EDUCATIONAL PLANNING & COORDINATING COUNCIL
MINUTES OF October 23, 2014
3:15PM – 5:00PM
Plover Hall, Room 526

COMMITTEE FUNCTION (REVISED):
1. To assist the Academic Senate in the development of sound educational policies, procedures, and practices by encouraging thorough discussions of current issues among various constituent groups.
2. To coordinate and review educational planning activities throughout the District.
3. To inform and review the Academic Affairs Component Program and Resource Planning Process (PRPP) priorities
4. To review and recommend to the Vice President of Academic Affairs new degrees, certificates and majors and the revitalization or discontinuance of existing degrees, certificates and majors.
5. To serve as a multi-constituent clearinghouse for educational matters.

Attending:  Mary Kay Rudolph, Robin Fautley, Li Collier, Yolanda Garcia, Matthew Greaney, Melissa Kort, Ron Myers, Freyja Pereira, Susan Wilson
Absent: Andrea Alvarado, Deborah Chigazola, Sara Stanley, Zak Gruey
Guests:  Angela Romagnoli and Terry Shell, Academic Senate Task Force representatives, Karen Furukawa

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 3:22 p.m. by Mary Kay Rudolph.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** It was moved, seconded, and carried to approve the minutes of the October 9, 2014 meeting, as presented.

3. **Continued Discussion of Academic Senate Sub-Committee Proposals for Revisions to Policy and Procedure 4.3.2 and 4.3.2P, Faculty Hiring, Regular and Adjunct** – Mary Kay Rudolph, Robin Fautley, Karen Furukawa, Terry Shell, Angela Romagnoli

This was the third review of Policy and Procedure 4.3.2/P. Terry Shell and Angela Romagnoli were in attendance as representatives of the Academic Senate Task Force, whose job was to review and make recommendations on the policy and procedure. The notes below reflect highlights of the discussion and recommendations.

[It should be noted that for this meeting, members of the committee reviewed the document that has the following three columns:

- HR/Task Force suggestions
- EPCC Edits/Melissa Kort edits
- Rationale

The organization of the existing procedure has three titled sections:

- Search, Screening and Selection Procedures for Regular Faculty
- Selection Procedures for Adjunct Faculty
- Procedures for Emergency Hiring

Each section contains items with Roman numerals, and in most of the discussion items mentioned in the minutes, the Roman numeral specifies the section under discussion.

In her revision of the Procedures document, Melissa Kort has reorganized it into the following sections:
- Responsibilities
- Timeline
- Screening and Interviewing Committees for Regular Faculty
- Recruitment of Regular Faculty
- Screening of Regular Faculty
- Interviewing of Regular Faculty
- Selection of Regular Faculty
- Adjunct Pool
- Emergency Hiring

At various times during the meeting, Melissa read out her suggested revision; however, the committee members did not have this document in hand.

**Discussion Points**

Under “Search, Screening and Selection Procedures for Regular Faculty” (sections V. through VII.):

- Committee members agreed to *delete* the paragraphs under section VI. beginning with “Clear and complete job announcements” and continuing through VI. A. “... shall be encouraged to network with colleagues in all areas for recruiting purposes.”

- A majority of members agreed that the matter of having a Regular Faculty from outside the discipline should be considered a best practice, rather than a requirement, due to the fact that it is sometimes difficult to recruit faculty, especially when there is a large hiring.

- It was agreed that the hiring committee would be composed of a minimum of six, rather than seven, members—1 department chair and/or director; 3 or more additional full-time faculty from the department or related discipline; 1 supervising administrator or administrative designee; and 1 non-voting monitor. In addition, the committee may have a faculty member from outside the discipline and *may* have participation from adjunct faculty, classified staff, and/or students.

- Classified staff participation: It was unclear who should have the authority to approve the appointment of a classified staff member to a committee—the Classified Senate President or the SEIU President. This will require clarification.

- The issue of “diversity”:
  - In section VI. the following change was recommended: replace “The search committee should be comprised of both minority and non-minority groups, all of whom are genuinely committed to faculty diversity” to “When possible, the search committee should have a diverse representation.”

