

Date: November 15, 2005

To: The Faculty Senate

From: The Executive Committee

Issue: Recommended New Policies Related to Faculty Hiring Processes

BACKGROUND

The Executive Committee's recommended policies address the need for sharing accurate information with the faculty search committees related to our campus commitment to the "active elimination of discrimination and the affirmative recruitment of a diverse, multi-racial community of students, faculty, and staff." (President Gonzalez, letter accompanying Update to Affirmative Action Plan in Compliance with Executive Order 11246, dated October 31, 2003) The issue involves competing needs for legal compliance, commitment to diversity, and departmental prerogatives re: faculty hiring. The need for accurate information on this issue has been accentuated by the passage of Proposition 209 in California and the consequent uncertainties about strategies and processes. Concerned members of the university community express sentiment that recruitment processes have not been effective to date in generating strong and diverse pools of applicants for faculty positions. The manner in which that information is presented to departmental faculty committees raises sensitive issues of mandated processes and external control.

This issue has been worked on by the Committee on Diversity and Equity (CODE) and the University Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (UARTP) over the last several years. In the Spring of 2005, the Executive Committee received a report from UARTP expressing its recommendations (letter from UARTP Chair Dillon dated May 11, 2005) concerning the CODE proposal (Recommendations for Revisions to PM FSA 02-11, section D, dated October 2002, revised 4/19/05) and began a series of discussions and meetings with representatives of several groups and the University Counsel and Vice President for Human Resources. Over the last two months we have developed the recommendations below for consideration by the Senate.

Major points of agreement:

- Commitment to building strong and effective recruitment practices to secure diverse pool of faculty candidates
- Commitment to the AA/EOR being a full voting member of each search committee
- Commitment to required training for department chairs and AA/EORs

Major points of disagreement:

- Issue of mandatory training for all search committee members

- Use of data from Human Resources; specifically whether it should inform decisions on the effectiveness of the recruitment plan.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is presented in terms of three overall concepts which have links to detailed recommendations as noted below. The overall concepts include the election and voting status of AA/EORs, their role and responsibilities in the recruiting and selection process, and training of search committee members

1. ELECTION AND VOTING

See D.1A which makes AA/EOR a voting member, tenured or probationary dependent upon department policies

See deletion in old policy that specifies preference for full professor as AA/EOR

2. ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AA/EOR

See A-K which describe role and responsibilities as advisor to search committee re: effectiveness of recruitment process and selection process to “ensure that there has been no discrimination against or preference for any group”.

3. RECRUITMENT PROCESS

Section (i-iv) on Recruitment process which enumerates the role of the AA/EOR working with the Department Chair and Chair of Committee in developing a recruitment plan using departmental hiring data and national availability data, analyzing the position description and advertisements, and applies data to an evaluation of the effectiveness of the recruitment plan.

4. TRAINING OF SEARCH COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- a. describes the responsibility of Human Resources to prescribe the required training, develop and offer it; distinguishes between more extensive training for Search Chairs and AA/EORs AND a different training for faculty search members
- b. requires that all faculty participating in search to participate in training
- c. prescribes the currency of training to be reviewed and revised in a three year cycle.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

- Proposition 209 has created an uncertain environment in which many faculty are unsure about “what is permissible” and “what is not”

- The ongoing challenges in recruiting and selecting a diverse faculty raise questions about the effectiveness of our current recruitment strategies and suggest we need to devote more attention to strong recruitment plans
- AA/EORs need to be part of the committee process as full voting members, not marginalized.
- All faculty will benefit from an ongoing update of campus commitments
- Eliminating the requirement that AA/EORs be tenured (and preference to full professor) permits departments who permit probationary faculty to serve on search committees to elect AA/EORs who are non-tenured, and thereby increases the pool of diverse faculty who are available to serve in the role.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

- Mandatory training will only add to burgeoning workload for faculty
- Mandatory training is not enforceable
- Faculty will refuse to serve on Search Committees
- Untenured faculty serving in the role of AA/EORs are at professional risk.
- Challenges in recruiting a diverse faculty will not likely be diminished by these policies.