

# **FACULTY HIRING PRIORITIZATION PROCESS**

## **TASK FORCE MEMBERS:**

**ALANA GATES, SONG GRAHAM, SCOTT HOWELL, KIMBERLY JOHNSON,  
TARA KUBICKA-MILLER, DANIEL OASE, & RITA VAN DYKE-KAO**

**Special Thanks To Aaron Voelcker**

# Goal

The goal of the task force is to create a process of evaluation that attempts to ensure all hiring requests are being evaluated objectively and equitably by senators as they complete the forced ranking.

# Senators Will Receive

- Normal Hiring Requests Packet
- “Executive Summary”
- Assumptions and Criteria
- Rubric

# Executive Summary - No more graphs!

## Power BI Report

Presorted and Preranked Data for ONLY the programs submitting a request.

## Data

- Full-Time Faculty Count
- Total FTES (Full-Time Equivalent Students)
- Total LHE (Lecture Hour Equivalent)
- Total FTEF (Full-Time Equivalent Faculty)
- PT/OL FTEF (Part-Time and Overload FTEF)

ASCCC Guidance is used for Student to Faculty Ratios in Library, Counseling, DSPS.

# Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate Faculty Position Request Ranking Data

Ranking

FT Faculty Count

PT/Overload FTEF

Glossary and Methods

TERM

Academic Year

All

2020-2021

## RANKING

SUBJECT	FTES	LHE	FTEF	PT & OL FTEF
ACCT	28	25	27	40
ACE	52	44	44	48
ANTH	23	25	25	24
ART	15	14	15	11
ASL	26	20	21	15
ASTR	32	32	32	43
BIOL	6	4	7	8
BUS	17	21	22	27
CDEV	22	17	18	20
CHEM	7	3	5	6
CINE	33	35	35	27
CIS	49	48	48	53
CJ	47	45	45	41
CMPR	27	29	29	21
CNSL	30	30	30	18
COMM	11	11	11	16
COSM	35	57	57	53
DNCE	51	50	50	46
ECON	25	31	31	38
EDUC	37	37	38	29
ELCT	58	57	57	53
ENGL	3	1	1	1
ENGR	57	55	55	51
ERTH	34	33	33	31

## TOTAL FTES

RANK	SUBJECT	FTES
1	MATH	767.87
2	ESBS	735.88
3	ENGL	582.34
4	OAP	534.88
5	ESL	507.94
6	BIOL	474.18
7	CHEM	393.52
8	VOC	369.41
9	PSYC	367.19
10	HIST	307.48
11	COMM	272.80
12	POLT	206.73
13	SOC	171.74
14	KIN	168.84
15	ART	166.35
16	MUS	147.11
17	BUS	129.69
18	PHYS	124.30
19	SPAN	121.76
20	WKPR	119.33
21	PHIL	111.78
22	CDEV	109.57
23	ANTH	102.08
24	WATR	100.69

## TOTAL LHE

RANK	SUBJECT	LHE
1	ENGL	691.30
2	MATH	688.90
3	CHEM	474.00
4	BIOL	439.94
5	ESBS	391.76
6	ESL	378.66
7	VOC	312.23
8	PSYC	306.15
9	OAP	283.81
10	KIN	279.41
11	COMM	275.55
12	HIST	240.00
13	POLT	160.80
14	ART	150.55
15	SOC	132.00
16	SPAN	119.10
17	CDEV	119.00
18	MUS	113.70
19	PHIL	106.00
20	ASL	105.90
21	BUS	102.00
22	WKPR	101.78
23	PHYS	98.00
24	WATR	93.70

## TOTAL FTEF

RANK	SUBJECT	FTEF
1	ENGL	23.04
2	MATH	22.96
3	ESBS	19.59
4	ESL	18.93
5	CHEM	15.80
6	VOC	15.61
7	BIOL	14.66
8	OAP	14.19
9	PSYC	10.20
10	KIN	9.31
11	COMM	9.18
12	HIST	8.00
13	POLT	5.36
14	WKPR	5.09
15	ART	5.02
16	SOC	4.40
17	SPAN	3.97
18	CDEV	3.97
19	MUS	3.79
20	PHIL	3.53
21	ASL	3.53
22	BUS	3.40
23	PHYS	3.27
24	WATR	3.12

## PT/OL FTEF

RANK	SUBJECT	PT & OL FTEF
1	ENGL	20.28
2	ESBS	17.63
3	ESL	15.42
4	VOC	12.68
5	OAP	10.97
6	CHEM	9.70
7	MATH	9.66
8	BIOL	6.71
9	PSYC	5.49
10	WKPR	4.33
11	ART	4.28
12	KIN	4.17
13	HIST	3.20
14	SPAN	2.79
15	ASL	2.55
16	COMM	2.39
17	MUS	1.99
18	CNSL	1.93
19	PHYS	1.90
20	CDEV	1.77
21	CMPR	1.74
22	RE	1.67
23	WATR	1.52
24	ANTH	1.40

# Assumptions and Criteria Handout

**Santiago Canyon College**

Faculty Hiring Prioritization Assumptions and Criteria

## Assumptions for Prioritization

- All requests are equally important and present an area of need.
- The prioritization result serves as a recommendation to the President. If the President chooses to deviate from the order of the prioritization list, it is agreed that the President will discuss the decision with the Academic Senate President.
- Positions that are legally mandated (e.g., for accreditation) will not be in the prioritization queue and will be automatically filled based on need.

# Assumptions and Criteria Handout Cont.

## Suggested Criteria for Prioritization

Note: These are not listed in order of importance; each voting member determines which criteria are most important to them but are asked to be consistent in their determination.

### 1. Executive Summary data/evidence in support of need.

- Ranking page data should only be used for instructional programs.
- Full-time Faculty Count page only includes the headcount of faculty with full-time status indicated in their contract type and includes non instructional assignments (in case any FT faculty are 100% released). Hovering over the values in the counselor and librarian recommendations will show a tooltip with a link to documentation from the ASCCC.
- PT/Overload FTEF page provides FTEF and LHE for major semesters and shorter-terms, separately. This should be used to determine how many FT faculty can be supported within the department based on PT and Overload assignments.

# Assumptions and Criteria Handout Cont.

## 2. **The impact of a full-time faculty position.**

Lack of a new full-time position would might result in the department or a program within the department from existing.

## 3. **“Other” areas to consider such as:**

- Difficulty in finding adjuncts.
- Demand for the program is projected to increase.
- Community impact.
- Changes to legislature.
- Changes in the student body.
- The program does not have a full-time faculty member.
- Retirements or other departures from the position.
- Any other needs described in the narrative.



# Rubric

## Criteria Scoring Rubric

	1 point	5 points	10 points	Possible
<b>Executive Summary- Data/Evidence in support of need</b>	Minimal need as substantiated by appropriate data.	Moderate need as substantiated by appropriate data.	Significant need as substantiated by appropriate data.	10
	1 point	3 points	5 points	
<b>The impact of a full-time faculty position.</b>	Lack of position would minimally impact a program's ability to exist.	Lack of position would moderately impact a program's ability to exist.	Lack of position would significantly impact a program's ability to exist.	5
	1 point	5 points	10 points	
<b>"Other" areas to consider (see list above)</b>	Minimal need when considering other areas.	Moderate need when considering other areas.	Significant need when considering other areas.	10
			<b>Total Maximum Score</b>	<b>25</b>