Proposal: Revised Hiring Prioritization Process

Based on Taskforce work conducted by Tony Ayala, Erin Duane, LaNae Jaimez, Josh Scott

May 11, 2022

Problems with Current Process:

- Prioritization ranking rationale can be difficult to understand with closed/secret ballots.
- People put in inordinate amounts of work for years advocating for a position, resulting in hurt feelings and a lost sense of comradery.
- Bulky proposals can be daunting to read and absorb.
- By the time we've prioritized and secured positions, we don't have much time to create committees or to offer jobs to most qualified candidates.

Proposed Solutions:

- Permanently moving the time-line up to allow early to mid-October prioritization
    - Allows us to identify committee members in the fall
    - Prep screening and interview questions early
    - Select students and allow them to prepare for the time commitment.
- Create a two-tier process. The first layer of proposals is quickly put together and no more than one or two paragraphs in length. The Senate ranks these proposals. Then, based on the number of positions available, the top proposals are further developed with qualitative and quantitative data (regionally and college wide) at which point the Senate can finalize the ranking of these top positions (e.g. if we expect three full time hires this year, then advocates further develop the top five proposals to compete for these three positions)
- In order to create a less competitive, more communal/consensus-driven process, we recommend the following changes:
    - Open up larger conversations in the Senate:
        - to what extent should we see our sister schools as "competition" vs "allies" as we serve our students? (e.g. if sister college X has a strong program in a given area, does that mean we should offer something similar so we don't lose students to our sister college, or should we deprioritize that program as that need has already been met?)
        - How do proposed hires impact the mission of our college?
        - what is our obligation /commitment to smaller programs that don't have the numbers to compete with the departments that serve more students and/or have larger class sizes? Do we save one position for new programs and/or small programs (Fine Arts, the library, etc)
    - Shift format of Senate to thematic meetings. Once a month a meeting would focus on a specific school (e.g. Social and Behavioral Sciences) or area of focus or special concern (e.g. Vallejo Center, Academic Success and Tutoring Center,

economically disadvantaged students, etc). These meetings would showcase what's working in this area, issues of concern, and how the Senate can support this school/area. We would consider future hires, professional development, or other aspects of campus life and student support that fall under our purview. Two added benefits of this new format would be a) opportunity for all us of to learn more about what's happening across campus and b) an opportunity to encourage more widespread participation in Senate meetings.