

## Affirmative Action is Undermined by Administrators Meddling with Hiring Procedures

Over the last several semesters, increasing numbers of questions have been raised about the faculty hiring process and, in particular, the role of administrators on screening committees. Since last Spring, however, the focus on the hiring process has centered on issues of diversity and affirmative action.

This focus seems to have stemmed most directly from a case reported on

### ADVOCATE EDITORIAL

in the May 2000 issue of *The Advocate* in which administrators at Skyline intervened in and eventually dissolved a screening committee on the grounds that the committee was "screening out diversity". Following the publication of that article, Cañada professor Paul Roscelli published an op-ed piece in the *S. F. Chronicle* (that was reprinted in the September-October *Advocate* in a slightly different version) which claimed that procedures in our District's hiring process were unfair and illegal "pool manipulation" which sought "equality of outcome" rather than just "equality of access." Several faculty members wrote articles responding to Roscelli by defending the District's affirmative action policies, and emphasizing the importance of promoting diversity in our faculty. (See articles by Kate Motoyama of CSM in the September-October *Advocate* and by Walter Owyang and Jacquie Phillips of Cañada in the November *Advocate*). Roscelli has written a response that is published on page 4 of this issue.

*Continued on page 6*

## Online Education Critic David Noble to Speak at CFT Convention in March

Noted historian David Noble, of York University in Toronto, will be a keynote speaker at the upcoming California Federation of Teachers' Convention, to be held in Los Angeles, March 9 thru March 11, 2001.

Professor Nobel was a keynote speaker at the AFT Local 1493-initiated Conference on Online Education that was held at CSM on October 9, 1999. At our Conference, Professor Noble presented his critique of online education and what he sees as the related trend toward the commodification of education.

After David Noble spoke at our Conference on Online Education, both the CFT's Distance Education and Technology Issues Committee and its Educational Technology Committee, wrote to the CFT's elected leadership urging them to invite Professor Noble to speak at its next Convention.

By extending to Professor Noble

an invitation to speak at its Convention, the CFT has indicated its interest in providing Professor Noble with another forum to present his views on these important issues of concern to increasing numbers of educators. Clearly, the CFT sees his presentation at its next Convention as a continuation of the discussion that began at our local's Conference on Online Education.



David Noble

Additionally, CFT convention workshops will cover issues including: changes in STRS benefits, part-time faculty equity, distance education issues, the compressed calendar, maintaining quality health benefits, and, finally, involving part-time faculty in

local union activities.

If you are interested in attending the next CFT Convention, March 9-11, 2001, in Los Angeles, as either a delegate or an observer, please call the AFT 1493 office at x6491.

### IN THIS ISSUE

<b>Presidents' Perspectives .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Part Timers' Letters on Class Cuts, Diversity &amp; Evaluation .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Paul Roscelli's Counterresponse on Faculty Hiring &amp; Diversity .</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introducing New AFT 1493 Executive Committee Members .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Kate Motoyama Clarifies Data on Diversity in Faculty Hiring ....</b>	<b>8</b>

*The Advocate is now available online at:*

[www.smccd.net/accounts/brenner/advo](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/brenner/advo)

Email letters or articles to: [brenner@smccd.net](mailto:brenner@smccd.net)

# the Advocate

San Mateo Community College  
Federation of Teachers  
AFT Local 1493, AFL-CIO  
1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.  
San Mateo, CA 94402  
(650) 574-6491

## Editor:

Eric Brenner, Skyline, x 4177

## Editorial Board

Eric Brenner, Skyline, x 4177

Dan Kaplan, x 6491

## Co-Presidents

Katharine Harer, Skyline, x 4412

Joaquin Rivera, Skyline, x 4159

## Vice President

Bess Chandler, Skyline, x 4286

## Secretary

George Goth, Skyline, x 4390

## Treasurer

Anita Fisher, CSM, x6383

## Chapter Chairs

Bess Chandler, Skyline, x 4286

Pat Deamer, Skyline, x 4217

Romelia Thiele, Cañada, x3211

John Searle, CSM, x6607

## Executive Committee Reps.

Nina Floro, Skyline, x 4243

Rick Hough, Skyline, x 4193

Anne Nicholls, Cañada, x 3293

Karen Olesen, Cañada, x 3415

Mary Valenti, CSM, x 6194

Linda Vogel, Skyline, x 4289

Shaye Zahedi, CSM, x 6240

## Part-timers Reps.

Carol Hansen, CSM, x 6677 x 9267

Paddy Moran, CSM, x 6677 x 9245

Patricia Palmer, Sky, x 6889 x 9418

## Chief Grievance Officer

John Kirk, CSM, x 6386

## Executive Secretary

Dan Kaplan, x 6491

## THE PRESIDENTS' PERSPECTIVES

# New Year's Hopes: New Contract, New Bond Measure, Stability at District Office

by Joaquin Rivera and Katharine Harer,  
AFT 1493 Co-Presidents



photos by Jeanne Angler

Hello out there. Some good news for education in the election. Prop. 38 was shot down by a huge margin and Prop. 39 made it through. Rumor has it the District will mount a new bond campaign in the not-so-distant future, and this time it should win. Keep your eyes out for news about the new bond and get involved. All of us — students, staff and faculty — will benefit from improved facilities. The leaks and the broken furniture, not to mention the asbestos and the little animals scurrying along the roof beams, are not going away. Let's all help out with the next bond campaign. The inconvenience of renovations will be worth the rewards of clean, up-to-date facilities for all of us to enjoy. And with enrollments lagging, spiffier campuses will help to draw students to our colleges.

## Did Someone Say Settlement?

If you've been following our reports from the negotiating table in this column and you read our recent Negotiations Update, then you know about as much as we do at the moment.

For those of you who wondered what happened to part-time issues in our last report, we can tell you that the District has agreed to use AB 420 as a "pass-through" to reimburse part-time instructors for up to one-half of the cost of their health insurance plans. The law calls for a 50% reimbursement, but there's only so much cash in the state pot, so we can't guarantee the full

50% until we see how many districts apply for the funding. This is a substantial increase in part-time health coverage. We've also convinced the District to (finally) implement equal paychecks for part-timers. It's a bit of a clerical tangle, but it should be in place by summer or spring 2001.

All in all, we're pleased with where we are: the 5.3% increase — 5% on the salary scale for full and part-timers — the return of sabbatical leaves as well as full vision coverage, and an improved life insurance plan for full-timers will almost certainly be part of the new agreement. Unfortunately, there have been too many delays in working out the details, but we hope to bring this one-year settlement to you for a vote right after we come back from the Winter break in January.

## Who's on First at the District?

On another front, we've been curious about the administrative "reorganization" at the District Office, but have been given little information or opportunity for input. There have been a number of administrative changes and more, we understand, in the works, but no one has consulted with faculty about any of it. We learned that Barbara Beno, Acting Assistant Chancellor, Employee Relations and Human Resources had her contract extended for another six months. Greg Marvel is still (until December) employed as a consultant — doing what? He's not at the negotiating table these days. Paula Anderson has taken his place in negotiations. There's talk of Carol Green's position changing. Does anyone know what she'll be doing? Who's on first? No one can tell us.

At the last Shared Governance Council meeting we asked the Chan-

*Continued on next page*

## LETTERS TO THE ADVOCATE

**A Part-timer's Views on Class Cuts & Diversity**

Dear Editor:

I'd like to comment on two items in the September-October issue of *The Advocate*. First, the increases in class cuts spell disaster for part-timers. All the other issues will pale if we have no work. A year ago in the spring, I was teaching nine units per semester. This spring, it looks like I will have three units.

I specialize in writing and enjoy teaching business writing and word processing classes. I worked very hard to develop valuable lessons based on my real life writing experience of 20 years as a news reporter, author and Web content specialist. It doesn't seem to matter all of a sudden what you bring to the classroom in terms of experience and dedication.

I'll survive. I'll go back to writing and consulting full-time if needed, but I will miss sharing my passion for

**Presidents' Perspectives**

*Continued from previous page*

cellor about the reorganization directly. His answer was that we'd know more soon. That's the same answer we got when we asked him that question in August at the District Academic Senate retreat. We asked if there would be opportunities for input to these important, and expensive decisions, and were given another vague answer. As we all know, District administrators pull down the highest salaries of all employees, so in a time of low enrollments and tight budgets, shouldn't faculty, staff and students have something to say about how these large amounts of money are spent? A report to the Shared Governance Council about decisions already in place is not *true* shared governance — and we haven't even been given a report! ■

writing and communication with my students, especially those for whom English is a second language.

I know I am not alone. But it really hurts to be discarded in this way.

Secondly, on the subject of hiring diversity, it is interesting to note that my husband is a 100 percent disabled Vietnam veteran, and my teaching income really helps supplement his disability. I care very much about all my students regardless of their age, sex, ethnicity, race, ability or physical limitations.

As a third generation child of Irish immigrants who experienced great discrimination, I am sensitive to the injustices suffered by people for no other reason than their heritage. My mom was denied an English book in high school (her senior year) because she was "a dirty little Catholic mic" who would never amount to anything anyway. Because she failed English, she didn't get to graduate and had to go to school later to get her degree.

This story inspired me to want to help others to make their dreams come true no matter where they come from.

As a reporter for a major daily, my beat was education and I followed many of the public school desegregation cases of the '70s.

But to the system, I suppose I am just another white statistic on a form.

Thanks for listening. Too bad academia is getting more corporate than the corporate world.

*Adjunct Faculty (at least for now)*

*Name withheld by request*

**National Conference on Part-Time Faculty to be Held in January in San Jose**

**See page 8 for more info**

**Evaluation: Formative, Formidable or Abominable?**

Editor's Note: *The following letter is a response to "How Our Evaluation System Lacks Clear Criteria: An Illustration" by CSM professor Bob Hasson in the November Advocate. The author of the letter is an adjunct faculty member whose name is withheld by request.*

I agree with Bob Hasson that instructor evaluations should be formative - not formidable, and certainly not abominable. In an ideal world the criteria by which teachers are judged would be determined by the community. However, departments and districts have their own hidden agendas, and in my experience, each college district behaves like a monastic microcosm. My review here was so completely different and opposite from a district just across the bridge that I believe it warrants an analysis.

My review at CSM was so thorough as to be grueling and formidable in nature. I was even asked to provide my philosophy of teaching in printed form. At the time, I was on the 'we-aim-to-please' bandwagon, and didn't think anything of it. However, no mention was made of my teaching philosophy, either as a requirement of the review, or in the statistical results of the review. Now, being asked to provide this philosophy seems suspicious. On the other hand, the thoroughness of the CSM review, and the overall objectivity of statistical analysis of the student evaluation, along with all of the other evaluation points, impresses me, mostly, as a fair and objective review.

This is because I recently suffered a scathing double review at a monastic microcosm just across the bridge, which I am still having trouble totally reconciling in my mind. No portfolio

*Continued on page 7*

## VIEWPOINT

## Counterresponse Clarifies Critique of District Hiring Procedures

by Paul Roscelli, Cañada

Editor's Note: *The following article is a counterresponse to articles by Kate Motoyama of CSM (in the Sept.-Oct. Advocate) and by Walter Owyang and Jacqui Phillips of Cañada (in the Nov. Advocate) which responded to Roscelli's article in the Sept.-Oct. Advocate.*

As I read over my colleagues' responses, to my previous piece on the District's use of race and gender in its hiring practices, a few thoughts popped into my mind...

