



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

Tuesday, 3 December 2019

3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Location: College Conference Room (10-106)

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Barrow	<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"/> <i>Vacancy</i>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peggy Wells	GUESTS/OBSERVERS
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kyleb Wild	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marion de Koning
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Denise Schulmeyer
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Catherine Webb
		<input type="checkbox"/> Victoria Rodriguez

**ROUTINE BUSINESS**

1. Welcome and Introductions	Three guests joined this meeting as observers and were introduced to the members. Marion de Koning attended to observe on behalf of the Staffing Committee, which she co-chairs, Denise Schulmeyer attended to observe on behalf of Academic Senate, which she is the president, and Catherine Webb (Sr. Dean of CPIE) attended as an observer of the process.
2. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting	Friday, November 8, 2019 – <a href="#">Summary</a> from the meeting on Nov. 8, 2019 were approved as presented by verbal vote.
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	No official additions/deletions to the agenda were made.

**NEW BUSINESS**

1. Collect scores in summary table	As members arrived at meeting, their individual scores were added to the summary table for the 20 full-time (FT) faculty positions for the 2020-2021 academic year.  The 20 applications, as listed on the summary table, represent 16 disciplines: BIO1/BIO2; CHEM; MATH; PHYSICS; COMM; DANCE; SPAN; THEATRE; CSIS1/2; DREAM; FYE; ENGL1/2; ESL; PHIL; PSYCH1/2; and LIB.
2. Review of matrix	Question raised from the group about which positions are possibly categorically funded. Mike commented that this information is for post-sorting purposes only, and will be used by the President as he chooses. It was decided that the ranking of a second (same) position was mainly based on a presumption that the department received one position.

<b>INFORMATION &amp; DISCUSSION</b>	
1. Discuss list of positions (applications received)	<p>Question from group of how the data was reviewed by the other members. Per Mike, as a group we need to decide what/which data to review.</p> <p>Each position on the list was discussed, in the order as they were listed on the summary table. Group shared information from each of the applications, highlighting areas that demonstrated a need for a new FT faculty, such as classes being cancelled due to lack of faculty, anticipated/unofficial retirements, enrollment data, number of students served, planned growth, challenges to find minimally qualified faculty for unique/specialized subject areas, and so forth.</p> <p>After each position was discussed, group members had an opportunity to adjust their scores on the summary table, which was done for some individual scores (higher and lower) across the board/summary table.</p>
2. Review of scores in summary table	<p>First round of ranking was to look at positions that scored at least a 4.0 mean on the summary table. These were pulled out and ranked by the group. Second round of ranking was for positions that scored at least a 3.0 mean. These were discussed and added to the preliminary ranked list. Remaining applications/positions were discussed and folded into the list based on input from the group.</p>
3. Discuss ranked list	<p>Preliminary ranked list was discussed. Some reordering occurred based on input from group members.</p> <p>For DREAM, FYE (First Year Experience), and LIB (Library), all agreed there is a need for these positions, however data indicated a relatively small number of students are served by some of these and/or current need did not exceed other applications.</p>
4. Finalize ranked list and create narrative on rankings	<p><u>Finalized ranked list and narrative/comments from group:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>BIO1</b> – recognition of benefit to having FT Bio 120 instructor (serves many students); full sections have had to be cancelled due to lack of instructor; offers courses that feed students into other departments; gateway course to Allied Health and related programs</li> <li>b. <b>PSYCH1</b> – low FT%; efficient department; serves many students; offers courses that feed students into other departments; gateway course; serves a large portion of disadvantaged student population; high productivity program</li> <li>c. <b>CSIS1</b> – low FT%; growth demonstrated and expected; new degrees and certificates; one current FT assigned to Distance Ed (DE) coordination</li> <li>d. <b>ESL</b> – low FT%; retirements; serves many students; serves immigrants and recently settled refugees and a large portion of international students; linguistically and culturally prepares students to go into all other classes at the college; critical need for equity</li> <li>e. <b>COMM</b> – low FT%; X-pay used; serves many students; gateway course; foreseeing an increase in offerings due to increase student demand; general education core</li> <li>f. <b>DANCE</b> – low FT%; impending retirement will have great effect; department valued for outreach efforts; new PVAC building</li> <li>g. <b>THEATRE</b> – recognized potential impact of retiring faculty as costume/makeup – essential need for department; new PVAC building</li> <li>h. <b>ENGL1</b> – large department with consistent need for more FT faculty; may not be as impacted as other smaller departments in this cohort of Faculty Staffing Prioritization; general education core</li> <li>i. <b>PHYSICS</b> – low FT%; problems with quality adjunct faculty; has had need for many years; high X-pay</li> <li>j. <b>PHIL</b> – while need is recognized with impending retirement currently at higher FT%; recognized that department is very efficient</li> <li>k. <b>MATH</b> – relatively good FT% at present</li> <li>l. <b>SPAN</b> – need did not rank as high in comparison to current applications; fairly large FT teaching proportion</li> <li>m. <b>CHEM</b> – application expressed need for single course instructor that might be met by other science faculty on campus; no X-pay; FT 42%</li> <li>n. <b>DREAM</b> – all agreed need/importance was there but since the data indicated a relatively small number of students are served; the committee was not convinced current counseling faculty could not fulfill this job; if not counseling faculty, maybe staff could accomplish some of the goals</li> </ol>

