

**Minutes for Executive Session Faculty Meeting
October 30, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Dean Pareja at 3:05 p.m. The following people were present for at least some portion of the meeting:

Faculty: Maryam Ahranjani, George Bach, Reed Benson, Sherri Burr, Camille Carey, Barbara Creel, Scott England, Steven Homer, Scott Hughes, Lucrecia Jaramillo, Joshua Kastenber, April Land, John LaVelle, Ernesto Longa, Nathalie Martin, Serge Martinez, Aliza Organick, Mary Pareja, Sergio Pareja, Sonia Rankin, Michelle Rigual, Leo Romero, Alexandra Siek, Sarah Steadman, David Stout, Carol Suzuki, Cliff Villa, Jeanette Wolfley, Christine Zuni Cruz

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

ACTION ITEM: Faculty hiring decision – Faculty Appointments Committee and Dean Sergio Pareja:

Members of the Faculty Appointments Committee summarized the qualifications of the five candidates for the faculty position to primarily teach Civil Procedure. 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 three candidates they considered acceptable to primarily teach Civil Procedure. All five 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. From the remaining four candidates, the faculty then was asked to write down the name of the one candidate whom s/he preferred. The one with the most votes was ranked second. From the remaining three candidates, the faculty then was asked to write down the name of the one candidate whom s/he preferred. The one with the most votes was ranked third. From the remaining two candidates, the faculty then was asked to write down the name of the one candidate whom s/he preferred. The one with the most votes was ranked fourth, and the remaining candidate was ranked fifth.
3. The faculty had planned for a third round of voting (runoff round) if a candidate in the ranking round were to receive merely a plurality of the vote rather than a majority. That did not happen. Thus, a runoff round was unnecessary.

4. For the final round of voting (60% offer round), also by secret ballot, the faculty voted on the three ranked candidates to determine if each had the support of at least 60% of the faculty. Such 60% support is needed to extend an offer. The top four ranked candidates received well over 60% support. The third did not. As a result, it was decided that, subject to Provost approval, the Dean would start by offering the top-ranked candidate the position. If that person turns down the offer, the Dean would move to the second ranked candidate. If that person turns down the offer, the Dean would move to the third ranked candidate. If that person turns down the offer, the Dean would move to the fourth ranked candidate. Other than the fifth ranked candidate, who did not get enough votes to support an offer, candidates that do not get an offer from today's vote may still be considered for positions to primarily teach other courses that they may be qualified to teach.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m.