

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

ACADEMIC SENATE

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

REPORT TO

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

FA-004-212

Review of Policy 1311

Faculty Affairs Committee

Date: 03/20/2023

Executive Committee
Received and Forwarded

Date: 03/22/2023

Academic Senate

Date: 04/05/2023
First Reading

Referral

Review of Policy 1311

Background

Policy #1311 has not been updated in a long time. The Policy should be updated to support the best practices in faculty hiring, especially with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Resources

Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement, Current Policy #1311, Faculty recruitment policies at other CSU that have been updated in the past few years, Jill Hargis Interim AVP Faculty Affairs, Faculty Equity Liaisons 2021-22, Martin Sancho-Madriz, Greg Barding.

Discussion

Policy 1311 is an important document that describes the policies and some procedures of our hiring process. One goal of the committee was to align Policy 1311 with the CBA (specifically, 12.22a), which delegates the authority of recommendations regarding probationary appointments to the search committee. This change results in significant institutional policy shift because our current policy (and practice) is in direct opposition to the CBA, requiring that the recommendation for appointment originate from the department. The trickle-down effect of the changes required to align us to the CBA was profound and extremely controversial. Until the finalists, the search committee's work is to be confidential. Many colleagues spoke up against this, with the concern centered around the "rogue" search committee (the committee whose search ideas do not align with that of the department). However, the FAC felt that 1) the search committee was elected by the department, by majority vote, to represent their interests and should be trusted to do their job and 2) this document does not restrict the department from being a committee of the whole if the department wants full access to all files. One colleague argued that isn't practical if a subset of members do not want to participate. If that were the case, then a search committee can be formed by the remaining members. Additionally, the FAC wrote several ways into the policy that help alleviate the concerns associated with the new changes. The FAC requires the committee to consult with the department and *does not dictate what that consultation would mean*. The FAC also requires that the finalist application material be made available to the department tenure-line faculty. By doing this, we are aligning our policies with that of the CBA but also guaranteeing the inclusion of the department.

Another goal of the revision was to codify existing and best practices regarding a diverse committee membership. The committee included language requiring that committees be diverse (broadly defined), where practicable. The committee and the university recognizes that diversity means different things in different departments and our goal was to ensure that if someone wanted to serve on the search committee, they'd be able to. The committee also recognizes cultural taxation as a real and growing threat to under-represented groups and emphasizes the voluntary nature of serving on these committees.

Our last major goal was to limit the amount of procedure in the policy by delegating much of the internal search packet to the role of Faculty affairs. Although the FAC did not remove all procedures, many of the more fluid items were updated or removed to better adapt to the changes needed in faculty recruitment, advertising, and the interview process.

One more important change to the policy was recognizing that the CBA limits search committees to tenured faculty members, except by request of the department and approval of

the president. Best practice and inclusive principles dictate that all ranks be allowed to serve on the search committee to increase diversity of the search and also increase success of the search. By department vote, if any non-tenured faculty are elected to the search committee, that acts as a request to the president and by signing this policy, the president approves these requests. However, this is revokable at any time at the discretion of the president to be in agreement with the CBA.

Some common concerns are outlined below, with the FAC responses underneath. Although we were grateful for the broad feedback, we could not address every concern. We've also included the tracked changes to what we made in response to feedback to make it a better policy.

- If the Faculty Search Committee members are elected through confidential votes of the Department faculty, how does the Department enforce this diversity?
 - There is no way to control the outcome of the vote. That's typically good. If the question arises about inclusion of people not represented, then other people may be identified. Those people are in no way forced to participate. Sometimes, some people will not be represented. There needs to be an agreement from the department to add them to the committee.
- If Faculty Affairs deems the committee to be sub-optimally diverse, does Faculty Affairs have recourse to penalize the committee/Department or stop the search process?
 - The Dean would work with the department to add to the committee or at least have that discussion. No penalty.
- Defining diversity as "diverse with representation from academic ranks, subdisciplines or specialties, and historically under-represented groups" is not inclusive. What about gender diversity? Age diversity? Diversity with different economic backgrounds? Diversity with different national origins? Defining diversity with a restricted range of characteristics shows a lack of understanding of diversity.
 - By being inclusive, you run the risk of being exclusive – since we cannot come up with an encompassing list, better to be broad.
- We should include adjunct/lecturer faculty, staff, and students on the search committee.
 - We agree that the search committee should be broad in how it consults with the department at large. However, the CBA is clear – only tenure-line faculty are eligible to serve on the search committee.

Recommendation

While the FAC may not have unanimously agreed on all aspects of the policy changes, we do agree that the new policy codifies existing practice at CPP while ensuring the department's voice is heard. We unanimously recommend moving this policy to the Executive Committee and subsequently, the senate.