

**Minutes for Executive Session Faculty Meeting
November 12, 2019**

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, Elizabeth Elia, Scott England, Sonia Gipson Rankin, Veronica Gonzales-Zamora, Marc-Tizoc González, Vinay Harpalani, Steven Homer, John Kang, Joshua Kastenber, April Land, John LaVelle, Jennifer Laws, Nathalie Martin, Serge Martinez, Jennifer Moore, Gabe Pacyniak, Aliza Organick, Mary Leto Pareja, Sergio Pareja, Sonia Rankin, Leo Romero, Joseph Schremmer, Laura Spitz, Sarah Steadman, David Stout, Carol Suzuki, Sherri Thomas, Gloria Valencia-Weber, Cliff Villa, Peter Winograd, and Christine Zuni Cruz** (20 needed for quorum; names that count toward quorum in bold)

Staff: Beverly Akin

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 Economic Justice 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 Economic Justice Clinic. All four 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 three 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. 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 third. The one with the least votes was ranked fourth.
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 four 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 three ranked candidates received 60% support but the fourth ranked candidate did not. As a result, it was decided that, subject to Provost approval, the position would be offered to the top-ranked candidate first. If that candidate does not accept, the position will be offered to the second ranked candidate. If that person does not accept, the position will be offered to the third ranked candidate.

The faculty did not consider rank or credit toward tenure of the ranked candidates at this meeting. That issue has been referred to the Faculty Retention, Promotion & Tenure Committee for a recommendation to the full faculty. The recommendation is expected to come at the November 19 faculty meeting. At that meeting, all faculty eligible to vote on the matter will vote regarding their preference as to rank and credit toward tenure.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.