy and/or procedure. As a matter of best practice, all Board policy and/or procedures should be free of any linked outside documents, to ensure the integrity of said policy and/or procedures.

Senators were asked to review Board Policy 4.3.2/P and bring recommendation to the next Senate meeting.

May 2, 2018

From agenda:

CONSENT

4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring (6, 11): Changes to clarify processes for screening and interviewing committee diversity and faculty input into faculty hiring.

From May 2, 2018 minutes:

CONSENT

4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring – R. Fautley

Motion: T. Johnson made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded and the consent agenda was approved by roll-call vote unanimously.

April 18, 2018

ACTION:

4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring – R. Fautley brought this policy and procedure back for further Senate input, and endorsement. Suggestions voiced by the Senate included: adding that the District shall encourage and support faculty networking; removing the requirement to send a minimum number of candidates forward; and to more clearly define the Administrative Interview Committee. Additional recommendations can be forwarded to R. Fautley. This item will be brought back as a consent item at the next meeting.

April 4, 2018

DISCUSSION

4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring – R. Fautley presented the most recent version of 4.3.2/P that incorporated the Senate’s suggestions with the goal of moving it to an action item for Senate approval. Suggestions voiced by the Senate included: getting student input regarding student participation on faculty hiring committees; including students in addition to classified and adjunct in the section regarding diversity of perspectives; having Human Resources notify all

adjuncts of open faculty positions instead of department administrative assistants; and using the term encourage regarding networking and recruiting.

Motion: L. Aspinall made a motion to move this to an action item. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Additional proposed language should be sent to R. Fautley.

March 7, 2018

DISCUSSION

4.3.2/P, Faculty Hiring—R. Fautley brought this back for further Senate input. Concerns and suggestions voiced by the Senate included: concerns that the compliance officer could potentially be the VP of HR; more inclusion of and collaboration with the hiring committee; and never having just the VP interview candidates in order to protect the college, the VP, and the candidate from potential litigation.

February 21, 2018

DISCUSSION

Faculty Hiring 4.3.2/P – R. Fautley brought this policy and procedure for additional Senate input. Suggestions voiced by the Senate regarding ranking included: withholding the ranking until after the administrative interview to prevent bias; allowing flexibility for the committee to choose how and if they want to rank; and including the different options in the procedure for the committee to reference. The majority of Senators were in favor of allowing the hiring committee to choose how and if they want to rank candidates. Additional follow up requested by the Senate included: confirming with Human Resources that written rankings will remain confidential and not be shared with candidates. Suggestions and concerns voiced by the Senate regarding who should be present during candidate administrative interviews: the appropriate administrator interviews the candidate and then meets with the chairs to discuss and deliberate; including at minimum the faculty co-chair and possibly the administrative co-chair in the administrative interview; making the inclusion of the co-chairs the default with the option to opt-out; issues with candidates having to interview with the same people multiple times; issues with scheduling; and adding the option to have the district compliance officer instead of the co- chairs. This topic will be brought back for further discussion.

February 7, 2018

DISCUSSION

Faculty Hiring 4.3.2/P – R. Fautley brought this for Senate input on the following questions: whether hiring committees should forward candidates with official rankings or unranked; if candidates are ranked whether ranking should be based on committee consensus or individual committee member rankings; and whether the ranking should be kept secret or should be made clear to the interviewing administrator. The majority of senators were in favor of consensus ranking that is made clear to the interviewing administrator. Arguments in favor of ranking included: it is more honest and transparent; committees are already doing it; and ranking allows for departments to prioritize candidates that may be better suited to the position and the department. Concerns with ranking included: the potential for lawsuits if candidates were to find

out their ranking; the potential for ranking to be applied inconsistently; and even with ranking the hiring committee still does not have the final say in who is hired. This topic will be brought back for further discussion.

December 6, 2017

DISCUSSION

Faculty Hiring 4.3.2/P – R. Fautley. This item was tabled in favor of continuing the discussion on Guided Pathways.

November 15, 2017

DISCUSSION

Faculty Hiring 4.3.2/P – R. Fautley recapped the changes agreed to by straw vote at the last Senate meeting which included: departments should be responsible for notifying all adjuncts of full-time openings; and that recruitment belongs in the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan and not in the policy and procedure. The current topic of discussion is whether hiring committee members from outside the department should be encouraged, required, or at the discretion of the department. Arguments in favor of including outside department members included: it would bring a diversity of opinions; and it would give the candidate a better sense of the SRJC community. Arguments opposed to including outside department members included: outside members lack of expertise of course material. Suggestions included: making the outside member non-voting. A straw vote showed a slight preference for including an outside member. This topic will be brought back for further discussion. R. Fautley encouraged senators to submit proposed language prior to the next meeting.

November 1, 2017

DISCUSSION

Faculty Hiring 4.3.2/P – R. Fautley gave a brief background of the revisions to this policy and procedure. The revisions were put on hold pending completion of the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan. The current draft includes recommendations from the Senate task force and the Educational Planning & Coordinating Council (EPCC); M. Kort edited the document stylistically and for clarity. It was noted that any changes to the policy and procedure made by the Senate would have to be approved by College Council (CC) before moving forward. Suggestions voiced by the Senate included: specifying that adjuncts will be notified rather than encouraging notification; removing the section relating to faculty involvement in recruiting; refraining from using vague terms like encourage; and including faculty from outside the discipline on hiring committees as a best practice or whenever possible rather than making it mandatory. Concerns voiced by the Senate included: potential workload issues; the difficulty of recruiting faculty from outside the discipline and the potential for that to hold up hiring if required; and the potential for requiring faculty outside the discipline to be used punitively. This topic will be brought back for further discussion.