

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON PROPOSED NEW OR REVISED POLICIES

AP 2.02.02: Faculty Hiring		
Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
10-30-25	<p>I am disappointed by the revised draft language for AP 2.02.02: Faculty Hiring which almost completely eliminates references to diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice considerations in the faculty hiring process. While I acknowledge current political pressures from the federal sphere, we should not abandon our institutional mission to reflect and serve our local community.</p> <p>Yes there are places in this draft policy where DEI language has been revised rather than completely removed, however I'm strongly encouraging you to seek out additional places in the draft which could better reflect our values as a community institution.</p> <p>It seems to me that two additional areas may be revised:</p> <p>Statement of purpose: Instead of eliminating all language related to DEI, can we retain a statement that the faculty hiring process includes consideration of the demographics (or characteristics) of the community and student population?</p> <p>SECTION 2: Selection Advisory Committees Encourage/Consider #4.</p> <p>Similarly, include a statement that whenever possible, selection advisory committee membership will consider the demographics (or characteristics) of the community and student population.</p> <p>There may be additional places in the draft where we can still affirm our institutional mission to serve the Pima County community.</p>	SEE END OF DOCUMENT FOR RESPONSE
10-31-25	Striking out all references to diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice represents a clear retreat from these core principles of higher education that will continue to perpetuate historic and current inequities in hiring and workforce demographics at Pima Community College, such as the fact that only 17% of full-time faculty are Hispanic/Latino and 70% are	SEE END OF DOCUMENT FOR RESPONSE

	<p>white ethnic in spite of a student and city population of 50% Hispanic/Mexican ethnic.</p> <p>I strongly oppose these changes to the policy.</p>	
10-31-25	<p>Removing references to diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice sends the wrong message to our students, employees, and community. These values are not political, they are educational. They ensure that every student sees themselves reflected and supported in our classrooms and in our faculty. At a college that serves a majority Hispanic/Mexican community, our policies should move us closer to equity, not further from it.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider this decision and uphold the principles that make education accessible and equitable for all.</p>	SEE END OF DOCUMENT FOR RESPONSE
11-1-25	<p>Removing 'Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion' language from the policy referenced above clearly clashes with the College's statements of inclusion on the main website and in job announcements. As a blind employee of Pima College and a member of the Tucson community, I strongly object to removing this language from hiring policies.</p> <p>As stated by Dr. Francisca James Hernandez, I agree that: "Striking out all references to diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice represents a clear retreat from these core principles of higher education that will continue to perpetuate historic and current inequities in hiring and workforce demographics at Pima Community College, such as the fact that only 17% of full-time faculty are Hispanic/Latino and 70% are white ethnic in spite of a student and city population of 50% Hispanic/Mexican ethnic."</p> <p>I agree with the argument presented above, and strongly oppose these changes to the policy.</p>	SEE END OF DOCUMENT FOR RESPONSE
11-4-25	<p>The section Statement of purpose, page 2 states "have cultural competence and understanding of the needs of a diverse and under-resourced student population that includes, for example, people with disabilities, veterans, and members of the LGBTQ+ community."</p> <p>We need to show some cultural humility when talking about historic government to government relations and policies.</p> <p>The word change "under resourced" implies that</p>	SEE END OF DOCUMENT FOR RESPONSE

	<p>people had the resources to begin with but that is not true. The language could be hurtful. Are we discussing economics or communities that have been historically underfunded for their resources? Or are we discussing systemic barriers and the lack of resources to remove barriers.</p> <p>Instead, change to populations facing resource inequities or communities with limited access to education, healthcare, services and recognition.</p> <p>I do not agree with the wording.</p>	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

11-3-25: It is disturbing and disappointing to see our institution preemptively strip diversity language and values from our hiring documents. It is not inline with the culture of Pima and shows a lack of respect and appreciation for the reality that Pima is an inequitable institution that is unable or refuses to hire staff and faculty in ways that reflect the demographics of our Tucson population. There is no language that violates law or policy by mentioning and including minoritized populations, their contributions or value they bring to our professional community.

I was recently asked to participate in the upcoming HLC Assurance argument for Pima. I was told that my expertise and perspective could be of value to Criterion 1 component 1C. Specifically I was provided the following language,

"Core Component 1C - Mission and Diversity of Society

The institution provides opportunities for civic engagement in a diverse, multicultural society and globally connected world, as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves."

I point this out because it highlights a complete disconnect from the reality of what it means to do higher education in the US and in the American Southwest, while actively trying to attract and represent minoritized populations as an institution. It is offensive that our leadership can feel good or inspired to erase the language of diversity from our institution while somehow thinking of themselves as champions of diverse communities.

This attempt to change language feels like an act of cowardice from our administration, trying to placate a racist white supremacist political administration, instead of reaffirming our values and commitments to our community and students.

In previous HLC visits it was identified that Pima fails to hire staff and faculty personnel at rates that reflect the racial diversity of our community and student population. We are now seeing our administration trying to eliminate any reference to the populations we should be attracting to support our students. Not only does this send a confused and mixed message to our Pima and Tucson community if we are truly committed to improving our demographics to be more reflective of our students population, but this language change would be antithetical to that goal.

Pima has identified the lack of transfer students attending Pima as a major concern, all while proposing to erase diverse identity and culture from the college in these documents and practices. How can we expect diverse students to feel comfortable here, when our administration can't support, or feels fearful of diversity oriented language being used throughout the college, and specifically in the way we attract and hire applicants to engage with our students?

11-5-25: I would like to respectfully express my extreme disappointment and disagreement concerning the recent decision to no longer consider DEI criteria in hiring Faculty for Pima Community College.

I have been a Community College Professor of Sociology for over 50 years. (at LaGuardia Community College and Pima) I have taught students of every minority group, from Native

American, Mexican, Greek, Black, Woman, Disabled, Ukrainian, South Asian and many many more in my career.

Students always respond more positively when their Professor is of a similar ethnic or cultural group as they are. It allows them to feel safe, heard and empowered.

Of course this is not always possible--- we do not match students in class registration.

But I believe it is imperative that our Faculty as a whole represent our students. In such a diverse city as Tucson, we must ensure that in each department there are, if possible, and if they meet academic merit criteria for hiring, Hispanic, Native American, Woman, LGBTQ, Black faculty, to encourage and support our students and understand some of the issues they face in society today.

I do not believe we need to surrender to the Racism that is being fed to us by the Federal Government at this time. Let us stand up for the integrity of each institution of Higher Education making and fulfilling its own objectives and standards. If not we are contributing to turning the United States into a totalitarian state of all White people.

By the way, I am a White Jewish Woman of 83 years old. I am happy to answer any questions you may have about my experience over the past 50 years.

11-12-25: I appreciate the earnest effort put into obtaining and incorporating faculty input for [this AP](#). While it is disappointing to see Pima is blow in the political winds (years ago by stuffing the policy with terms du jour like DEI and Latinx, now deleting most references to diversity), I am hopeful that the final proposed language deletions and additions will only have a limited effect on who we hire.

Let's please discuss the Provisional Faculty section with the AERC a bit.

A provisional faculty is a full-time regular faculty member expected to serve for no more than one year.

The term "regular" in legal/HR speak usually implies ongoing employment, the opposite of "no more than one year". PCC has until now made a distinction between regular and provisional faculty in policy language. Not opposed to changing that, just wanted to check if there may be a potential liability with using the term and to remind us to update other parts of the Handbook. Here's part of what Google served up:

AI Overview

A "regular employee" is an employee hired for a continuous, ongoing, and indefinite period, typically working a consistent schedule of 20 or more hours per week and receiving benefits. They are different from temporary or contract employees because their employment is not for a fixed, short-term duration and their employer is responsible for withholding taxes and making contributions on their behalf. The term is often used synonymously with "permanent employee" and can include both full-time and part-time regular employees. 

