

Academic Senate Minutes January 6, 2020

Meeting called to order at 2:02 p.m.

Roll call

Isaac Escoto (present)
Eric Kuehnl (present)
Robert Cormia (present)
Carolyn Holcroft (present)
Kathryn Maurer (present)
Amber LaPiana (present)
David McCormick (present)
Maria Dominguez (present)
MaryAnn Sunseri (absent)
Mary Thomas (present)
Kristy Lisle (present)
Tracee Cunningham (present)
Voltaire Villanueva (absent)
Lisa Eshman (present)
Sara Cooper (present)
Matthew Litrus (present)
David Marasco (present)
Mimi Rae (absent)
Donna Frankel (present)

Guest - Paul Starer

David Marasco announced that the Physics department had 3,000 children title 1 schools on campus for the physics show

Isaac thanked faculty for attending this meeting on the first day of the quarter, to discuss the faculty prioritization tool and process, the single agenda item.

Agenda was approved by consensus. The minutes from December 2nd were approved by consensus (added David McCormick as attending)

David McCormick communicated the need for a faculty rep on the search committee for a Program Coordinator II position. Question if Katie Ha could be added to the hiring / search committee for program coordinator II for restructuring the teaching and learning center? This

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 agreed that the deans will reach out to the program faculty today, and this will be the fastest and surest path to getting the task (of faculty input for the faculty hiring prioritization tool) done on time.

Sara and Kathryn (both) asked what criteria will those at the dean's meeting use to prioritize positions? Paul commented that we'll look at whatever data was submitted/gathered, and look to see program needs seem to be the most urgent?

1. Will the decision affect the program?
2. Will the decision affect accreditation?
3. In non-instructional areas, what is the demand?

For instance, can we find P/T faculty to fill positions that F/T faculty aren't available? Paul commented that the faculty prioritization decision process doesn't always fit a rubric, and that urgency is important. There will always be the comment (perspective) that there will never be a way to quantitatively make the prioritization decision. There will always be a lot of back and forth in the discussion, and it's difficult to provide an explanation as to why one position was approved and not another, that will feel satisfactory to all (as mentioned above, all faculty requests have merit).

Looking to the future. It's still not clear exactly how decisions are made regarding prioritizing positions. Comment that the current process we have, has a bit of built in ambiguity prior to the dean's meeting, as the folks in the room, then and there, discuss data collected from the prioritization requests, and try and decide which needs seem the most immediate to our campus.

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.