First, contrary to popular mythology, I am not opposed to "affirmative action" *per se*; in fact, neither my *Advocate*, nor my *Chronicle*, piece uses that specific phrase. "Affirmative action" is an umbrella term meaning different things to different people. There is no sense in engaging in a debate over a phrase that has an imprecise meaning—it's like discussing the merits of "welfare." You first need to identify the program you wish to discuss (i.e. SSI, AFDC etc...) in order to have a constructive conversation. In fact, it would be hard to square my supposed opposition to all forms of affirmative action with my last few years as a mentor in the UC Berkeley multi-cultural mentoring program.

### Racial & Gender Preferences Equal "Quotas"

I am opposed, however, to *the type* of affirmative action that uses racial and gender preferences in hiring. This process is even more troublesome when the administration (as in our District) has the authority to reject lists of qualified interviewees, as well as lists of qualified finalists (yes finalists) put forward by the faculty hiring committees, simply because the list lacks diversity.

Some of my colleagues, in their writings, cite specific court cases (espe-

cially cases lacking precedent—such as the *Wilson* case) and Ed Code as proof the District acts lawfully. Let me try out my own legalism, it goes like this: "The substance of a transaction will prevail over its form." What this means is that courts will evaluate a policy based on how it is practiced, not written. Our District has a policy that, as practiced, has allowed the administration to pull a job opening if the hiring committee refuses to change/amend an interview (or finalist) list of qualified candidates if that list does not comport with some ill-defined view of diversity. Now, if you wish to evaluate this practice as the "mere granting of a preference, or pursuit of a legal goal" be my guest—but only the most naïve will fail to see the *substance of the transaction* for what it is: the administration's ability to pull a job opening whenever a list of candidates do not meet some unspecified level of diversity turns a "subtle goal" into a system of "quotas by coercion."

### "Diversity Is a Strength" Is Not Axiomatic

In defense of this District process a colleague of mine writes, "Diversity itself is a strength." Unfortunately, precious little empirical evidence is cited supporting this assertion. When assertions are made (well meaning or not) in the absence of hard data, when questions of causation and correlation are challenged as being too "Western," when one is made to feel that merely questioning an idea may brand one a "reactionary" then something is wrong. It seems that someone, somewhere, determined that the benefit of increased racial and gender diversity is axiomatic—it is true because it is self-evident. But treating this as an axiom turns any debate about it into an empty academic exercise—since it is, by definition, true. Clearly there are axioms—universal self-evident truths present in the world. For me though,

these axioms are more frequently found in the likes of Euclid's geometry than in the muddy waters occupied by social engineers. Here there are too many variables with which to contend, too many exceptions to this "rule of diversity" that go unexplained (e.g. the Chinese and the Incas were very closed, racially homogeneous societies—relative to the US—just how did they reach their acknowledged cultural heights without the degree of ethnic difference that our society possesses?) This amorphous "goal of diversity," instead of being an axiomatic belief, is exactly the type of thing we should examine empirically and debate vigorously. Ironically, this would require us to value and celebrate a far different kind of diversity—diversity of thought, rather than the one to which we currently give platitudes.

### Administrators Won't Publicly Oppose Preferences

Lastly, isn't it odd, given that 55% of the population voted to end race and gender preferences in hiring in California (Prop 209), that you've never heard nor read of a single administrator at any public university (UC, CSU, or CC—and, by logical extension, our District) that has ever embraced, publicly, the merits of 209? Do you seriously think an administrator's chances of being hired would improve if he or she publicly expressed views sympathetic to "race neutral" hiring practices? The abject silence of this perspective in our District's administration, as in Higher Ed overall, speaks volumes to that question. Apparently some educators draw the line at supporting diversity when it comes to hiring and promoting those that do not share their view of the world—so much for diversity of thought.

To employ "race conscious" po-

*Continued on page 8*



## NEW AFT 1493 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Editor's note: We asked three new members of AFT 1493's Executive Committee—Skyline Exec. Committee Rep. Nina Floro, CSM Part-Timer Rep. Paddy Moran and Cañada Chapter Chair Romy Thiele—to write brief introductions of themselves so that AFT members can get to better know their representatives. Their introductions are printed below.

