



**GROSSMONT COLLEGE**  
**Faculty Staffing Prioritization Committee (FSPC)**

**Friday, 8 November 2019**

**2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**Location: 34-255**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

CO-CHAIRS	ACADEMIC SENATE REPRESENTATIVES	ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Reese	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natalia Aylett	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan Ahrens
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brodney Fitzgerald	<input type="checkbox"/> Caylor Cuevas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Javier Ayala
RECORDER	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Brodney Fitzgerald</i>	EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Krista Ames-Cook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hau Nguyen	<input type="checkbox"/> Marsha Gable
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peggy Wells	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Kyleb Wild	

PROXIES	GUESTS	ATTACHMENTS
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Barrow (Academic Senate Officer)	<b>Faculty Staffing Request Form</b>

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome and Introductions	Brodney convened the meeting at 2:05 PM and introductions were made around the table. Liz Barrow, Academic Senate Officer, was welcomed as a guest.
2. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting	<u>Friday, September 6, 2019</u> : Approved as presented with a verbal vote.
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	Javier requested "Communication" be added as New Business item #5.
4. Committee Purpose Reminder	Brodney reviewed the handout from the Sept. 6 <sup>th</sup> meeting with the FSPC's purpose: "Annual prioritization of faculty staffing requests, aligning with college mission, vision, and goals."

*Agenda continued on next page*

<b>NEW BUSINESS</b>	
1. Explanation of Old Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Handout:</b> Previous Faculty Staffing Request Form</li> <li>• Brodney reviewed the steps from last year (2018) for the 2019-2020 hires:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Faculty Staffing Comm. (FSC) met to discuss prior year’s request form/rubric and reviewed the process timeline.</li> <li>○ FSC submitted feedback to FSC co-chairs regarding revision of the request form/rubric.</li> <li>○ Once FSC agrees on revisions, the process is kicked off and departments are requested to “raise hand” if they wish to apply for a FT faculty position.</li> <li>○ Data collected for departments that raised hand.</li> <li>○ Departments develop and submit applications.</li> <li>○ Departments presented their positions to the FSC.</li> <li>○ FSC members individually score requests and submit set of scores to FSC co-chairs.</li> <li>○ Co-chairs rank each FSC members’ scores and combine rankings from all members, producing a single ranked list.</li> <li>○ FSC meets to develop narrative explaining final rankings.</li> <li>○ FSC submits ranked list and narrative to Planning and Resources Council.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• This year, CPIE and Bonnie Ripley are not available. They are available to assist with spot checking data, however cannot compile and share the data.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mike shared examples of data he has started to compile for some departments.</li> <li>○ Some of the data comes from “Reports” and other information comes from additional sources.</li> <li>○ Mike indicated that this group needs to determine the process and thus what data is needed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2. Academic Senate (AS) Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new process that FSPC developed in September was discussed at recent AS mtg.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about the extra questions for counseling and library.</li> <li>○ Concerns about the data being gathered.</li> <li>○ Concerns about the Equity question and how to answer this.</li> <li>○ Concerns that the AUP (Annual Unit Plan) is not fully in place yet, and that this new process may be better after AUP is in place.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reminder from Liz Barrow that this matter is not part of 10+1 and therefore the recommendation is not under the purview of Academic Senate. It should come back to FSPC for final determination and process and it’s ultimately this committee’s decision to go with new or old process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Academic Senate recommends that FSPC follow last year’s process as closely as possible. If a new form is selected, provide more support and guidance for faculty on how to complete the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is up to the FSPC committee to decide which process will be used (e.g., old, new, hybrid of both) and the timeline.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Javier commented that the new process has a lot of future trending reflections and focuses on where we want to go as a college. The old form may better reflect where we’ve been (our past); he requests to look at any FTES data that is available.                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If we stick with the future (new form) and look at some of the data points over time, including retention rates, we could have/use the old and the new process.</li> <li>▪ Qualitative form (new), especially the narrative, has some benefits. Able to combine the data and the retention rates to discuss what’s been happening and how this would be addressed with new faculty.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Comment from Liz that if there are qualitative/narrative questions, it may be helpful to have a reminder statement that “This is a goal of the college...” and explaining why this response is important.                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Academic Senate was concerned with not seeing a rubric in the new process and how different questions are weighted.</li> <li>▪ Comment from a FSPC member agreeing that sharing the rubric would have been helpful.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Academic Senate (AS) Recommendations (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joan suggested that the timeline be looked at first and then review the old process and new process before making decisions. If we're going to do something different, she's inclined to give longer (more) time so folks can process the changes. If we're going to stick with the old process, then a shorter timeline could be okay. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Javier commented that having more time may not be an option.</li> <li>○ Mike added that the timeline could be extended out to February 2020</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3. Norming of Scoring	Group discussed where in the timeline the norming for scoring will occur. FSPC will meet on December 3 <sup>rd</sup> to discuss and rank the applications.
4. Data Request for Departments	<i>See below sections about timeline and format of applications.</i>
5. Communication	Group discussed communication flow to ensure that all departments receive the information about the updated form for 2020-21 in a timely fashion.

