

SMC Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee meeting minutes
Tuesday, March 1, 2016
1:30pm to 2:50pm
Library 275

Present: Andrew Nestler (chair), Sherri Lee-Lewis (vice-chair), Trish Burson, Nate Donahue, Tracey Ellis, Mitch Heskell, Moya Mazorow, Will Pachas-Flores

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:35pm.
2. There were no public comments.
3. Announcement: As Will is new to the committee this spring, the members introduced themselves.
4. The draft of the minutes of the December 17, 2015 meeting was corrected to reflect the fact that Mitch was present. The minutes were moved by Tracey and seconded by Mitch, and were approved with Will abstaining.
5. Discussion on AR 3214 (Sabbaticals): The committee's work on this AR was presented to the Senate's Executive Committee for a second time on Tuesday, February 23.

At Exec, there continued to be disagreement on whether the faculty contract language grants tenured faculty members the right to go on a sabbatical leave prior to one's seventh year of full-time service. The Committee passed a motion to the effect that the AR should not go forward to the full Senate until the Faculty Association and the District come to mutual agreement on this point. The draft we reviewed contains no changes to paragraph 2, which is in question.

In paragraph 1, the last sentence is changed from "One type of leave shall not have greater merit than another" to "One type of project shall not have greater merit than another."

Paragraphs 11 and 12 have been modified so that paragraph 11 assigns the Sabbaticals Committee the responsibility to accept summary reports of sabbaticals, and paragraph 12 assigns the Committee the responsibility to evaluate the summary reports. This new draft removes references to individuals such as the College Superintendent/President, area Vice-President and Academic Senate President in the event that there is a concern that the sabbatical awardee did not substantially complete the project. It was the desire of members of Exec that the Sabbaticals Committee handle any concern regarding an awardee's substantial completion of the sabbatical project.

6. AR 3211.3 (Department Chairperson – Tenure and Selection): We had been waiting to receive final approval from Jenny and Georgia on our draft from December 17, and we did receive this approval. Moved by Nate, seconded by Moya, approved unanimously.

7. AR 3230.1 (Procedure for Hiring Temporary Faculty): Sherri brought two suggestions from the administration. First, it is requested that the final sentence of section 2A, “All applications will be received and entered into the application tracking system by the Office of Human Resources,” be struck from the AR. This is legacy language from the era of paper applications.

Second, it is requested that section 2B include language along the lines of, “Faculty members of selection committees shall be appointed by the department chair/faculty leader in consultation with the Office of Human Resources.”

Andrew said that he would discuss these potential changes with Fran. Andrew pointed out that the second paragraph of section 2B should specify that the EEO representative is a faculty member.

7. AR 3211.1 (Procedure for Hiring Full-Time Faculty): With the looming possibility of drastically increasing the rate of full-time hiring over the next few years, we have been asked by the AS President to see if there are opportunities to streamline the hiring procedure and permit screening committees flexibility.

Andrew will investigate whether the committee name given in section 1B, “the Academic Senate’s Joint Committee on New Contract Faculty Position Ranking,” is accurate.

Sherri explained that an SMC academic application form is required, as specified in section 2F, so that the applicant is signing a legal document as part of the application process. The reference to “unofficial copies of all post-secondary education transcripts” probably should be changed to “official or unofficial copies of all post-secondary education transcripts.”

According to section 4A, only complete applications are to be released by HR to the screening committee. The committee discussed Sherri’s suggestion that letters of recommendation not be required in the first stage of the application process, in an effort to achieve increased diversity. The committee acknowledged that it is the applicant’s responsibility to choose recommenders who will submit letters in time. The applicant could request more than the stated minimum of two letters, in order to increase the probability that two are received by the deadline. Another idea was that unsuccessful applicants could be surveyed to determine why their letters of recommendation were not submitted on time.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 1:50pm. Moved by Trish, seconded by Will. Approved unanimously.