

Faculty Meeting Minutes

December 6, 2016

Meeting was called to order by Dean Sergio Pareja at 3:02 pm

Faculty: Maryam Ahranjani, Marsha Baum, Reed Benson, Sherri Burr, Camille Carey, Barbara Creel, Scott England, Steven Homer, April Land, Ernesto Longa, Nathalie Martin, Serge Martinez, Aliza Organick, Mary Pareja, Sergio Pareja, Michelle Rigual, Alex Ritchie, Leo Romero, Alexandra Siek, David Stout, Sherri Thomas, Cliff Villa, Jeanette Wolfley, Christine Zuni Cruz

Staff: Beverly Akin

1. Announcements

- Provost Hiring - We are anticipating approval for the hire of a natural resources and environmental law clinician; however, according to the Provost, “this will be the last approved hire for a long time.”
- The Register Office has been shorthanded; therefore, we are asking that you be patient with the Register Office.
- The Curriculum Committee has put forth a proposal for a bar prep course, which will be a three credit course, as a pilot project for next semester. The course will be very different than the bar class that is offered now.
- Leo Romero stated that the task force on bar passage is in need of volunteers to assist our graduates in preparation for the bar exam. There are some holes that need to be filled:

Civil Procedures
Contracts and Sales
Criminal Law and Evidence
Real Property and Torts
Family Law and Secure Transaction

- Sherri Burr announced that the current art will be taken down, with the walls being blank for a month. The new art will not be mounted until mid-January, with the reception occurring on January 24, 2017. Therefore, if you are interested in any the art please contact Sherri Burr or Tony Anderson.
- The Art Committee received a large amount of applications for the Artist in Residence program, which is highly competitive and is now opened up to alumni -- not just from the law school but from the entire university community.

2. Action Item: Approval of Minutes from November 29, 2016:

Motion to approve the minute was made and was seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed with one abstention

3. Action Item: Lecturer Promotion Policy – Faculty Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee

A motion was made to adopt the proposed Lecturer Promotion Policy. This motion was seconded, and discussion ensued.

There was a discussion about university policy C190 and the fact that law school policies must be consistent within university policy. It was noted that there are inconsistencies within university policy regarding the hiring of lecturers.

A friendly amendment to add the word “continuous” to page 5, line 1 and line 4, so that it will comply with policy C190 was proposed and accepted. An additional friendly amendment was proposed to note “A senior lecturer must have at least five years of continuous experience teaching at the law school at 0.5 FTE or greater. Years of services at other institutions of higher learning may be used to meet the needs of years needed to apply for promotion at the discretion of the deans.”

Motion, as amended, was voted and passed unanimously.

4. Executive Session: Child & Family Justice Clinic hiring decision – Faculty Appointments Committee and Dean Pareja

Members of the Faculty Appointments Committee summarized the qualifications of the two candidates for the Child & Family Justice Clinic faculty position. Questions and conversation ensued. Upon conclusion of the exchange, the faculty proceeded to vote in the following manner:

1. For the first round of voting (40% acceptability round), by secret ballot, faculty members were asked to mark which of the four candidates they considered acceptable for appointment. Both candidates received a number of votes that exceeded the 40% threshold for acceptability.
2. For the second round of voting (ranking round), also by secret ballot, each faculty member first was asked to write down only the name of the one candidate whom

s/he preferred. The one with the most votes was ranked first. The remaining candidate was, by default, ranked second.

3. For the third round of voting (60% offer round), also by secret ballot, the faculty went through each of the two ranked candidates, one at a time, to determine if each had the support of at least 60% of the faculty. Such 60% support is needed to extend an offer. The process started with the top-ranked candidate, and the deans asked the faculty to just write yes or no on their ballots. Both candidates received at least 60% support. It was decided that, subject to Provost approval, the deans would start by offering the top-ranked candidate the position. If that person turns down the offer, the deans would move to the second ranked candidate.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:36 pm