

SPECIAL REPORT
of the
RULES COMMITTEE
concerning
PROFESSIONAL SEARCH PROCEDURES

Presented at the
404th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate
November 6, 1990

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Dean Alfange, Chair
Jeremiah Allen
Roland Chilton
Micheline Dufau
John Roberts
Masha Rudman
Harlan Sturm

The Rules Committee has received expressions of concern from a number of faculty members regarding both the provisions of the current “interim” search procedures for professional positions and the process by which those procedures are to be revised and new, non-interim procedures are to be developed and instituted. This report and associated motions are the result of the Committee’s consideration of these questions.

I. Interim Procedures

Several features of the interim procedures may call for further discussion, but the one most strongly objected to—particularly as it applies to recruitment of faculty members—is the requirement that when departments forward recommendations to the appointing authorities, the “top candidates must not be rank-ordered; appointing authorities will refuse to accept rank-ordered recommendations.” Not only is this a significant departure from long-established procedures—but it strikes many faculty members as counterproductive to the goal of recruiting the most highly qualified faculty members available, and possibly subversive of the goals of affirmative action. The Rules Committee therefore offers the following motion to the Senate for discussion and action:

MOVED: 08-87 That the Faculty Senate request the Administration to rescind—insofar as appointments to the faculty are concerned—the provision of the Interim Professional Search Procedures that “top candidates must not be rank-ordered; appointing authorities will refuse to accept rank-ordered recommendations.”

II. Processes for Developing and Instituting Non-Interim Search Procedures

A second concern expressed by faculty members has to do with the process by which new, non-interim search procedures are to be developed and instituted. A recent memorandum from the Affirmative Action Office suggests that “faculty input” to this process is to consist of written responses to that office, which will then be summarized by the Affirmative Action Office and forwarded to a “working group.” As one Department Chairperson put it, this is not an acceptable process by which a matter so sensitively touching upon the prerogatives and responsibilities of the faculty should be handled. The Rules Committee therefore proposes the following motion:

MOVED: 09-87 That no new, non-interim Professional Search Procedures be put into effect until such proposed procedures have been reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate.