

**Minutes for Executive Session Faculty Meeting
November 20, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Dean Pareja at 2:36 p.m. The following people were present for at least some portion of the meeting:

Faculty: **Maryam Ahranjani, George Bach, Reed Benson, Camille Carey, Scott England, Steven Homer, April Land, John LaVelle, Jennifer Laws, Ernesto Longa, Nathalie Martin, Serge Martinez, Aliza Organick, Mary Pareja, Sergio Pareja, Sonia Rankin, Michelle Rigual, Leo Romero, Laura Spitz, Sarah Steadman, David Stout, Carol Suzuki, Gloria Valencia-Weber, Cliff Villa, Jeanette Wolfley, Christine Zuni Cruz** (*17 needed for quorum; names that count toward quorum in bold*)

Staff: Krista Allen (substituting for Beverly Akin, Assistant to the Dean)

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 three candidates for the faculty position to primarily teach in the Law Clinic. 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 in the Law Clinic. All three 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 select on the ballot only the name of the one candidate whom s/he preferred. The one with the most votes was ranked first. From the remaining two candidates, the faculty then was asked to select on the ballot the name of the one candidate whom s/he preferred. The one with the most votes was ranked second. The one with the least votes was ranked third.
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 ranked candidate received 60% support but the second and third

ranked candidates did not. As a result, it was decided that, subject to Provost approval, the Dean would offer the position to the top-ranked candidate.

ACTION ITEM: Target of Opportunity Hire – Dean Sergio Pareja:

Dean Pareja discussed the possibility of a “target of opportunity hire,” for which he submitted a “placeholder” application to the Provost’s Office by the November 15th best consideration date. Three strong, possible candidates were identified in the application as being highly desirable for faculty positions at the law school and well qualified to teach Civil Procedure, which has been identified as a top curricular need. Dean Pareja solicited faculty input on whether or not to proceed with a possible target of opportunity hire.

Discussion and questions ensued, some of which focused on curricular needs. The question of adding a fourth candidate’s name was raised, which would require an amended application to be submitted to the Provost’s Office. Another question was raised about the amount of bridge funding available for this potential faculty position. Dean Pareja explained that we do not know yet how much money might be available to us through bridge funding, but the balance of the salary amount could be covered during the bridge funding period by salary savings from an upcoming December faculty retirement. Once bridge funding runs out, the law school would need to cover the full salary amount through salary savings from a future retirement or departure.

A motion was made to *not* withdraw the original application that was submitted on November 15th. The motion was seconded, and a vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously.

A second motion was made to add a fourth candidate’s name to the prior three candidates’ names by submitting an amended application to the Provost’s Office. The motion was seconded, and a vote was taken. The motion failed, with ten votes in favor and eleven votes against.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m.