

Modified Proposal: Revised Hiring Prioritization Process

Draft #2

Based on feedback to the proposal from Academic Senate on August 11th.

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 our most qualified candidates.
- Current process feels at times reactionary, with little attention to the larger context, mission, or long term needs of our campus community.
- Proposed Solutions:
- 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 when prioritizing hires 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 prioritize positions that can compete with our sister college, or should we deprioritize that position as that need has already been met on another campus?)
 - 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)
- 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 multi-step process.
 - Step 1:
 - Research and Planning would gather data to show us where our greatest needs are on campus, related to growth and student success. This report would look at fill rates, full time/part time ratios, and other internal data, as well as a consideration of the need met by sister colleges in neighboring districts. We could choose to have a taskforce (possibly

joined by Academic Deans) to assist in local research and the evaluation of the data.

- The Academic Senate in partnership with Academic Deans would have a conversation where we review our mission and consider what areas of growth (on a full-time hiring level) might help us achieve that. This would be a chance for us to consider hires in programs such as counseling, theater, music, social justice studies, journalism, etc that might not have the numbers but clearly support our mission.
- Step 2:
 - Research and Planning and the Senate/Dean Taskforce presents its report to the Academic Senate. We, as a Senate, then invite departments which either the data or our mission-driven conversation show would benefit from more full time hires.
 - The Academic Senate shares the report and our recommendations with all faculty so that members of other departments who believe they may have been overlooked in either the data or mission conversations still have a chance to create a proposal, arguing the case that a new hire is needed on the basis of mission and/or data.
- Step 3: departments / programs create new FT hire proposals and submit them to the Senate and division deans, at which point we review those proposals and individually rank them based on rubrics that incorporate both mission and data.
- Step 4: The Senate and the Vice President of Academic Affairs would provide these recommendations to the Superintendent-President as is currently the process