The term "faculty" is plural for people or singular for "the faculty body". Suggestion:

A provisional faculty **position** is a full-time regular faculty member **position** expected to serve **last** for no more than one year.

Under Purpose, suggest adding

unexpected changes in the College's financial circumstances

Under Recruitment, the following was removed:

if there is no time to recruit externally

Why not have a more open, competitive process if time allows? Likewise, removing "only" from

Direct provisional appointments may **only** be made in exceptional circumstances

changes the emphasis and makes direct appointments easier. It creates bad incentives and does not appear to serve the public good.

Under Extended Provisional Service, for clarity, paragraph 1 should be moved to paragraph 3 or deleted due to redundancy, perhaps incorporating "as soon as reasonably possible" into paragraph 2.

11-13-25:

Dear Colleagues,

I am currently an adjunct professor at Pima CC. After reading the language "strikeouts" in hiring practices guidelines, I must agree with those in the Pima faculty community who say that this clashes with the current and historic vision and mission of the College. Even if there had been unanimity on the U.S. Supreme court on affirmative action and student admissions, the issue of faculty is very different. And the question of recruitment is not even touched on in the decision. The stricken language regarding LGBTQ student services and rights protection, is especially callous.

Faculty can't know, because faculty governance and oversight has been so compromised in the managerial and corporate revolution in higher education, what pressure administrators faced from politicians. This "compliance in advance" by a storied institution and its stated, published principles, seems to this citizen and academic, unnecessary at best.

The Justice's June decision is directed at faculty and administrators in student admissions. While commentators have said this will have "implications" for faculty hiring and promotion, none are clear how. It was not nearly unanimous, and the two published of the three Dissents are or should be, guiding lights for a college to study and respect.

Higher education institutions are expected by the public to be conservative in how they bend their values to appease the whims of a passing political power. With so much instability and distortion in the social contract ensuring justice and fairness in education, it is crucial that administrators also look seriously at that oath we all must take to serve in these positions. We forget it, but it is to "Preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic...."

The country is so polarized, we as faculty have an obligation to provide not knee jerk reactions to threats of future funding penalty, and throw Vision, Mission and Public serving missions out so quickly. Both of these brim with the promise that intelligent service, "cultural prosperity" in the Vision Statement for example, means that research based and common sense efforts to offer students opportunities to learn from a culturally diverse faculty should still be honored. Especially in a climate where anything associated with "DEI" has been turned into a slur, veritably smeared, nearly criminalized.

I have been a professor and involved with Education History and Policy, and I have retired after a forty-five-year career. I've come to love all that Pima Community College does for its very diverse student body. This document is not good, not wise, not nearly good enough for the community, and the public it serves.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

The College appreciates the comments that were received. The response to comments during the update to the related Board Policy, BP 2.01 (Diversity and Inclusion), is generally applicable to a common theme in comments to this AP update. We provide that response in full and provide additional responses pertinent to other areas of comment below.

Clarification of Governing Board Policy on Hiring Practices

The recent review of the Governing Board Policy regarding hiring practices was initiated due to changes in federal policy. However, it's essential to recognize that the College's policy has not changed. The revision aims to ensure the policy statement is clear, legal, and consistent with our actual practices, particularly concerning the role of diversity in hiring and admissions.

Understanding Diversity and Non-Discrimination

The College values diversity and is committed to fostering an inclusive environment for employees and students. We actively work to identify and eliminate any discrimination that might arise in hiring and the workplace. Our prohibition against discrimination, harassment, and retaliation is broader than what federal and state laws require.

Several federal laws prohibit discrimination based on various characteristics:

- Title VI addresses discrimination based on race, color, and national origin.
- Title VII addresses discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.
- Title IX addresses participation on the basis of sex in educational settings for both employees and students.