  - The term “sufficiently diverse” may require clarification with regard to definition and who will determine whether a committee is sufficiently diverse. Karen Furukawa said that her interest would be to make sure that the composition reflects different perspectives with regard to gender, ethnicity, etc. It was suggested that some boilerplate language was needed to address the diversity issue.

  - It was agreed that the monitor should be from outside the department, with no vested interest.

  - One person suggested that the Academic Senate president be the person to intervene when a committee is deemed to be insufficiently diverse.

  - Melissa addressed the matter of diversity with the following suggested verbiage, which
the committee liked: “In order to encourage a diverse committee membership, departments may add one or more of the following members to the committee:

- a regular faculty member from outside the discipline, approved by the Academic Senate President;
- A classified staff member, approved by the local SEIU President and/or Classified Senate President;
- An adjunct faculty member

In addition, departments may invite student input, including but not limited to having students evaluate teaching demonstrations, or participate as voting or non-voting members of the Screening and Interviewing Committee.”

She also added this statement: “Departments are encouraged to rotate Screening and Interviewing Committee members as much as possible.” This would address the issue of departments that use the same members over and over on their screening and interviewing committees.

- Diversity of the applicant pool (VIII. B.):
  - If insufficiently diverse, would the recruitment have to be kept open until the pool is considered sufficiently diverse? Karen said that much of the language in that section is outdated and no longer applies. She said that Prop. 209 put an end to that language, which included doing a statistical analysis. Now what is required is an “affirmative responsibility.”
  - To address this concern, Melissa recommended the following paragraphs under “Responsibilities”:

    In his/her role as District Compliance Officer, the VP of Human Resources or designee shall be available for consultation on all aspects of the hiring process and shall serve as a consultant on District and state guidelines and the District’s hiring procedures, including but not limited to a review of the job descriptions, announcements, and procedures of screening and interviewing committees to ensure equity, diversity, and the adequacy of the applicant pool. The VP of Human Resources will also appoint a non-voting District Compliance Monitor to screening and interviewing committees.

    In his/her role as District Compliance Officer, the VP of Human Resources or designee may recommend a suspension of the screening and interviewing process at any time when a question of non-compliance arises, review any concern regarding the selection process, and determine the appropriate action to be taken.

    Karen stated that there is no longer a way to identify the diversity in the applicant pool (unlike in the past, when the Compliance Monitor was able to see the applicants and ask why other candidates who had identified as diverse were not in the group). Therefore, it may be necessary to delete references to ensuring applicant pool diversity.

    Terry indicated that the Task Force is working on developing a workable diversity statement. In the meantime, Para. B of Section VIII needs to be deleted.

- Responsibility for recruiting: It was recommended that a statement be added addressing the responsibility for recruiting, including outreach (for example, job fairs) and advertising. It could say something like “The department, Human Resources, and the District have a joint affirmative responsibility to reach a large potential pool through outreach and advertising in appropriate publications.”

- Para. C of section VIII. Make the following change in the last sentence: “For candidates
coming from distances exceeding 200 miles, special interview arrangements may be developed. … special arrangements [or reasonable efforts?] may be made as needed.” It was suggested that this part of the procedure be consistent with the management hiring policy.

- Rating/ranking system (section VIII):
  - It was agreed that the committee should not put rankings in writing because that information goes into the legal record and could be subject to subpoena, but it was also acknowledged that the committees need to be clear as to what their ranking is.
  - The question was how to indicate to the VP 1st choice, 2nd choice, etc.

- Role of the VP with the screening and interviewing committee:
  - The screening and interviewing committee needs to make its preferences known to the Vice President.
    - The Vice President checks references on all of the candidates presented by the committee.
    - Members of the Task Force stated their strong desire for feedback from the Vice President to the screening and interviewing committee after the Vice President’s interviews but before a name or names are forwarded to the Superintendent/President. Valuing the voice of faculty and the issue of transparency in the process were part of this discussion.
  - The issue of “leakage” of information was a concern. Maintaining confidentiality regarding potentially damaging information obtained during the interview processes was acknowledged to be important, particularly if the applicant is an adjunct faculty member.

