

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee Minutes April 8, 2022

Attendees: John Crocitti (co-chair), Isabel O'Connor (co-chair), Monica Romero, Leslie Shimazaki, Chris Sullivan, Mark Manasse, Tracy Penrod, Paloma Vargas.

Agenda:

Motion to approve – 1st Chris, 2nd – Leslie

Amendment: Future meetings are from 11:00 – 12:30 (not 2:30)

Unanimous approval

Minutes:

(quick side discussion for the future process to include the list going to Academic Senate, then Pie and then to President's Cabinet before review and decision by the President.)

Amend date at of the next meeting to "Friday, April 8, 11 to 12:30"

Motion to approve with amendment 1st - Leslie, 2nd – Paloma

No discussion

Unanimous approval

Isabel – Recommended we decide on how we want to frame our discussion to review and revised the FHP process. Do we use the process that was:

- built in Spring 2021
- what we actually did in Spring 2022
- the old system

Once we decide this, we can discuss all the pieces.

John – The way we ended up in the Spring with the Data on the side was going back to the way it was before. The data was there and folks were supposed to discuss the data. He recommended looking at the process prior to this year and go back, since we tried and it did not work out. And then really look at the data that is provided so the lead writers have more to speak to. Including equity data.

Leslie – in regards to scoring the data - The impetus was to help those that don't write well the data would help.

Chris – I think we are misusing the data. The rubric is not using the data correction. It did not seem the rubric was really applicable to the data. And what is the point of the generalist question.

Leslie – How as the generalist question really a valid assessment.

Isabel – Same

Mark – Data – self interpretation, politicizing it. Can the data be presented in a way of likely hood of getting a position. A better understanding need for the campus. Position are submitted on a narrow lens – a lot of time is spent, and maybe unnecessarily if the larger needs of the campus are understood.

Isabel – That is why there are two levels of review

John – I would caution against this – programs should not be discouraged to apply. Sometimes programs don't think they will get a position.

Mark – Clarification – NOT DISWAY – Close the gap between the campus and department level need. It would help folks understand overall process and what is being discussed

Isabel – I agree Mark, it is a time investment, it is discouraging when you apply year after year and you don't get it. I would like to see, prior to people deciding to go after a position, it would be good to have a budget to know how many positions we will be able to obtain. Not to discourage, but so there is a global

Monica – what about the program review process.

Chris – but when will that happen?

Isabel – that would be great, but can we really wait for the unknown.

John – the lack of reference back to the program review is missing.

Isabel – same with BARC

Paloma – What we come up with as a committee and feed that back into program review for the development of their process. So we are not duplicating working. Can we make our rubric no detailed so that folks know what to include in their narrative.

John - when data is provided to the department they should also include the campus-wide data so the writer can see the comparison to the campus. Really emphasizes the training to help with the writing.

Isabel – so we will include campus wide data to writers for comparison – it is agreed! I like the idea updating the rubric. Like what happened in BARC and the work Mariette did.

Leslie – maybe a subgroup of this committee to look at other colleges to look at different approaches/evaluation. It takes time.

Isabel – it does take time. We would like the summer to work on this instead of rushing to have this done by the end of the year. John and Isabel would ask Pam.

Mark – Brought up the transition of people maybe we can have some continuity....

Isabel – good point – maybe keep the current people involved (all for one more year.)

John – doesn't like the portal and not having a direct link to program review.

Isabel – so let's recap: Not everyone is here, but for those of us who are, we are not going to use the process that was devised in Spring of 2021. All voting members voted yes.

Isabel – how do we envision our process – go back to the past or the one we used for this year's regular process.

Chris – can we go back and get the old process to look at it.

Isabel – how can we capture the old process as a starting point?

Leslie – How the new process was explained to the campus so that there was standardized data and to address that how some people were better writers than others and their ability to take their own data and wow us with it.

Isabel – I think that is an overall issue. I thought it was about how to capture data for program that do not have access to data or the request for the data was not applicable or comparative apples to apples or programs that do not exist yet.

Isabel - I will ask Pam what she looks at.

John – we need to train people how to write.

Isabel – Yes, we need to help if we had it at the beginning of the semester with FLEX

Decisions/Actions

- 1) Not using Spring 2021 process
- 2) Moving forward we will to review the data, process, and rubric
- 3) Next steps
 - a. Isabel to ask Pam for more time
 - b. The entire group to discuss the points
 - c. Chris will reach out to the RP group for processes and elements

Isabel will send out the PPT from the process developed last year for everyone to review before the next meeting.