### Nina L. Floro, Skyline Exec. Committee Rep.

I began teaching full-time at Skyline College in the Spring of 1991 after serving as an adjunct instructor at



several other Bay Area community colleges (San Jose City, Ohlone, and Diablo Valley). As a "novice" union rep-

resentative, I plan first to educate myself about the variety of issues affecting both adjunct and full-time faculty, discover what I can do to best represent my colleagues, and work towards achieving the compensation, benefits, and rewards we all deserve.

One of my main, ongoing professional interests is reading Asian American literature and researching special issues relevant to Asian Americans. Outside of teaching, you will most often find me spending time with my daughter in the East Bay, in my car commuting across the Bay Bridge, taking a long walk in the woods, sitting near a body of water (ocean, river, lake), and rooting for the Oakland Raiders and Oakland A's. I also enjoy playing in the Hawaiian sun, listening to music (traditional jazz, Latin jazz, R & B/soul, oldies, classical), watching movies and plays, hiking, fishing,

dancing the salsa, reading, and eating different types of foods in different types of places. ■

### Paddy Moran, CSM Part-Timer Rep.

As an art educator and exhibiting artist, my goal since receiving an MFA degree in painting and drawing from



photo by Jeanne Angier

San Jose State University, has been to be a full-time faculty member. This is still my goal but it has been made difficult by the

fact that a employment strategy in place since 1972 has introduced a two-tiered labor system in which part time labor has been used increasingly in higher education.<sup>1</sup> Currently, in many community colleges, 60% of the instructors are part-time. This means, of course, that full-time retirees are often replaced by part-time workers and that there is a general scarcity of full-time positions. It is clear to me that part-time community college instructors must work for equality in their field. Concerns are seniority rights, equal pay for equal work, health benefits and paid office hours. Equality for part time instructors will naturally enhance and promote quality education for students.

I teach in three different community colleges, one of them the College of San Mateo. I have long been an AFT member, but didn't get really involved until last spring when AFT supported me and others in setting up a petition drive (sponsored by the California Part Time Faculty Association) to send petitions to Governor Davis regarding part-time faculty issues. Now I am

looking forward to attending a CPFA hosted National Contingent Academic Labor Conference in San Jose, Jan. 12-14, 2001. This will be a national forum addressing concerns of part time community college faculty and lecturers from UC and State Universities. I am happy to serve as a part-time representative on the AFT 1493 Executive Committee for the San Mateo Community College District and will work to promote change.

<sup>1</sup> Panel presentation: "Why Full-time Faculty Should Support the Interests of Part-time Faculty", Richard Moser, Associate Secretary, American Association of University Professors. 1998 AAUP Connecticut Conference.

### Romy Reyes Thiele, Cañada Chapter Chair

In 1992 I started teaching at Cañada College in the Business Office Technology program. For many years prior to



photo by Jeanne Angier

Cañada, I taught office technology courses and computer applications at a secondary level in Southern California.

I received my BS degree in Business Education from CSU Long Beach and my MA in Instructional Technology from San Jose State University. I am an active member of Delta Pi Epsilon, Beta Epsilon local chapter and an active member of the California Business Education Association. I served as an elected officer and member for both of the professional organizations, and I also served as an elected officer in the Academic Senate at Cañada. ■

## **EDITORIAL: Affirmative Action Undermined by Administrators' Meddling**

*Continued from page 1*

AFT Local 1493 believes strongly in the principle of affirmative action—that is, special efforts to recruit and employ qualified members of groups who have been discriminated against in the past and who are currently under-represented among our faculty. The District has a hiring policy—Selection Procedures for Faculty Members, which was developed by a joint committee of the AFT, the Academic Senate, and District administration—that attempts to promote the hiring of members of under-represented groups as long as they also are found to be qualified and among the top candidates by faculty screening committees.