- Discussed a potential compromise: The VP could report back to the committee after the hiring decision is made if confidentiality is guaranteed and if the Superintendent/President is in agreement; however, this would not be routine – it would be an exception, at the request of the committee. This is an issue that potentially needs Senate discussion. (Melissa will work on language to cover this and will send to Terry Shell for review.)

- Vice President’s interview: Melissa suggested the following verbiage to cover some of the issues discussed:

  “The appropriate vice president(s) or designee(s) will contact the candidates’ references prior to the second interviews. All discussions will remain private and confidential.

  All second interviews shall be scheduled for the same length of time, ask the same core questions, and apply the same evaluation criteria. In contrast to the screening and interviewing committee interviews, which serve to identify the candidates’ discipline knowledge and teaching expertise, the primary focus of the second interview is to identify the best candidate to achieve District goals, serve its educational plan, and satisfy institutional needs.

  A written record of each candidate’s second interview shall be maintained on the appropriate forms. In addition to the written record of each candidate’s second interview, the appropriate vice president(s) shall take into consideration the evaluation of the screening and interviewing committee, the reference checks, and the District’s Equal Employment Opportunity in formulating recommendations.
The appropriate vice president(s) will forward the name(s) of the final candidate(s) to the Superintendent/President. If unable to make a recommendation, the appropriate vice president(s) shall meet with the screening and interviewing committee to discuss and decide on options including, but not limited to, re-interviewing some or all of the semi-finalists, interviewing other candidates from the qualified applicant pool, or re-opening recruitment.

- Superintendent/President’s role: The Superintendent/President decides how many finalists he wants to interview, and he can decide not to hire any of the candidates. This has happened in the past, and in that case the hiring process had to be started over again.

Melissa suggested the following language:

“If the Superintendent/President decides not to forward any of the finalists to the Board of Trustees, he/she shall communicate this decision to the Screening and Interviewing Committee co-chair(s), the Academic Senate President, and the appropriate Vice President(s). The Screening and Interviewing Committee will reconvene to discuss options for filling the vacancy and will forward its recommendations to the Superintendent/President, who then determines the appropriate course of action.”

- A question was raised again as to whether the Vice President’s interview should include an additional interviewer, as recommended by the Task Force. This was a reference to the AIC (the Administrative Interview Committee) proposed by the Task Force and to include the VP, the faculty co-chair and administrative co-chair of the Search Committee; but the AIC had previously been deleted in the process of EPCC and Melissa edits. It was stated that the second interview has never in the past included a faculty member; it has always been an administrative interview.

- Second interview questions: After discussing the types of questions used in the second interview, Mary Kay stated that she was willing to give the list of questions to anyone who asked.

4. Meeting Review and confirmation of next agenda items

Robin said that the committee would need to review Melissa’s revisions and that the procedures would come back once more to the committee. She said she hoped to get the policy and procedure on the November 19th Academic Senate agenda for discussion and input. There was no review or confirmation of next agenda items.

5. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

6. Pending Items
   a. Revisions to Policy and Procedure 4.7.1/P, Reporting Faculty Absence and Leave Time – Mary Kay Rudolph, Robin Fautley
   b. Revisions to Policy 3.9, Faculty Member’s Obligation to Students – Robin Fautley
   c. Revisions to Policy 3.9.1, Syllabi – Robin Fautley
   d. General Education Student Learning Outcomes
   e. Pre- and co-requisite changes – Robin Fautley
   f. Review of Policy 3.6 actions from 2012-13 and 2013-14
   g. Reverse transfer of units to award AA degrees – Abe Farkas (see article on Tennessee)
   h. Health Sciences Career Pipeline – Deb Chigazola
   i. New certificate/degree, Health Care Interpreter – Deb Chigazola
Committee Membership for 2014-2015
Administrators: Mary Kay Rudolph, Freyja Pereira, Deborah Chigazola, Ron Myers, Yolanda Garcia
Faculty: Robin Fautley, Melissa Kort, Matthew Greaney, Andrea Alvarado, Susan Wilson
Student Representatives: Sara Stanley
Information: KC Greaney
Ex-Officio: Li Collier