San Diego Mesa College

Faculty Hiring Priority Process

Introduction

This academic year, along with Program Review, there were no FHP requests. Instead, the FHP Committee chose to take this year to reassess the process and redesign it based on the following ideas:

1. Data should be auto-populated from Program Review and other entities in order to facilitate the application process and avoid "extra work"

2. FHP should be based on data and empirical evidence rather than on the skill of the author

3. FHP process should encourage a comprehensive vision of the program's need for a faculty hire

Types of Faculty Requests

- Instructional Faculty (faculty whose primary responsibility is instruction)

- Librarians

- Counselors

- Other Faculty Positions (positions that are non-traditional or non-existent)

Instructional, Counseling, Librarian Format

For Instructional, counseling, and library faculty the new FHP application process will be formatted around two main categories

- **Empirical Data from Program Review and Other Sources (60% of overall FHP total)**
  - Data such as FTE, retirement data, hiring data and other relevant data will automatically populate the application directly from Program Review input. In cases where FHP requests are for non-instructional faculty (i.e. counselors and librarians) data will be based on local, statewide, and national standards and ratios.
- **Responses to Clarification Questions (40% of overall FHP total)**
  - A set of 5 questions will allow for the FHP application to include relevant justifications and explanations.
  - Each response will be assessed on a 1 - 10 scale
  - Each response is weighted equally
  - All three types of requests will answer the same set of questions

Instructional Faculty Empirical Data

Data for Instructional Faculty will be automatically populated from Program Review

1. FTES/FTEF Actual over Maximum (30 pts)

2. FTES year over year percent change (20 pts)

3. Percentage of classroom FTEF assigned to non-contract in the previous academic year (Fall and Spring semester) (20 pts)

4. Percent change in contract faculty from current year to five years ago (30 pts)

Empirical Data for Librarian Positions

Data for Librarian Positions to be automatically populated from Program Review and LRC sources. Standards are based on the Association for College and Research Libraries.

1. Difference in full-time Librarians from five years ago to previous year (30 pts)

2. Ratio of FTES to volumes (30 pts)

3. Average increase in volumes per year over the last five years (10 pts)

4. Contract to non-contract ratio over the previous year (30 pts)

Empirical Data for Counseling Positions

Data for Instructional Faculty will be automatically populated from Program Review

1. Difference in full-time counselors from five years ago to previous year (30 pts)

2. Contract to non-contract ratio over the previous year (30 pts)

3. Student head-count to Counselor ratio (40 pts)

Questions for Clarification

Please use the following questions to show how the data supports your request:

1. Will this position focus on a specific area of expertise in your discipline or will it be a "general" position? Please explain how the above data supports the request.

2. How would this position advance your equity goals? What trends in your departmental equity do you see that supports your requests?

3. In what ways will this new position contribute to student engagement and success?

4. In what ways will this new position help to support your department/discipline's learning objectives/outcomes as well as institution-wide objectives/outcomes?

5. In what ways will this new hire help to support your department/discipline?

The Rubric

- 1-3 points = Rationale for position is indicated, but not justified using data sets provided by reliable and relevant sources

- 4-7 points = Rationale for position articulated and justified by use of data

- 8-10 points = Rationale for position strongly articulated and justified by use of data

Format for Other Faculty Position Requests

In order to accommodate requests for faculty positions that may not currently exist or do not fit within traditional Librarian/Counselor roles, a different format has been developed (such roles may include Professional Learning, Work-Based Learning , Learning Resource, and Instructional Design coordinators).   Because it is difficult to determine/identify specific data for such requests, this format will rely on a set of questions to determine priority.

1. What are the programmatic and/or classroom outcomes that support the request for this position? (25 points)

2. What are the projected outcomes that this new position would support? (25 points)

3. In what ways will this position support the college's commitment to equity and excellence? (25 points)

4. How does this position support faculty facilitation of student success? (25 points)

Final Points

1. While the process for "other faculty" differs from that of instructional, counseling, and librarian faculty, the questions are formulated in a way that aligns the final scores and allows for both types of requests to be prioritized on one list.

2. The empirical data used for each type of request was chosen in an attempt to present a comprehensive vision of the faculty need, however the committee also recognizes that this data can and should be fine-tuned with more expert input.

3. The FHP committee recommends that, for the coming academic year, the FHP process begin early in order to establish screening committees in the Spring semester.

Thank you!

The FHP Committee would like to extend their gratitude and appreciation to those members who are rotating out this year:

- Larry Maxey

- Leroy Johnson

- Alison Primoza

- Charles Zappia

- Danene Brown