



## FACULTY PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

Faculty prioritization is a key process aimed at strengthening our college, engaging community needs and fostering student success. Because prioritization cannot be reduced to one rubric, the process is multifaceted, and decision making will consider qualitative and quantitative data from program review, legal mandates, accreditation, and student education goals to come from large and small groups across transfer, career technical and student development areas. This process relies on collegial consultation between the administration and the academic senate.

### Process:

1. Each academic year, as part of Program Review, the administration and faculty will have the opportunity to fill out a faculty position request form, providing relevant data and a narrative justifying the need for a fulltime position. All faculty request forms will be forwarded to the Academic Senate Co-presidents and to the Chief Instruction/Student Services Officer (CIO/CSSO) who will then prepare the requests for distribution to the Faculty Prioritization Committee. Faculty position requests and the faculty prioritization process are completed each year. Position rankings developed during the faculty prioritization process do not carry over into the faculty prioritization process in following years.
2. Faculty requests will include both teaching and non-teaching faculty positions. Replacement requests due to tenure track attrition during the four year probationary period for that position are not part of this process and are filled automatically, unless there is mutual agreement to the contrary.
3. Requests shall be campus and site specific.
4. Temporary grant-funded positions will not be included in this process. Proposals to convert grant-funded to tenure-track faculty positions will be included in the process.
5. The data required on the Faculty Request forms and the criteria used for ranking on the Prioritization Rubric will be articulated and revised as necessary by mutual agreement of the Academic Senate and the Administration.
6. Each year, prior to the evaluation of the faculty requests, members of the Faculty Prioritization Committee (FPC) will be trained (normed) in using the criteria on the rubric. Data will be used as much as possible in evaluating the requests, but as every program is different, qualitative factors must be considered. Not all criteria are hierarchical in nature.
7. The FPC will review the data from the request forms and will evaluate each request on the basis of the specified criteria (See Prioritization Rubric and Directions).

8. The co-chairs of the Faculty Prioritization Committee are voting members.
9. In the event that the Faculty Prioritization Committee needs more information, the Co-Chairs of the committee may ask for a representative from the discipline in question to come forward to answer questions about the position; however, no formal presentations will be made.
10. All faculty requests will be ranked, regardless of how many positions may be available.
11. The initial ranking will be done by ballot as follows: each member will assign a score to each rubric category for each position request. Each member will then use their scores to determine an initial ranking of the (e.g. 10) positions, where a ranking of 1 indicates the position with the lowest priority, and a ranking equal to the total number of positions (e.g. 10) indicates the position with the highest priority. The ranking that results shall not include ties.
12. Once the individual committee members' rankings been completed all the rankings will be added together to create an overall ranking for all positions, any member of the Faculty Prioritization Committee can request an override of a ranking where there is significant statistical discrepancy of 5 total points or more with any of the members initial ranking scores. Overrides can move a ranking by one position, and are permitted when a majority votes to re-rank a single position
13. Faculty positions will be forwarded to the President/Superintendent by the committee Co-Chairs as a recommendation for action.
14. The President/Superintendent acts on the committee's recommendations and forwards positions to the District as appropriate (timing may be affected by available funding or information regarding the fulltime faculty obligation [FTO]). Should the President/Superintendent override any of the ranked positions, he or she must present a written explanation of that decision to the FPC.
15. The timeline shown below is for typical prioritization and faculty hiring cycle. The process will also apply to out-of-cycle faculty requests.
16. In the event that the recruitment for an approved faculty position results in a "failed search", the funding for that position remains in the budget and the search process will normally continue until filled. However, during this period, exigent circumstances may cause the President/Superintendent, in mutual agreement with the Academic Senate, to eliminate the position.