Unfortunately, in recent years various members of the administration at the district and college levels have attempted to manipulate the process of screening committees in ways that do not follow Board-approved hiring procedures. The intervention of administrators in last Spring's Skyline English screening committee exemplified several problematic issues in one case. As reported in last May's *Advocate*, the Skyline Vice President of Instruction attempted to hand-pick a screening committee, and suggested the committee use a new set of District hiring procedures called "Fast-Track", which included a paper screening device produced by the District Personnel Office and the "pre-screening" of all applicants' materials by the Personnel Office. Additionally, the District Academic Senate has requested that use of the packet of materials titled Applicant Procedures: A Checklist be discontinued due to substantive differences with the Board approved policy discussed below. In the view of the District Academic Senate, "the Checklist contains passages with misleading information which replace collegial processes with unilateral decisions made by the 'Hiring Manager.'"

There have also been other instances in the District of administrative manipulation of appointments to screening committees. At Skyline some deans included a student on the screening committee in violation of the policy. At Cañada, Deans have appointed themselves as the Chair of screening committees in violation of the policy which requires a vote of the committee to elect the Chair. Where does this practice come from? It isn't in the Board-approved hiring policy.

### **Policy Gives Faculty Primacy**

Administrators' actions have attempted to take away faculty's key role in the screening/hiring process. But there should be no misunderstanding concerning the primacy of the faculty in District faculty hiring procedures. The Board approved hiring document, Selection Procedures for Faculty Members, makes clear that: 1) it is the responsibility of faculty to ensure the quality of their faculty peers; 2) the job announcement will be prepared by subject matter faculty and the appropriate Dean; 3) the selection of the screening committee members will be collaborative; 4) members will be proposed by subject matter faculty and appropriate Dean; 5) the committee will always have a majority of faculty; 6) whenever possible, these faculty will be tenured and will be experts in the discipline or a related discipline; and 7) all members of the screening committee shall review all completed applications.

It has become increasingly clear over the last two semesters that District administrators have rationalized their actions by suggesting that faculty screening committees are screening out diverse candidates. The result of these administrators' unwillingness to follow procedures in the name of promoting diversity has, in fact, led to a misunderstanding of the actual procedures and what seems to be a backlash against affirmative action principles by Paul Roscelli and a few other indi-

vidual faculty members in our District.

We want to first address the administrators and then briefly respond to Professor Roscelli.

### **Hiring Committees Follow Affirmative Action Principles**

The administration is simply wrong-headed to even suggest that our faculty screening committees do not consistently follow affirmative action principles and hiring guidelines that promote diversity. We are, in fact, aware of more than one hiring committee that chose diversity candidates as finalists, but these candidates ended up taking jobs elsewhere before they could be hired by our District.

At the same time, we want to acknowledge that there is no question that there are many subjective responses that inevitably slip into the hiring process, no matter how many instruments you use, and personal biases of all kinds may influence decision-making—biases that encourage diversity and some that probably don't. This is just to acknowledge that even with the best faculty-driven instruments, there will always be bias and subjectivity in the process. But that in no way justifies the administration undercutting a faculty process that clearly promotes equal opportunities for diverse candidates.

### **Why Do Administrators Do It?**

We have often speculated about what the possible motivations might be for the administrative interference that we have noted above. Is it simply that if the number of diversity hires goes up in the District, then we are eligible to receive significantly more funding? What, we wonder, is driving the administration to act as they have? Why has the administration been attempting to disempower faculty in our essential role in the hiring process?

*Continued on next page*

*Continued from previous page*

## **Affirmative Action Counters Racism, Improves Education**

We want to take a moment here to directly address a key point made by Professor Roscelli. The idea that before the development of affirmative action policies there existed "race neutral" or "gender neutral" hiring policies fails to appreciate the significance of the statistical data on hiring that has been collected. Historically, the hiring policies in American higher education were never "race neutral" or "gender neutral." And the truth of the matter is clear and unambiguous: the effects of anti-affirmative policies like Proposition 209 hurt people of color and women by reinforcing already existing inequalities in society.

