

AR 7120.1

Draft Revisions

Recruitment & Selection of Full-Time Contract Faculty

Academic Senate • September 2026

Purpose of Today's Discussion

- Why were revisions proposed?
- Review the substantive differences between the current and proposed AR 7120.1.
- Identify changes that affect faculty participation, equity, evaluation, and the hiring process.
- Distinguish substantive changes from procedural or technical edits.

Why were revisions proposed?

- Theme of irregularity with each prioritization process
- Desire for consistency and clear expectations
- Proposed changes based upon:
 - Interviews with past prioritization committee members
 - Research of other colleges ARs
 - Letters of recommendation work
 - EEO professional development
- PPC has worked on revisions for over 2 years in collaboration with several Vice Presidents

At a Glance: What is Changing?

SUBSTANTIVE AREAS

Faculty position prioritization
Equity, diversity & EEO participation
Candidate evaluation & standardized rubrics
Student participation
Finalist and decision-making process

PROPOSED CHANGE

Revised FPPC structure; clearer data support; rationale required for changes to FPPC recommendations
New diversity statement; voting EEO representative; racial equity explicitly included
Required evaluation rubric; equal interview time; confidentiality statement; possible student participation
Changes to finalist process; clearer Board final authority; some changes to explicit Senate consultation

1. Faculty Position Prioritization

CURRENT AR 7120.1

Ranking Committee: 11 faculty + 5 administrators.

Departments submit needs assessment and justification.

Committee reviews budgetary, enrollment and program-review information.

Superintendent/President reviews recommendations with Senate President.

PROPOSED DRAFT

FPPC: 9 faculty + 4 administrators.

Process explicitly follows the FPPC Handbook.

VP Academic Affairs & IR provide departments current data and definitions tied to criteria.

Any modification to FPPC recommendations is communicated to Senate President with rationale.

2. Equity & Diversity in Hiring

- New opening section explicitly states the District's commitment to diversity, equal opportunity, and student learning/success
- EEO representative changes from a non-voting faculty member to a voting full-time faculty member
- Draft describes the EEO representative as monitoring adherence to EEO/diversity laws, regulations, and policies
- Candidate evaluation adds: “demonstrated commitment to eliminating racial equity gaps”

Key change: the EEO role moves from oversight without a vote to participation with a vote

3. A More Standardized Evaluation Process



- Draft requires the committee to agree upon criteria and a rubric before reviewing applications
- Draft also requires candidates to be treated uniformly and given equal time to answer interview questions
- Current regulation requires criteria and interview questions, but does not explicitly require a rubric

4. Candidate Evaluation Criteria

CURRENT

Subject-area knowledge & competence

Teaching & communication skills

Professional growth & service

Potential for overall college effectiveness

Understanding of student diversity, including disability-related differences

PROPOSED

Subject-area knowledge & competence

Teaching & communication skills

Professional growth & service

Understanding of student diversity, including disability-related differences

Demonstrated commitment to eliminating racial equity gaps

Two notable changes: “overall college effectiveness” is removed; a racial-equity criterion is added

5. Student Voice

NEW PROVISION

“Students may be included in observing portions of the interview process to provide feedback to the committee.”

- The provision is permissive: “may,” not “shall”
- Students are described as observers providing feedback, not as voting committee members
- The draft does not specify how student feedback would be incorporated into the committee’s evaluation

6. Confidentiality & Committee Responsibilities

CURRENT

Committee members must maintain candidate confidentiality

HR procedures govern confidentiality and security

HR/EEO training is required

PROPOSED

Adds an explicit confidentiality statement requirement

Strengthens/formalizes confidentiality language earlier in the process

Retains HR/EEO training requirement

7. Finalists & Decision-Making

CURRENT

Current: 2–3 candidates per position, unless otherwise approved

Superintendent/President makes selection to recommend to Board

Committee must be able to identify at least two candidates

PROPOSED

Retains 2–3 as the standard and clarifies procedure to contact HR if committee wants to send 1 or >3; or additional finalist for each additional position

Superintendent/President makes the final recommendation to send to BOT

BOT makes the final decision

8. Governance Provisions to Highlight

- Academic Senate President consultation: the draft removes the explicit requirement for consultation with the Senate President when recommending an **increase** in authorized positions
- FPPC modifications: the draft adds a requirement to communicate modifications and the rationale to the Senate President

Where are we now?

- After formally submitting the revised AR to Senior Staff, the committee received no feedback from Senior Staff
- However, campus legal counsel, recommended the removal of existing references to *diversity* and proposed addition of *demonstrated commitment to eliminating racial equity gaps*
- PPC rejected the recommendations and requested additional information on why they were made
- Next step to develop new guidebook to complement AR 7120.1