

Off-Cycle Second Hire Recruitment Requests: Guidelines for Review
Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB)
June 2018

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviews off-cycle second hire requests. Second hire recruitments provide a strategy and flexibility to take advantage of authorized searches resulting in strong FTE recruitment pools containing a second candidate who also meets high priority needs in the department or division.¹

There is currently no existing campus policy guiding second hire requests. Second hire requests reviewed by CPB vary considerably in both the information provided and in the quality of the proposals. This document updates CPB's "Guidelines on Double Hires" (CPB to CPEVC, 2/27/07), and is intended to encourage development and submission of consistent, informative, and complete proposals from the divisions, as well as to clarify the committee's review process.

CPB sees requests of second hires as appropriate in two types of circumstances. The first is when the finalist pool happens to contain an exceptional candidate who, while not necessarily the first choice for the position originally advertised, would be a great fit for a future departmental need that has previously been laid out in departmental hiring plans and external review documents as being among the top two departmental priorities. The second situation is when a recruitment already authorized for a future year can be filled by a candidate in the current finalist pool. In either case, CPB seeks evidence that the second proposed hire represents a special opportunity for the department and division and aligns with high divisional and campus priorities. CPB is then concerned primarily with the implications for hiring plans already in place, for future hiring plans, and with resource costs.

In any request for a second hire from a single search, CPB expects to see the following issues discussed:

Justification of a Second Hire Request:

Assuming that every recruitment should draw at least two excellent candidates, quality of the pool alone is not an adequate reason to propose a second hire. The second hire should address critical, anomalous and/or special needs or opportunities in the department (for example, unexpected attrition of faculty of a certain rank or unexpected retirements/separations that could be met by two simultaneous hires). What combination of critical and acute needs in research and/or curriculum does the second hire candidate meet? Will the hire help the department achieve or maintain critical mass? Do the two candidates bring complementary or overlapping expertise?

Discussion of the Pool and Candidates:

In assessing the programmatic need for the second candidate, the request must summarize the programmatic value of both the first candidate and the proposed second appointee. The relation of the second candidate's qualifications to academic planning is key to CPB's assessment and final recommendation. Since the motivation for two hires out of a search is based on the qualifications, areas, and strengths of the individuals, the information provided by the dean should differ from that required for CPB to simply recommend approval of a search in a sub-discipline. It is important that CPB be able to understand the planning implications of hiring these two individuals (as opposed to the single hire previously approved in the sub-discipline), and considerable detail is thus requested about how the two individuals fill the different programmatic needs of the department and division.

Although CPB does not require that CVs for the candidates be included with the request, the committee may request additional information, including CVs, from divisional deans when the departmental and divisional letters do not fully address the planning implications of the dual hires. To avoid the potential delay that requests

¹ All references to divisions should be interpreted to include both academic divisions and schools.

for additional information might introduce, CPB suggests that candidate CVs be provided with the request.

Departmental and Divisional Consultation

Because a second hire will have implications for future recruitments, all requests for a second-hire must be approved by the department in question. CPB recommends that a formal vote on the request be taken, in which case it should be shared with CPB. This vote is not to be confused with the eventual Bylaw 55 vote taken on the appointment itself, if the second hire request is approved. It may also be useful for the dean to consult with, or at least inform, the chairs of other departments within the division of the request. If there are interdepartmental or interdivisional strengths that would be enhanced by the two hires, that would be another important part of the argument for the request. Communication with other Divisions, when relevant, is encouraged.

If the original recruitment was authorized as a divisional appointment, the request for a second hire must specify clearly how the second hire fits within divisional plans. CPB is particularly concerned with divisional appointments at the Assistant Professor rank. In such cases, the dean's letter must clearly explain how adequate mentoring of the individual will be ensured, verify there are tenured faculty with sufficient expertise to conduct personnel reviews of the proposed candidate, and discuss whether the hire is part of a plan to eventually form a new department.

Impact on Existing Plans

Where is the FTE in the timeline of future proposed hires? As a general rule, CPB believes that the hire should be already planned for no longer than two years out. With this short time frame, several persuasive rationales, such as saving the cost and effort of another search as well as arguing that the pool in two years would not be significantly different, may be made.

There may be cases when using an open FTE from those in the division that are farther out on the hiring horizon will be appropriate. However, planning on this longer time frame tends to be more tentative (and often subject to revision), so the department must articulate an explicit rationale for moving the divisional FTE forward for a second hire and the dean must confirm the division's support for this move. The bar must be set higher in these cases, because to make them persuasively presents greater challenges, intellectually and programmatically, than arguing for forward-funding an approved FTE specifically earmarked for the position.

A shift in priorities may well be warranted to seize unexpected opportunities, but emphasizing one priority area necessitates de-emphasizing other previous priorities, and that trade-off must be discussed. It is critical that requests articulate how preexisting plans will be affected, so that CPB can understand and evaluate what the opportunity costs of such decisions would be; that is, given the current environment of limited resources, what previously articulated priorities would be sacrificed in pursuit of unexpected opportunities presented by the proposed second hire?

Resource Implications

Which budgeted FTE provision (or equivalent funds) are to be used for the proposed hire and startup package? To the extent that the second hire alters existing plans, the resources released or (more likely) encumbered must be identified. CPB is more sympathetic to requests that identify clearly the open provision to be used rather than simply alluding generically to future anticipated separations or retirements.

Diversity

Since second hires follow a regular open recruitment procedure, implications for diversity are addressed as part of the regular process that produces the candidates and therefore do not need to be directly addressed in the request. However, for CPB, the potential to contribute to diversity might be a criterion that would bolster the case for a second hire.