We also would like to respond directly to one other part of the argument that Professor Roscelli advances in his article in this issue of the *Advocate*. He writes that "One need only examine the history of Germany, the antebellum South, and more recently South Africa....to see just how 'enlightened' societies can be when designing policies around distinctions of race and gender." But to make this kind of argument requires one to equate policies designed to enforce racism with affirmative action policies which (whether you agree with them or not) clearly have anti-racist motivations and origins—they are a direct outgrowth of the struggles of the civil rights movement. Does this kind of argument really make any analytical sense? Does this kind of broad-brush approach really help us to clarify the issues in dispute?

But beyond the question of motivations, and much more important, is what we think is the most salient issue in this debate: the actual results of affirmative action policies in higher education. The effects of these policies has been to actually make progress in achieving a more diversified faculty that reflects more accurately what the population of the state of California

looks like. We think that this produces a better environment in the classroom, one that makes for better student learning. And we strongly believe that if administrators would let faculty do the important work that we are entrusted with in screening committees—following the approved procedures, using the approved instruments, without intervention—our District will continue to steadily increase the diversity and excellence of our faculty. ■

---



---

## **Evaluation: Formative, Formidable or Abominable?**

*Continued from page 3*

was required - only a syllabus. No student evaluations were completed; this system has four different kinds of evaluations! I discovered through talking with my assigned mentor that a second review was a bad sign, and became concerned because I especially liked the student population there and felt I was creating positive educational outcomes with that same population. My own informal surveys of students indicated that they both enjoyed my class and felt their skills and learning were improving. Unfortunately, neither the dean nor the first evaluator ever answered my repeated question as to why I was being reviewed twice. Finally, I was summoned into the dean's office via a gestapo-like scribbled note in my mailbox, which really felt strange. The note said, "See me today about your review." Where was the traditional polite request to meet at a time convenient for both parties?

As a result of all this, I was unable to take the review seriously due to the gross generalizations that were made such as 'all of the students were contentious,' and 'no positive interaction was observed.' In fact, two of the students are a tad contentious, but they are the same two students who are first to tell me when they appreciate an activity for enhancing their understanding. Moreover, the observation was conducted during a pop quiz

given because the students were not doing their required textbook reading. Therefore, a 'congenial' atmosphere in the classroom was not logically possible on that day. Consequently, attendance and textbook reading increased among the students after that day, which was the educational outcome I was aiming for as an educator. As a social scientist this whole review reeked of non-objectivity and grossly unfair, biased generalizations. I wrote a rebuttal stating these facts and more and delivered them to the dean despite the fact that a colleague had told me it wouldn't do me any good as the dean was viewed as God. During the oral review I was informed that a third review would be done by a male member of the faculty. (To date two female members had reviewed me.) At this point, three reviews felt like harassment to me—especially for one class in the lowest paying college in the system.

I met with my mentor a couple of times, and emailed him in an effort to make sense of this whole abominable process. He enlightened me about the cookie-cutter criterion for instructors at this college, and stated further that if you didn't fit the mold, it was unlikely that you'd be called upon to continue teaching there. Recently, I've noticed that there are similar looking faculty members in this department. For example, there are several long-haired male faculty members of approximately the same age.

In conclusion, I do agree with Bob's Assertion 5, which notes the difficulty of defending any unsatisfactory evaluation as fair. Instead, we seem to have an ivory-tower administration/chair versus instructors/evaluatees, who are predominantly uninformed of the overly personalized criteria. The social scientist in me would like to see clear criteria for instructor evaluation standardized, and approved by the community. The personal and secret agendas must be eliminated if an evaluation system is ever to be clear, fair and objective. ■

## Motoyama Clarifies Data on Diversity in Faculty Hiring

Editor's note: *The following letter by Kate Motoyama (CSM) responds to a letter by George Goth (Skyline) in the November Advocate that questioned some data in her article in the Sept.-Oct. issue.*

Editor:

Professor Goth raises some questions about the numbers in the table on faculty hiring in my article, "Is Hiring Goal Diversity or Equality?" (in the September-October *Advocate*.) Figures were derived from an on-line survey begun at the request of the Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, to obtain information on full-time faculty hiring for Fall 1999. The 40 responding districts advertised 673 full-time positions, and 605 of those positions were filled.

