Academic Senate Minutes January 6, 2020

addition to the consent calendar was approved, and the consent calendar was approved by
consensus.

Summary of meeting:

- Discussion of the faculty hiring prioritization process, decision criteria, etc
- Discussion about the prioritization tool not being ready for the dean’s meeting
- What are the next steps to get faculty input on the faculty prioritization tool?
- Rescheduling the dean’s meeting to discuss faculty prioritization to 1/21/2020
- Deans will reach out to faculty program leads to get input ASAP

The purpose of the Senate meeting today is to inform the faculty hiring prioritization process.
The faculty hiring meeting is (was) scheduled for 9 a.m. tomorrow morning Tuesday January
7th, 2020. Isaac pulled up the faculty prioritization tool document for the group to see.
Procedurally, the Advisory Council would approve the list of positions, the AC meets this Friday.
If Academic Senate is comfortable with the process, Tuesday dean’s meeting could be followed
by taking the list of prioritized positions to the Advisory Council this Friday. Kristy Lisle and Paul
Starer joined the meeting to help Academic Senate with the discussion.

Laura Savage was doing EO training, there is currently an interim for that position. Folks
wondering if this could affect EO training availability, which is mandatory to serve on a search
committee. EEO training dates/locations can be found here http://hr.fhda.edu/train-dev/HR%20Trainings.html. There was discussion about how many faculty positions would be
possible, but that hasn’t been determined yet. There were some recent retirements.

Paul commented that we should consider all the faculty positions as “possible”. Sara asked
Isaac about the faculty prioritization form and process. Isaac commented that we looked at
campus need, FT/PT ratios, success rates, retirements, state wide initiatives (AB 705). The data
was presented uniformly, and deans were asked to advocate for a program other than those
they supervise, so as to provide different perspectives. After this exercise, deans clarified
division/department needs within their division.

Paul commented that Sara asked the fundamental question about “what are the deciding
criteria”, and that all faculty hires are meritorious. It’s not one controlling data point, it comes
down to a sense of urgency about the program. Paul shared that in a program with just one F/T
faculty, and if that faculty retires and the position isn’t replaced, we’re essentially closing the
program. Paul commented that for years and years the library has advocated for a new F/T
faculty, but it was difficult to get that approved. In an ideal world, we’d have F/T positions for
every program request, but we have only 3 or 4 positions available for 17 programs.

Kathryn Mauer spoke about the anthropology department, and commented further that after a
previous year’s meeting, that no one could articulate why positions were approved. David
commented that when he looked at the tool, it was aimed at large academic departments with
strong instructional components, and that we should look at providing a tool for smaller and non-

instructional departments. David also commented that honors and equity have in the past
conflicted, and other comments about dual enrollment and equity. There was also a comment
about listing demographic and gender data, how was this used? Kristy commented that the data
(sometimes) follows Perkins rules. Faculty gender data could also be used as a means to
address campus equity goals
.

Kristy commented that the data is very detailed, but with a limited number of positions (possible)
what are the three (or few) most important priority items in prioritizations?
 Carolyn commented
that the diversity of faculty can be very important in addressing success of underrepresented
populations (equity issue). Kristy commented that she thought faculty were going to bring back
feedback about the criterion that should be part of the prioritization of the tool.
 Faculty comment
that we understood the approved prioritization tool would be used as is, while also possibly

updating the tool in the future.

Kathryn asked about criterion for prioritization, and data for prioritization, and do we need to
have all the data available for faculty prioritization. Kristy mentioned understanding
 that faculty
would bring back a set of criteria. Kristy commented that she wouldn’t feel comfortable with
faculty positions being prioritized tomorrow, since there was confusion in how the faculty
prioritization tool would be used. Comment that discussion
 at senate last year did include
looking at the prioritization tool again for possible revision for future years, however we still
approved the tool as is (last year) for usage until (if) changes were made to the tool for future
use.

There was (is) confusion about whether faculty were asked to fill out the narrative portions of the

prioritization tool. The problem is, we’re in exactly the same place that we were last year. We
have to own this document, and decide to use this document
 as it approved for use, and
continue to tinker for another year
 if necessary. And do we have a process to make decisions
with the data that we have?

Going through the data sheet, Isaac (and others) were unclear about whether IR was asked to
pull data for each field on the tool (minus the narrative data portions).
 But there’s also the

concern that there are narrative fields
 in the prioritization tool that faculty were not asked to
directly fill out.
 Clarification that IR was asked to provide all data (minus narrative portions),

other than program cost.

Isaac suggested everyone be on the same page about the data to be collected for the faculty
prioritization process, and what is the timing to get that? As a group, we went through the
narrative on both the quantitative and qualitative pieces. Kristy commented that administration
would make gathering all data from the entire current faculty prioritization tool a priority.

There were comments about open ended (qualitative) questions in the form; Isaac highlighted
these. Paul commented that quantitative data was provided for almost all the elements, with the
exception of the cost of the program (#4). Not all requests are for retirements, resignations, etc.

Kristy commented that
 we should take the time we need, and not to rush the process, so that
faculty have an opportunity to weigh in on what they think is
 important. Sara asked what needs
to happen before the advisory council meets and
 has the list of prioritized faculty positions
 for
approval? What has to happen between the prioritization meeting and the deans meeting?
Answer: after the dean’s meeting, and the list of prioritized faculty positions is complete, that list
is ready to go to the next Advisory Council meeting. Discussion, do we want to shoot for the
Advisory Council to vote on the prioritized list at their January 24th
 meeting? If not, the next
meeting wouldn’t
 happen until February 28th. Agreement that February is too late, as we’d like
for search committees to be formed in the near future.
 Agreement by the body that we would
like the prioritized faculty position list to be considered by the Advisory Council on January 24th,
so that search committees could be formed soon thereafter. This means the dean’s meeting on
January 21st, is
 when/where the faculty position prioritization process will happen. In order for
this meeting to include the narrative information the faculty prioritization tool asks for, we’ll need
narrative info on the prioritization tool to be submitted no later than
 5 p.m. on January 16th, to
give staff a full
 day to get everything inputted, and ready to go for the following week’s dean’s
meeting.

Deans need to share this with department faculty. The group a (eeti)-1.eD0.73ouncent that ..

Comment that the prioritization process in the past was a bit more about whom would be the
loudest/strongest voice in the room vs a more data driven/collaborative approach we currently
have.

Tuesday the 21st of January will be the faculty prioritization meeting (Dean’s meeting).
 Isaac
Escoto, Robert Cormia and Amy Edwards will join the meeting so as to add a broad
faculty/senate perspective.
 Paul commented that it’d be really helpful to discuss
 the prioritization
process for next year, well ahead of when the actual prioritization needs to happen during the
next academic year. Agreement in the room. Isaac mentioned that we will prioritize discussion
re: future faculty prioritization processes, during the remainder of this academic year.

Announcements

Donna: it’s Jewish pride day, Donna commented that people have supported a church in Palo
Alto that was recently vandalized, and she made available

a
 document of spiritual support, for
those that would like to take one.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.