**INFORMATION & DISCUSSION** (continued)

Finalize ranked list and create narrative on rankings (continued)	<p>o. <b>FYE</b> – all agreed need/importance was there but since the data indicated a relatively small number of students are served, the committee was not convinced current counseling faculty could not fulfill this job; if not counseling faculty, maybe staff could accomplish some of the goals</p> <p>p. <b>LIB</b> – in comparison, current need did not exceed other applications; if not counseling faculty, maybe staff could accomplish some of the goals</p> <p>q. <b>PSYCH2</b> – same as PSYCH1 but all second positions considered to follow primary requests</p> <p>r. <b>ENGL2</b> – same as ENGL1 but all second positions considered to follow primary requests</p> <p>s. <b>CSIS2</b> – same as CSIS1 but all second positions considered to follow primary requests</p> <p>t. <b>BIO2</b> – same as BIO1 but all second positions considered to follow primary requests</p>
--	---

**DINNER BREAK****FOR CONSENSUS**

1. Reach consensus	All group members reviewed the finalized list and it was unanimously voted to move the ranked list to Staffing Committee so it could be forwarded to College Council (meeting on Dec. 6, 2019).
--------------------	---

Faculty Prioritization for 2020 - 2021 Academic Year	
1	BIO 1
2	PSYCH 1
3	CSIS 1
4	ESL
5	COMM
6	DANCE
7	THEATRE
8	ENGL 1
9	PHYSICS
10	PHIL
11	MATH
12	SPAN
13	CHEM
14	PSYCH 2
15	ENGL 2
16	CSIS 2
17	BIO 2
	DREAM
	FYE
	LIB