First, the ethnic composition of the Applicant Pool included 67% White, 8.35% Asian/Pacific Islander, 6.91% Hispanic, 3.7% African American, .2% American Indian, and 13.1% Other or unreported. The reported ethnic composition of those hired included 79% White, 7% Asian/Pacific Islander, 12% Hispanic, 1% African American, and just over 1% American Indian.

The Other or unreported category in the Applicant Pool appears to be incorporated fully in the numbers of Full Time Faculty Hires. The ethnic composition of the Applicant Pool appears to be more diverse than those who were actually hired. One interpretation for the sizable group of Other or unreported is found in "Diversity Hiring: A System Overview, 1980-1999," presented to the Board of Governors, California Community Colleges. The Overview states:

*The number of "unknown/unidentified" or "other" is growing without a verifiable reason for the growth. Some possible reasons for the unexplained "growth" may be due to reporting errors, a sense of employee*

*frustration with the concept of ethnic categorization, backlash from Proposition 209, the growth in multi-group identification or a combination of these factors.*

Second, the Overview examined System hiring from 1980 through 1999—representing nearly two decades of hiring data. That Overview states, "Full-time community college ethnic minority faculty continue to be substantially underrepresented (26 percent compared to 44.8 percent) in comparison to ethnic minorities in the state's population."

Additionally, as discussion has revolved around a comparison of the Applicant Pool and Full Time Faculty Hires, it must be noted that the availability data which districts use to determine their hiring goals is a decade old and probably should reflect even higher percentages of ethnic minorities who are available to work in the community colleges.

Kate Motoyama

---

## Counterresponse Clarifies Critique of Hiring Process

*Continued from page 4*

lices in order to reach a "race neutral" world, educators had better have the Wisdom of Solomon. Sadly, history doesn't give me much confidence that we are so enlightened. History is, however, much better at providing evidence about the past "success" of governments that employ policies differentiating among individuals based on race and gender. One need only examine the history of Germany, the antebellum South, and more recently South Africa and present day Malaysia to see just how "enlightened" societies can be when designing policies around dis-

## PART-TIMERS

# Major Conference on Part-Time Faculty to be Held in Jan. in San Jose

COCAL IV, The Fourth National Conference on Contingent Academic Labor, will be held in San Jose, on January 12-14, 2001. It is being hosted by the California Part-time Faculty Association (CPFA), and sponsored by a growing list of major academic organizations including the CFT Community College Council, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), the University of California Lecturers, UC-AFT, the Lecturers Council - California State University CFA, and the Community College Association/CTA, among many others.

For more information on the Conference and early registration, check out the Conference Web site linked to <[www.cpfaf.org](http://www.cpfaf.org)> or directly at <[www.cpfaf.org/cocal](http://www.cpfaf.org/cocal)> . ■

---

tinctions of race and gender.

Faculty supporting this piece:

Romelia Thiele—Business/Office Technology  
 Jim Steidel—History  
 Steven Gavazza—Physics/Math  
 Carolyn Jung—Business/Office Technology  
 Pamela Smith—English  
 Sally McGill—Science  
 Eldon Earnhardt—Anthropology  
 Dick Claire—Accounting

**WHAT DO YOU THINK?** We'd like to hear what you think about any of the articles or issues discussed in *The Advocate* or about any other issues of interest to faculty. Please email your letters or articles to: [brenner@smccd.net](mailto:brenner@smccd.net) or just use campus mail and send to: **AFT 1493, CSM**