Recruitment Versus Selection

A key point of clarification is the distinction between recruitment efforts and hiring or admission decisions. The College strives to broaden its recruitment efforts for employees and students, actively reaching out to populations who may not have previously considered the College for their education or employment. We recognize that having an employee and student population that reflects the community is a laudable objective. If our demographics vary noticeably from the community, it prompts us to evaluate potential barriers or perceptions and improve our recruitment strategies.

However, it is crucial to understand that hiring and admission decisions cannot include recognition of demographics or diversity as part of the selection process. While we can take extra steps to reach a broader audience during recruitment, federal law and College policy prohibit hiring or admission decisions based on demographic information or diversity goals.

This means that just as the College cannot discriminate against a person based on a personal characteristic or demographic, we also cannot discriminate in favor of a person based on such characteristics. With the proposed change, the College policy language will better align with long-established legal standards.

Addressing Misinterpretations

The removal of specific language from the policy, specifically a reference to "hiring" that caused confusion, does not indicate that the College no longer recognizes the value of a diverse employee and student population. Instead, it removes language that has been misinterpreted as stating that the College's policy is to consider diversity in the hiring interview and selection process. Such a practice would be inconsistent with federal law and College policy.

Ultimately, the College values all employees for who they are, our shared values, and our collective ability to support a healthy work and education environment that encourages student success. Our commitment remains to non-discriminatory practices while actively working to broaden our reach and attract a diverse pool of applicants.

Responding to other comments about the AP update, a commenter felt that using 'under-resourced' in a particular context could convey an unintended message and recommended alternative language. A variation was adopted, and the statement now reads:

We seek to hire faculty who . . . have cultural competence and understanding of the needs of a diverse student population, including low-income communities and those who have experienced limited access to education, healthcare, and services.

Several comments recommended retaining language that would allow the College to consider whether hiring an applicant would help bring the faculty or staff demographics more closely in line with our community or student population.

Notably, the College is an equal opportunity and affirmative action employer, as reflected on its website and in job recruitment materials. The College publicizes its commitment to non-discrimination in hiring (Equal Opportunity) in its hiring information. Moreover, the following provision is now included in the AP to clarify the College's Affirmative Action responsibilities and commitment:

Human Resources, in collaboration with Faculty Qualifications & Hiring, shall, as appropriate, evaluate whether faculty recruitment strategies and actions result in unintended barriers to receiving sufficient qualified applicants that meet the needs of the College. The College will develop plans and actions to address and remove identified barriers.

We should also be mindful that seeking to attract employees and students from backgrounds beyond those currently represented in the local community may further enhance diversity and the student experience.

Longstanding law and the College's policy not only prohibit negative-impact discrimination, but also prohibit providing preference based on a listed demographic or characteristic, which can also constitute unlawful discrimination. These principles are reflected in:

- BP 2.01 (Diversity and Inclusion),
- this AP 2.02.02 (Faculty Hiring),
- BP 5.10 (Equal Employment Opportunity, ADA, Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment (including Sexual Harassment)), and
- AP 2.03 (Discrimination, harassment, and Retaliation - Prevention and Complaint Procedure).

Another commenter referenced the Higher Learning Commission's criteria for accreditation, specifically component 1C, Mission and Diversity of Society, which states: "The institution provides opportunities for civic engagement in a diverse, multicultural society and globally connected world, as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves." The commenter misapplies this Criterion to College hiring decisions.

Notably, HLC accreditation begins with a series of Assumed Practices that must always be met. Assumed Practice A13 states: The institution remains in compliance at all times with all applicable laws, including laws related to research, authorization of educational activities, and consumer protection wherever it does business.

HLC Component 1C pertains to the opportunities the College offers its student body. It does not direct the College to use personal characteristics or demographics in its hiring decisions, and doing so would conflict with Assumed Practice A13.

Response to Section 4 comments

We have removed the word 'regular' from the definition because, as you are correct, our current and past usage of the term 'regular' implies long-term employment.

We added the word 'position' as you suggested. And reworded the sentence to get to a similar meaning that you were suggesting.

We also added the word 'only' back in.