House Bill 2216

Sponsored by Representative GREENLICK; Representatives DOHERTY, HERNANDEZ, HOLVEY, NOSSE, SALINAS, SANCHEZ, WILDE (Presession filed.)

SUMMARY

The following summary is not prepared by the sponsors of the measure and is not a part of the body thereof subject to consideration by the Legislative Assembly. It is an editor's brief statement of the essential features of the measure as introduced.

Repeals sunset date on temporary law and makes permanent law requiring public universities to interview qualified minority candidate when hiring head coach.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

Relating to hiring practices of public universities; amending ORS 352.218; and repealing section 4, chapter 780, Oregon Laws 2009.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. Section 4, chapter 780, Oregon Laws 2009, is repealed.

SECTION 2. ORS 352.218, as amended by section 3, chapter 780, Oregon Laws 2009, and section 248, chapter 637, Oregon Laws 2011, is amended to read:

352.218. (1) As used in this section, “minority” means:

(a) A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa but who is not Hispanic;

(b) A person of Hispanic culture or origin;

(c) A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent or the Pacific Islands; or

(d) An American Indian or Alaskan Native having origins in any of the original peoples of North America.

(2) Each public university listed in ORS 352.002 shall:

(a) Consider and maintain affirmative action plans and goals when reductions in faculty and staff are required as a result of:

[(1)] (A) Reductions in revenue that necessitate discontinuance of its educational program at its anticipated level;

[(2)] (B) Elimination of classes due to decreased student enrollment; or

[(3)] (C) Reduction in courses due to administrative decisions.

(b) Interview one or more qualified minority applicants when hiring a head coach or athletic director, unless the public university was unable to identify a qualified minority applicant who was willing to interview for the position. It is an affirmative defense to a claim of a violation of this paragraph that the public university, in good faith, was unable to identify a qualified minority applicant who was willing to interview for the position.
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