#### Membership of the Prioritization Committee:

Academic Senate Co-Presidents or designees (2) (1 of whom is Co-Chair)

Program Review Committee faculty representatives (2)

At-large faculty representatives selected by the Academic Senate Co-Presidents (3)

Chief Instruction Officer/Chief Student Services Officer (CIO/CSSO) (Co-Chair)

Deans (4)

Director of Counseling and Student Development

At least one member of the committee shall be a non-Eureka representative

## Timeline:

- Nov Administration and faculty fill out faculty request forms as part of Program review.  
Faculty Prioritization Committee evaluates and ranks the requests.  
Ranked list is forwarded to the President/Superintendent.
- Dec President/Superintendent announces the number of positions to be funded for the next academic year. HR initiates the process for faculty hiring.  
Faculty Prioritization Committee reconvenes, debriefs, and evaluates the process (in order to improve it).
- Jan Screening committees review applications.
- Feb Candidates interviewed; finalists selected.
- March/April Board of Trustees approves contracts

## Directions for Using the Rubric:

Prior to the Faculty Prioritization Committee meeting, each Co-Chair will be tasked with determining three interests from the faculty and administrative groups they represent and then meeting to collectively bring forward a single shared interest.

During the Faculty Prioritization Committee meeting, the single shared interest will be scored under the category "Other."

All faculty requests will fall into one of the first three blocks on the rubric: Faculty Replacement Positions (for programs/disciplines that have lost full-time faculty due to retirement or other reasons); Growth Positions (for established programs requesting full-time faculty); New Program/Discipline Position (for programs/disciplines not yet established or newly established with no full-time faculty).

Within the appropriate block, each request will be assigned 0-5 points based on the criteria listed.

All requests will be evaluated in blocks four, five and, if applicable, six. In each of these blocks, each request will be assigned 0-5 based on the criteria listed. NOTE: Not all criteria within a block are hierarchical in nature. Requests must be evaluated holistically within each block, based on a variety of factors.

The positions will then be ranked in order of the total points earned. In the case of ties, the committee will vote to rank the positions; a simple majority is all that is required for this procedure.

*Approved by Board of Trustees: February 7, 2012*

*Revised: October 6, 2015; Interim October 2016*

**RUBRIC FOR PRIORITIZING FULL-TIME FACULTY POSITIONS**

<p><b>Faculty Replacement Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stable or growing discipline or program needs replacement for FT faculty who have left within this academic year</li> <li>• Stable or growing discipline or program needs replacement for FT faculty who have left within 1-2 years</li> <li>• Stable discipline or program needs replacement for FT faculty who have left within three-four years</li> <li>• Stable discipline or program can justify replacement for FT faculty who have left within five years or more</li> <li>• Outside accreditation is at risk without FT hire</li> </ul>	<p>Points (0-5):</p>
<p><b>OR</b></p>	
<p><b>Growth Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrollment data over past two years indicate program is <i>growing</i></li> <li>• Enrollment data over past two years indicate program is <i>stable</i></li> <li>• Enrollment data over past two years indicate program is <i>declining</i></li> <li>• Independent marketing or other data indicate growth potential</li> </ul>	
<p><b>OR</b></p>	
<p><b>New Program/Discipline Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Initialization process complete</li> <li>• State curriculum approval complete</li> <li>• New program has shown significant growth without FT faculty</li> <li>• Independent marketing data suggest viability of new program</li> </ul>	
<p><b>FT/PT Ratio</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program has no full-time faculty</li> <li>• FT/PT ration below 50/50 percent</li> <li>• FT/PT ratio below 60/40 percent</li> <li>• FT/PT ratio below 75/25 percent</li> <li>• FT/PT ratio results in critical lack of effective oversight for associate faculty</li> <li>• Reliable pool of well-qualified associate faculty is unavailable</li> </ul> <p>(In the case of non-teaching faculty positions, the criteria will be the deviation from norms obtained from like institutions)</p>	<p>Points (0-5):</p>
<p><b>Program/Student Outcomes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative justification demonstrates clear need for FT faculty in order to maintain program outcomes</li> <li>• Narrative justification demonstrates clear need for FT faculty in order to achieve student learning outcomes</li> </ul>	<p>Points (0-5):</p>

<b>Other (Shared Interest)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Shared interest determined by the Faculty Prioritization Committee. Scoring rubric will be mutually agreed and will be based on the nature of the shared interest.</li></ul>	Points (0-5):
<b>TOTAL</b>	

Rubric Approved: 10/6/2015