



GROSSMONT COLLEGE
Staffing Committee
Thursday, August 15, 2019 | 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
ASGC BOARD ROOM (60-207)

AGENDA

Purpose: The Staffing Committee is responsible for drafting Grossmont College’s multi-year Staffing Plan based on Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan goals, and for monitoring the implementation of Staffing Plan to promote employment equity and diversity consistent with the college’s mission, vision and values. The Grossmont College Staffing Committee is responsible for prioritization of faculty and classified staffing requests from annual unit plans.

CO-CHAIRS	ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE	ADVISORY
<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Reese	<input type="checkbox"/> Tasha Courtney	<input type="checkbox"/> Catherine Webb
<input type="checkbox"/> Marion de Koning, Faculty Co-Chair	<input type="checkbox"/> Peniel Shebi	<input type="checkbox"/> Lida Rafia
	<input type="checkbox"/> Student vacancy	

ACADEMIC SENATE	CLASSIFIED SENATE	ADMINISTRATORS’ ASSOCIATION
<input type="checkbox"/> Marion de Koning	<input type="checkbox"/> Caroline Althaus	<input type="checkbox"/> Barbara Gallego
<input type="checkbox"/> Shina Alagia	<input type="checkbox"/> Bryan Lam	<input type="checkbox"/> Sara Varghese
<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty vacancy	<input type="checkbox"/> Jessica Lee	<input type="checkbox"/> Cary Willard

EX OFFICIO	RECORDER
<input type="checkbox"/> Bill McGreevy (VPAS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Krista Ames-Cook
<input type="checkbox"/> Marsha Gable (VPSS)	PROXIES (if applicable)
<input type="checkbox"/> Hau Nguyen (FSPC)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Luma Shamon (CSPC)	<input type="checkbox"/>

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome and Introductions	
2. Public Comment(s)	
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	
4. Approve Meeting Summaries & Follow-up	<u>May 16, 2019 Meeting Summary:</u>

DISCUSSION ON PREVIOUS AGENDA ITEMS	
1. Staffing 101	Let’s schedule some topics.
2. Staffing Plan	How will we accomplish this?
3. Annual Unit Plan (AUP) and annual cycle (Catherine Webb)	How do faculty and classified staffing prioritizations fit in the timeline?

NEW BUSINESS	
4. Classified Staffing Prioritization Committee (CSPC) Results	Annotate in preparation to submit to College Council.
5. Kicking off Faculty Staffing Prioritization Process this fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine process and rubric with Faculty Staffing Prioritization Committee (FSPC) • Solicit requests • Carry out process • Submit prioritized list to Staffing Committee • Annotate list and submit to College Council
6. Summer Research Homework – Other colleges’ processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See attachment (page 3-4) for processes from Grossmont, Cuyamaca, Monterey Peninsula, Imperial Valley, Cabrillo, Oxnard, Mesa
7. Rubric	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is important in selecting which department gets a new faculty member? • How do we code that into a rubric? • Since no rubric can capture everything, how do we enhance the process with human wisdom?
8. Voting systems to create a sorted list of winners (Catherine Webb)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding scores of each voter – Classified Staffing Prioritization Committee used this most recent time • Adding ranks of each voter (Borda Method) – Faculty Staffing Prioritization has used this method previously • Dowdall (or Nauru) Method – Like Borda, but higher-ranked candidates receive more emphasis • Ranked Pairs (or Tideman) Method – Every candidate is ranked against each other

COMMITTEE REPORTS	
9. Budget Committee	
10. Faculty Staffing Prioritization Committee	
11. Classified Staffing Prioritization Committee	
12. Other(s):	

FOR CONSENSUS	
13.	

FOLLOW-UP		
Who	Item	Timeline

Attachments: Fall 2018 Faculty Staffing Committee Prioritization List Recommendations
 Fall 2018 Faculty Staffing Ranking Data
 Fall 2018 Faculty Staffing Prioritization List Ranking Variation, Analysis by Bonnie Ripley
 Fall 2018 Faculty Staffing Request Form

14. **WORK AHEAD**

- **Announcements**
- **Preparations for future meetings**

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, September 19, 2019 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. Location: Distance Learning Room (DLR)
(70-066)
* NOTE: New location starting in Sept. for rest of 2019 and 2020.

CONCLUSION

Meeting adjourned at _____ p.m.

