**E & E Feedback on Faculty Prioritization Document from 1/11 Meeting**

* Patrick – Criteria of equity is a huge positive to the rubric which has never been on a template.
	+ suggests that we move question #9 to #1
	+ add a head count to the table in question #7.
	+ If we intend to diversify Foothill faculty, there’s a potential for unintended consequences in prioritizing hiring in programs with little faculty diversity. A program could preserve its priority for the next hiring cycle by actually failing to diversify their faculty in this cycle.
* Cleve – service learning considerations – for now, have it play a minimal role in the prioritization. A clarification was made that service learning refers to those already existing and what is in progress
	+ Ram responded that service learning was added for people to start thinking about
* Lisa:
	+ #4 EOPS and #5 – interdisciplinary curriculum are yes/no question, do we want to know more?
	+ #1 and #5 Enrollment trends and degrees/certificates -- should disaggregate by ethnicity for access statistics
	+ Also, should distinguish between who’s enrolling vs who’s actually getting the degrees/certificates?
* Karen -- #2 and #3 – honors enrollment and dual enrollment – do these belong under “equity”? They are broader than just equity.
	+ Ram – honors is now under equity office – goal is for honors become an equity-oriented program. Maybe instead of just asking for # of honors courses, also ask how the honors courses help serve the equity mission. He added that consideration of dual enrollment offerings is included because on opening day, Thuy showed that DE closes equity gaps
* Karen relayed concern about: #2 – fully online WSCH -- It’s harder for some departments to achieve this.
* Karen also asked about #4 – total cost of program – need to spell this out. How are we determining total cost? Is it FT/PT salary? Do we include funds coming into the program?
* Carolyn expressed appreciation to admin for moving so quickly to incorporate equity suggestions in faculty prioritization
	+ Request that we not forget the extended discussions we’ve had in the past in E & E. Although maybe not feasible to fully implement this cycle, asked that they be reconsidered again going forward in future years.
	+ Urge that we stop using the term “targeted” and use “disproportionately impacted students” instead.
	+ Support for including honors under “equity” because E&E has had extensive discussion about the role of honors programming in helping the college achieve our student equity goals
	+ Objects to including dual enrollment under “equity” for this cycle because E&E has not had any discussion regarding the role of dual enrollment in achieving student equity
	+ Debbie proposed that Honors & Dual Enrollment can stay under “equity” if we look at who these programs are serving
	+ Debbie also asked how we can ensure that new hires based on this prioritization are really helping achieve student equity?
* Lisa – #6 completion rates – be specific; what is this? How are we defining completion?
* Patrick – ordering of the questions matter
* Emphasize and lead with values (#9, #6, #4, #5, then follow with data) – makes a statement
* Sean – service learning – come up with an angle (question: if your program is going to get an award for service learning, what would it be?)
* Debbie advocated that regarding online WSCH, we look not just at increases, but look at who is taking these courses and if the equity gap is closing
* Ram – ongoing conversation, he will try to incorporate these comments later, not necessarily this year