

POINT OF PRIVILEGE
Special Meeting of Hartnell College Board of Trustees
June 17, 2008

Faculty Resolutions

1. Stop the Presidential Search

Let me re-trace the process

a) September 13th Board Meeting:

(1) Hired Search Firm

(2) Withdrew Item 9 – “Approval of a Search Committee” because the Board was advised that, if they appointed the search committee, the committee would then become a “committee of the Board” and thus be subjected to the Brown Act. This means that all meetings of the search committee would have had to have been posted in advance and open to the public, thus making it impossible to maintain the confidentiality of applicants’ information.

b) December 4th Board Meeting – In Dr. Helm’s report on Board’s Goals, it was pointed out that there were three groups involved in the search: (Steering, Search and Hiring): 1) Steering Committee – Board chair, 4 union, and senate leaders; 2) Search Committee – 10 representatives, of which half are male and half are Hispanic; 3) Hiring Committee, which is the Board of Trustees.

Also, at the December meeting, the Board chair read a letter summarizing a correspondence with legal counsel at the Chancellors Office and concluded by asking Dr. Helm to apply for the position.

c) All members were chosen by the leaders of their constituency groups with the exception of the community members. A pool of community members were chosen by the Board who then asked Dr. Helm to interview them and narrow the number to two.

Later in December, in response to a request of the La Raza faculty, Dr. Helm interviewed La Raza faculty who lived in the district to serve on the search committee, bringing the total to eleven members; 6 Hispanic, 3 white, 1 Asian, and 1 African American.

In April, in response to the faculty union's concerns, the search firm obtained the opinion of legal counsel from the firm of Lozano Smith regarding whether or not Dr. Helm could be properly considered as an applicant. The legal opinion was that she could.

The search committee determined that the search should go forward and forwarded the names of three finalists to the Board.

In May the Board interviewed the three candidates and chose two for site visits.

The Board invited the four constituent groups to choose a representative to participate in the site visits.

This is a chronological history of events leading to tonight.

2. Arbitration regarding two non-tenured faculty. Certainly, both the Board and the faculty union hope for a speedy resolution to the process.
3. Place the vacant administrative position: Executive Vice President on hold. While we all have concerns about the budget, I recommend that the reorganization go forward as agreed.
4. Release site visit reports regarding the two presidential candidates. Each individual can choose to release their reports, but we ask that all names be removed to protect the College.
5. Limit the presidential contract to one year as with other administrators – We will consider your recommendation.