Summer Research Homework Outcomes:

- o **Grossmont**
 - Departments “raise hand,” get data, submit application
 - Prioritization committee members score applications using rubric
 - Voters’ ranks combined to produce final rank
 - Submitted to Staffing Committee who can annotate
 - Submitted to College Council for recommendation to president
- o **Cuyamaca (Jessica Lee)**
 - Currently in the process of improving their staffing committee
 - Process is tied to program review
 - Staffing request form for classified or faculty can be filled out, and the questions on the form are related to the questions in program review
 - Requests are delivered to the staffing committee, who ranks each request using quantitative and qualitative data
 - Staffing Committee also has access to the program reviews, in order to read and fill in any background information not addressed in the form
 - For types of data, refer to the ASCCC article, “A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes”. Scroll to the bottom and click the last link, which is the paper. It is a nice, comprehensive review with helpful tips. (Source: <https://asccc.org/papers/re-examination-faculty-hiring-processes-and-procedures-0>) *Handout attached*
 - In fall, Cuyamaca will be changing the composition of its Staffing Committee, and improving the process (such as adding a critical hire process that they don’t currently have.
 - Kim Dudzik at Cuyamaca is planning to send an email to the CCC Senate’s listserv to find out how other colleges handle this and who is involved. She’s happy to share any information she gets back.
- o **Mesa (Brodney Fitzgerald) – *Handout attached***

- o **Monterey Peninsula (Catherine Webb)**
 - Any department who wishes to submit a request completes a standardized application
 - Application (reviewed periodically) includes a justification narrative and specific quantitative data related to load, assignment, LMI, departmental FTEF (FT, PT, and overload) etc.
 - Data dashboards linked to individual fields in the application are provided by the college research & IE team; department faculty use the dashboards to complete the application.
 - Applications are submitted to the Academic Affairs Advisory Group (AAAG), which is sort of a combination of Chairs and Coordinators and AAC: includes the faculty Division Chairs (10), division deans (4), Academic Senate president, and VPAA
 - Each faculty division chair is given a set amount of time (usually around 4 minutes per position) to present their positions at an AAAG meeting
 - After the presentation meeting, faculty Division Chairs discuss all applications within their divisions (including with their Academic Senate representatives) at monthly division & department meetings
 - At the following AAAG meeting, all AAAG members come together and score each application using a standardized rubric; scoring is done in a computer lab using Google Forms, which allows scores to be tallied instantaneously and discussed immediately after scoring is done
 - Any final adjustments to the scored list of positions are discussed and voted on by the group, before the list is recommended to the VPAA
 - VPAA takes the ranked list to the Superintendent/President; the list is also discussed at the President's Advisory Group (similar to College Council in structure) so that others outside Academic Affairs have an opportunity to comment
 - Superintendent/President may modify the list (but is asked to provide a formal explanation back to the college when s/he varies from the recommendation)
 - Catherine has requested copies of the application and rubric used in the process and will share once she receives it.

- o **Imperial Valley (Mike Reese)**
 - Departments complete application and fill out their own data
 - Submit to Instructional Council, who can change list
 - Submit to Curriculum Committee who can change list
 - Submit to Academic Senate
 - Then to President's Cabinet

- o **Cabrillo (Mike Reese)**
 - Initial ranking based solely on data provided by research office, top 30% of departments considered but no more than 12
 - Selected departments present at Academic Senate for discussion and ranking by senators
 - VPAA takes ranked list and can modify
 - Submit to president for decision

- o **Oxnard (Mike Reese)**
 - Departments request in annual program review update
 - Each program review committee member gets five votes (cannot use more than one vote for a department)
 - Ranked list submitted to Academic Senate who can annotate it
 - Then to president

Committees are to establish norms

In order to create valued outcomes, a commitment to participation, dialogue, and the pursuit of value in the form of useful output by all is necessary. It is acknowledged that there are power dynamics in a room. Work must be done to create the equitable and inclusive environment sought for effective and active participation. To do so, council/committee members will establish behavioral norms that include the following meeting rules of engagement, make use of meeting tools, and respect the roles of each member.

Rules of Engagement

In participatory government, a high level of collegiality, respect, and civility is expected. Those expectations include the following rules:

- There is no rank in the room when at the committee table. All participants are treated as peers, both between constituencies and within constituencies.
- Speakers will be heard one at a time and without interruption. Participants will allow for moments of silence for thought and other viewpoints. In consideration of hearing all feedback, members should be mindful of how often and how long they speak. Equity in consensus building means including diverse perspectives at all levels of the organization.
- Members will be engaged and contribute, and challenge ideas, not people. All meeting attendees will be respectful/civil in their comments, responses, and body language.
- Members will listen to others, and seek to focus on the merits of what is being said, while making a good faith effort to understand the concerns of others. Council/committee members are encouraged to ask questions of clarification.
- Each person reserves the right to disagree with any proposal and accepts responsibility for offering alternatives that accommodate individual interests and the interests of others.
- All members should be mindful of the language used in discussions, including use of "I" statements instead of "they" attributions to relate anecdotal evidence or experiences. Members are encouraged to use an asset-minded approach that focuses on what works and how something can be done. This is in contrast to a deficit-minded approach that focuses on the negative and why an initiative, idea, or project can't get done.
- All council/committee members will be aware of the purpose and responsibility of their committees. When issues arise in discussion that are not supported by the committee's charge, the chair will identify the proper council, committee, or constituency group leadership for review, and forward the issue for consideration.
- Once consensus is reached after deliberation, council/committee members will support the group's recommendation.