

Faculty Essential Interests in the Prioritization Process:

1) Improving the **outcome** of the process (which requests get approved/which ones don't) - *better resource management and reduction of inequities across divisions/departments (will ideally help also resolve 1320 inequities which result from some divisions having much fewer FT faculty positions)*

- Clarify factors used to prioritize the requests, and which ones outrank others.
- Ensure the process has flexibility built in to respond to unanticipated needs, factors that are difficult to quantify, and/or a deeper understanding of the needs that can emerge during the prioritization discussions while staying true to a broad commitment to the agreed-upon criteria.

2) Improving the **process** itself (how requests are made, who is involved in making the requests, which data are considered, what tool is being used to guide the data collection and analysis, how out-of-cycle requests are handled, etc.) - *more clarity & consistency, promote "data-driven decision making," reduction of frustration for all involved, more aligned with our equity values (not just the louder and more powerful voices being heard), more faculty inclusion and engagement in the decision-making process*

- We need a clear timeline, and one that handles "out-of-cycle" cases
- Clarify how department faculty can request a faculty hire (budget request, program review, some other way?)
- Revisit the Faculty Prioritization Tool to make sure it is collecting all the data points (criteria) to support the right outcomes (above)
- Clarify when the prioritization tool will be distributed, and how long folks will have to fill it out
- Clarify where (which committee, group) the prioritization process will happen, who will be at the table and what roles they will have, and how faculty can be involved
- (Discuss what to do with replacements in one-person departments when we don't have a well-established program-discontinuance policy.)

3) Improving the **communication** (about the process & outcome) - *increasing transparency, building faculty trust in decision-making.*

- In the interests of transparency and consistency, we would like the committee to give a written explanation as to why the selected positions were prioritized. We would also like all of the proposals to be released. That way departments that did not get selected and want to improve their prospects for the following year will have something to examine when writing their next request.

Administration interests:

- That it be data informed/driven (both qualitative and quantitative)
- That it be completed by spring term each year so that committees can start in the fall
- That it be driven/informed by program review
(current cycle time is 5 years, but departments do annual budget requests; however, the request forms are new and do not contain any of the data relevant to the faculty prioritization process. IP & B revisit review the annual budget request form to include

data for hiring requests. Needs to have connection between program review and budget requests. Return to this.)

- That it be transparent and fair
- That the faculty should have the right to make the case for their requests to the division and the dean, but that the dean ultimately decides what the division's priorities are. (There were questions about this one. Paul gave an example from several years ago. A FT request from CTIS was ranked #1 for dept and division. An argument was made that it was difficult to find PT faculty to teach in this area. Foothill went on a hiring spree for CTIS faculty, but the rapidly evolving field meant the CTIS faculty had to retrain since the classes were no longer relevant and demand for those courses dropped off dramatically. Both faculty and dean provide input. Deans have a bigger picture of what's going on in the division. Perhaps, the dean could show their rankings and reasonings to the respective division so folks are aware of the thinking behind the ranking. Revisit this.)
- That it maintains the understanding that departments/divisions do not own faculty lines; that they are a collective college resource
- Reach agreement on data points to be used
- Consider removing equity/demographics for prioritization while maintaining them in outreach, recruitment, and hiring (Dept doesn't have control over demographics; this doesn't belong in prioritization but rather in outreach, recruitment and hiring)
- A process that is fair for instructional and non-instructional faculty (Consider the 50/50 law which doesn't apply to non-instructional faculty, counselors, librarians, etc...)
- President maintains right to reprioritize list
- Need to talk about the process of what happens when people are in the room