#### FOR CONSENSUS

1. Deciding timeline and format of applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looking at timeline / possible calendar <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Staffing Committee is not supposed to make changes to the prioritization, only add annotations.</li> <li>○ Question about what was the timeline in the past? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One week to review applications</li> <li>▪ Presentations</li> <li>▪ Meet to rank &amp; write narrative</li> <li>▪ One week to finalize</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Discussion about this year's process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data for 5 semesters (top 10 of new format) would take about a week or so (done by department and program) to produce and share</li> <li>▪ Some of the data for the old format is the same as what's in the new format</li> <li>▪ Data integrity is a concern, which is why Bonnie has done this in the past</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Process explained for running REPORTS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Done via the GC website, only available while on campus (no remote access)</li> <li>▪ Much of the data for the top 10 areas is under "Instructional" and "Faculty"</li> <li>▪ "Total successful completion" is available in the Program Review section</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Comment from Joan about Bonnie's presentations in Canvas related to Program Review that help to describe and explain the data table and charts from the old process. She has a sense that her faculty would be more comfortable with this format since it's more similar to what is asked for Program Review.</li> <li>○ Comment from Peggy: Do we want everyone to do their own data, or one centralized person compile and share?</li> <li>○ Comment from Natalia: If we go with the new format, can we inform people that we will collect and share the data? Per Mike, yes and this could be done for the old format also.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---	---

<p>Deciding timeline and format of applications (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Comment that the “PT Faculty Count” in the old format is not necessarily a helpful piece of information.</li> <li>○ Comment from Liz: If you use more of the old process, then you’ll be familiar with it and then going forward you’ll have a better appreciation for how and why to change it.</li> <li>○ Comment from Mike: On the old process, the scoring and following the rubric has been troublesome because the rubric cannot always capture everything.</li> <li>● Suggestion from Javier to use the old data form and some or all of the new questions.</li> <li>● Suggestion from Hau to address the main issues (i.e., data, equity, rubric) from Academic Senate and then use the new form.</li> <li>● Discussion about using “success rate” versus “large class size” – is one of these (or neither of these) appropriate/important?</li> <li>● Comment from Peggy: They (Faculty) want some type of rubric even though looking at any type of table is/ can be subjective. Importance of having a norming session before the applications are scored/graded. This norming session can be done before or after the applications are received – each approach has benefits.</li> <li>● Suggestion from Joan to review/decide the timeline was revisited.</li> <li>● Scenario for “long timeline” described: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ College Council sends recommendation to President in late February 2020</li> <li>○ Committees could meet in early March 2020 to form hiring committees</li> <li>○ Applications could be posted in mid-March with applications due in late April</li> <li>○ Interviews could be done in May</li> <li>○ Decisions finalized before end of spring semester</li> </ul> </li> <li>● PROPOSED TIMELINE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Keep deadline for applications at November 25, 2019</li> <li>○ Potentially skip the Presentations</li> <li>○ FSPC meet to review, etc.</li> <li>○ Staffing Committee could work via email to review prioritized list (according to Mike and Marion agreed)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Application was updated on the document camera with input from FSPC members. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Format of application from last year was used as a starting point.</li> <li>○ Some aspects of the new/proposed form (from September) were incorporated.</li> <li>○ Rubric was developed (see below) for holistic scoring and will be included on the application when it is distributed.</li> <li>○ Narrative/Response Items were reviewed and updated.</li> <li>○ An instructions sheet will be included with the application.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Action item:</b> Krista will finalize the application, and instructions, and will prepare it for distribution.</li> <li>● <b>Action item:</b> Mike will compile and send out data to all departments on/before November 14, 2019.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Deciding on what to do about applications that have already been submitted using the new application</p>	<p>Group discussed how to handle the handful of applications that were received in October using the new format that is now being revised slightly.</p> <p>It was decided that the instructions on the updated form would state: <i>“If you already submitted an application using a different form and would like help migrating it to the official form, please contact Michael Reese or Brodney Fitzgerald.”</i></p>

3. Decision on rubrics	<p><u>Holistic Rubric was developed with input from all FSPC members:</u></p> <p>5: Application clearly demonstrates a critical need for a new FT faculty member based on an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data.</p> <p>4: Application demonstrates a need for a new FT faculty member based on an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data.</p> <p>3: Application somewhat demonstrates a need for a new FT faculty member based on an analysis of quantitative and qualitative data.</p> <p>2: Application contains limited evidence demonstrating the need for a new FT faculty member based on an analysis of quantitative and qualitative data.</p> <p>1: Application does not demonstrate sufficient evidence of the need for a new FT faculty member.</p> <p>0: Application is incomplete.</p>
4. Decision on presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question from Joan: What if we didn't do presentations this round?</li> <li>• Follow up question from Natalia: What are the presentations used for? What is the benefit of doing these?</li> <li>• Comment from Peggy: Often times the presentations are repetitive of the paper applications.</li> <li>• Group discussed if the timeline could accommodate presentations and it was decided that there is not time.</li> <li>• Idea of having departments share a short video in lieu of presentations was shared. It was decided that this is a good compromise and this will be stated in the instructions as an option.</li> <li>• Video submissions (up to 2 minutes in length) will be accepted in place of presentations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action item:</b> Krista will confirm best process for videos to be submitted.</p>

FOLLOW-UP / ACTION ITEMS		
Who	Item	Timeline
Krista Ames-Cook	Finalize the full-time faculty staffing request form (application), and instructions, and prepare it for distribution.	Prior to November 12, 2019 and ready to share on/before November 14, 2019.
Krista Ames-Cook	Confirm best process for videos to be submitted.	Prior to November 12, 2019 and ready to share on/before November 14, 2019.
Mike Reese	Compile and share data to departments.	On/before November 14, 2019.

**WORK AHEAD:**

**NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, December 3, 2019 from 3:00 to 6:00 PM** (Location = College Conf. Room; CCR – 10-106)

**Adjourned at 4:18 PM**