SAN DIEGO CONTINUING EDUCATION

San Diego Continuing Education
Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee
Minutes

Wednesday, May 22, 2019
1 p.m. – 2 p.m., ECC, PDC 106

ATTENDEES/ PROXIES	Committee Members/Guests	
	Timothy Pawlak, Co-Chair	
	Michelle Fischthal, Co-Chair	Joan McKenna
		Sean Caruana- Absent
	Kathy Campbell- Zoom	John Bromma
	Michelle Gray	Sam Phu- Absent
	Corinne Layton	Cassandra Storey
	Andrei Lucas	Stephanie Crosby
	Neill Kovrig	Marquest Glover
	Pat Mosteller- Absent	Henry Merritt- Absent
	Barbara Pongsrikul	Laurie Mikolaycik- Absent
	Esther Matthew- Absent	
	Linda Osborn	
	Lorie Crosby Howell	

Agenda Item A: **Call to Order**

DISCUSSION	• The meeting was called to order by T. Pawlak at 1:08pm.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item B: **Review and Approval of Minutes**

DISCUSSION	• April 29, 2019 Minutes
	     o M/S/C by Cassandra Storey and Lorie Crosby Howell as is.
	     o Discussions- None
	     o Abstentions- None

ACTION ITEMS	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Finalize minutes and post them on master calendar.	• Ginger Davis	• Before the next meeting.

Agenda Item C: **New Business**

DISCUSSION	• None

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
o None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item D: **Continuing Business**

DISCUSSION	**Recommended changes in the FPH process**

Recommended changes in the FPH process
- Discussion began with a reminder of the conversation held at the April 9th meeting in which the President responded to the committee concerns regarding the final Faculty Hiring Prioritization (FHP) list presented.
- A recap of ideas shared at the last meeting to support the FPH process:
  - Incorporate the guiding principles of the institution, particularly the goals
  - Have fewer meetings (i.e. quarterly or as needed)
  - Have a pool versus a ranked list
  - Have the President attend meetings early on in the prioritization process
- Considerations provided by the President to keep in mind when deciding how the committee wants to support faculty requests:
  - FTES to FTEF in a program area
  - Technology and infrastructure
  - How impacted is the program submitting the request?
  - Labor Market data- where do we have relationships with our employers? Which jobs are paying the most?
- Priorities should be highlighted and reviewed annually.
- There are multiple funding streams now available to fund positions.
- A hiring freeze is in the near or short term future.

Role of the Committee
- Discussion occurred around the role of the committee in the facilitation of the prioritization process within Program Review.
- The goal is to be objective in our support of faculty requests submitted.
- We can provide input as a committee but reduce the amount of time and effort in the process.
- If the process in how requests are submitted is changed, the Committee could support faculty by:
  - Helping programs strengthen their arguments in having a position.
  - Identifying what is missing.
  - Sharing other data sources to add.
- We need better communication between the deans and program chairs. This Committee could identify how the dean and program chairs collaborate in this work.
- Some thoughts on presentations, use of a rubric and having a pool system

were shared:
- o Presentations:
  - A past practice which allowed faculty to present requests on positions needed through an oral presentation. A program review component was still required to be submitted so that data could be provided to support requests.
  - This would offer faculty an opportunity to add anything else not included in their original submissions.
  - It can be used for a question/answer opportunity.
  - PowerPoint presentations are not necessary.
- o Use of a Rubric:
  - The version used this year came from the consultants utilized by the PIE and Program Review Committees in an attempt to standardize the process.
  - The 2017 rubric was developed by the committee.
  - The original purpose of the rubric was to support a prioritization list.
- o Having a Pool System:
  - We would still need data to support why the request was being included.
  - Utilization of colors: green, yellow, red.
    - ➢ Green identifies positions that can be hired immediately; all factors are in place (i.e. a class is available, facilities is in place, there's technology available, there's student demand).
    - ➢ Yellow means, some factors are missing. Strategic thinking for the future.
    - ➢ Red identifies requests not eligible or ready for hire.
  - Allows for external factors to be considered, that would not normally come into play.
  - Determine eligible requests versus non-eligible requests.
  - Use a checklist to determine eligibility.
- Criteria shared by the President can be built into the process so the committee could see it. This would prevent duplication in the need to build another document such as a rubric and minimize time spent in completing program review.
- It will be good to know what our priorities are annually. Clarifying which criteria we use, could serve as the framework from which we operate.
- As a committee, we can state the criteria of what requests will be based on, should positions become available.
- As part of the process, before the list gets shared, the President's list could come to this committee as a draft for discussion for comparison to the committee's list.
- After thorough discussion, the role of the committee is to move in the direction of grouping faculty requests into categories. When we do our program reviews and identify faculty needs, criteria will be created to help

determine which group the requests will fall into. Program review reports will be written to address criteria based on the grouping they want to receive. The committee will confirm if that grouping is supported and create a pool to recommend to the President for final decision. For this to occur next academic year, the Program Review Committee will need to add three boxes to the resource justification form (i.e. groups 1, 2 and 3). In September, the Committee will define what 1, 2 and 3 are.

- *Further discussion occurred where some committee members expressed interest in using the rubric the committee created in 2017. In summary, the committee needs to confirm:*
  - Use of a rubric and adjusting it based on criteria provided from the President.
  - Requesting the Program Review Committee add three groupings to be defined by criteria from the President.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Type up criteria shared at the meeting. • Bring the identified criteria to Program Review to incorporate in the program review process for next year. • Add three boxes to the resource justification form for groups 1, 2 and 3.	• Carlos Turner Cortez • John Bromma • Program Review Committee	• ASAP • Summer 2019 • Summer 2019

Agenda Item E: **Roundtable**

DISCUSSION	• No comments.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item F: **Next Meeting**

DISCUSSION	• Fall 2019 (4th Mondays, 3p-4p) • Reviewed meeting schedule for 2019-2020.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item G: **Adjournment**

DISCUSSION	• The meeting was adjourned by T. Pawlak at 2:08 p.m.

Submitted by Ginger Davis, Administrative Secretary, VP Instructional Services
Approved on: 9/23/19