<b>DEBRIEF</b>	
1. Debrief process and share notes	<p>Group members shared general observations about this year's process, which included that the binder for FSPC members was well-organized and straight-forward overall.</p> <p>Group members also shared some suggestions for operational improvements for next time. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data to be incorporated within the application, if possible, to avoid flipping back and forth.</li> <li>• Determine how to handle multiple requests and how to best delineate the ranking if there are 2 requested spots for 1 position.</li> <li>• Establish a set amount of time that each position is discussed during the FSPC ranking meeting so the discussion is fair and equitable.</li> <li>• Clear/clean data source that everyone uses for the reference point next time.</li> <li>• Counselors: The reassigned time is captured differently; idea to present the prioritized lists side-by-side and then let College Council &amp; President decide.</li> <li>• Library: Another situation of how are students being served? We need a different method to evaluate this. Library faculty members are on 11-month calendar, similar to Counselors.</li> </ul>
2. Suggest process improvements for next time	<p><b>Considerations for improving the faculty staffing prioritization process:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tighten up on question "Is this a required/mandatory position?" Make sure everyone understands what is meant</li> <li>• Review how other colleges rank/sort positions like counseling and library where the data is different than the other faculty positions</li> <li>• Data: Have and include data that we (the group) all understand and can fully comprehend/interpret</li> <li>• History of hiring and retirements, positions in process of hiring</li> <li>• Data should be closer to applications for reviewers' convenience</li> <li>• Consider degree and certificate completions</li> <li>• How to consider multiple requests in a discipline</li> <li>• Consider course caps and what WSCH/FTEF should be per discipline/course</li> <li>• Videos better than presentations?</li> <li>• Use visual representations of data as much as possible, compare to college</li> <li>• Hard page limits and video time limits? Font sizes, etc.? No extra whitespace</li> <li>• Score directly on application vs. separate page?</li> <li>• Summary sheet include column for scores? Multiple position scores?</li> <li>• Data + 1, + 2 for multiple positions?</li> <li>• Encourage bullets rather than inessential text</li> <li>• Place for scorer notes during review</li> <li>• Option for partial categorical funding</li> <li>• TRUE legal mandates should remove applications from process; another option for legal standards, etc., especially for COUNS and LIB positions?</li> <li>• Better data to help determine need for counselors and librarians</li> <li>• How to handle sabbaticals and other special situations in data</li> <li>• How to consider data for multiple-discipline departments</li> <li>• Agree upon data set and definitions before process runs</li> <li>• How to collect feedback on process from applicants</li> <li>• How to collect feedback during scoring from FSPC members</li> <li>• VPAA has unique perspective re faculty staffing needs for all programs, hence may be good to keep in Faculty Staffing Prioritization (FSP) process</li> </ul>
3. Additional suggestions received during College Council on 12/06/2019	<p><a href="#">Attachment</a> (see below)</p>

FOLLOW-UP / ACTION ITEMS		
Who	Item	Timeline
Mike Reese	Share ranked/prioritized faculty list with Marion de Koning	On/before December 4, 2019
Marion de Koning, on behalf of Faculty Staffing Prioritization Committee (FSPC)	Share ranked/prioritized faculty list with Staffing Committee via email	On/before December 5, 2019
Marion de Koning, on behalf of Faculty Staffing Prioritization Committee (FSPC)	Recommendation (prioritized faculty list) from FSPC to be presented at College Council	College Council meeting on December 6, 2019

<b>WORK AHEAD:</b> N/A
------------------------

<b>UPCOMING MEETINGS:</b> College Council on 6 December 2019 Staffing Committee on 16 January 2020 (may be cancelled)
--

**Adjourn** – The FSPC Meeting ended at 6:05 PM.

**Attachment: Additional suggestions for next time received during College Council on 6 Dec. 2019**

- From Denise Schulmeyer: Concerns when FSPC members did not fully understand the position, if there wasn't anyone in the room with experience/institutional knowledge to address these concerns (i.e., make the case).
- From Lida Rafia, Javier Ayala, and Julio Soto: Concerns about placement on the list for Dream, FYE, Library - should these be on a different/separate process since the data available/submitted is so different.
- From Javier Ayala: Reminder that this list is a recommendation from the FSPC members and the decision is ultimately up to the President.
- From Tate Hurvitz: General consensus that Dream, FYE, Library should be on an alternate list, rather than placeholders at #14, 15, and 16. Hope that the written recommendation from Staffing includes the future consideration that these positions (Counseling and Library) be analyzed on its own right.
- From Marion de Koning: Other future considerations of the process: (a) possible return of the presentations in some manner, (b) make sure the FSPC members represent all divisions, (c) continue to collect input/feedback on the process.