

**Faculty (Contract) Hiring Committee**

(Special Meeting)

Co-Chairs: Paulette Hopkins and Mary Kjartanson

Thursday, May 2, 2019; 2:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.

Room: R1-101

*Approved: 9/5/2019*

**MINUTES**

**Members Present:** Paulette Hopkins, Adrian Gonzales, Lou Ascione, Linda Woods (proxy for Jesse Lopez), Tonia Teresh, Cheryl Barnard, Mara Palma-Sanft, Kirk Webley, Kandice Brandt, Judy Patacsil, Mary Hart (proxy for Daniel Miramontez and Lisa Brewster), Dawn DiMarzo, Larry Pink, Duane Short (proxy for Alan Viersen), Dan Willkie, Joe Young, Carmen Jay, Molly Fassler, Daniel Igou, Richard Halliday, Andrew Lowe, Namphol Sinkaset, Francois Bereaud, Gina Bochicchio, Mary Kjartanson (proxy for Darren Hall), David Mehlhoff, Scott Moller, Marie McMahon, Jessica McCambly, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry

**Members Absent:** Jesse Lopez, Daniel Miramontez, Monica Demcho, Naomi Grisham, Mona Patel, Alan Viersen, Lisa Brewster, Nicolas Gehler, Darren Hall, Jordan Omens

---

The Faculty (Contract) Hiring Committee was held on Thursday, May 2, 2019 at 2:00 P.M. in Miramar College, Room R1-101. The meeting was called to order at 2:09 P.M. by co-chair, P. Hopkins, with a quorum being present.

- I. **Call to Order** – 2:09 P.M.
- II. **Approval of Agenda** - Motion to approve the agenda by J. Patacsil; seconded by L. Pink; motion to approve carried.
- III. **Approval of Minutes** - Motion to approve the minutes by R. Halliday; seconded by D. Mehlhoff with J. Patacsil, D. Igou, M. Sanft, and A. Lowe abstaining; motion to approve carried.
- IV. **Old Business**
  - a. Faculty Contract Hiring and Search Committee Report (Hopkins)
    - i. P. Hopkins stated the respective deans will provide an update in regards to the progress of each faculty hiring which are currently underway.
      1. L. Woods stated that for the Biology position, the second round of interviews had been recently concluded. A candidate will be recommended and forwarded to the chancellor for approval. For the Physics position, the tally meeting had been recently concluded. The

second round of interviews will be conducted during the last week of the Spring 2019 semester.

2. M. Hart stated that for the Library position, the first round of interviews had been recently concluded. The candidate recommendations were forwarded for the second round of interviews, which will be conducted on May 9<sup>th</sup>.
  3. M. Fassler stated that for the Psychology position, the first round of interviews have been concluded. The second round of interviews will be conducted on May 22<sup>nd</sup>.
  4. D. Igou stated that for the History position, the tally meeting had been recently concluded. The second round of interviews will be conducted next week.
  5. T. Teresh stated that the General Counseling department tried to determine the department's needs for academic advising, especially with the new initiatives and goals. At the last department meeting, the department agreed to move forward with the recommendation for hiring a General Counseling position. A committee will be presented to the department chair. If the proposed timeline is followed, the position will most likely be filled by August 1<sup>st</sup>.
  6. C. Barnard stated that for the Mental Health position, the job description is nearly finalized and will follow the same proposed timeline for the General Counseling position.
- ii. P. Hopkins stated that the committee members should be aware of the recent retirements. The deans and departments chairs of those affected by the recent retirements have drafted a justification proposal listing the reasons for why the positions are critical to the college's needs. President Hsieh brought the proposal forward to Chancellor Carroll whom responded the college will need to wait until the May 2019 Revise Budget Report.
  - iii. The committee discussed the following points:
    1. The hold for replacement of retirements being applied districtwide
    2. The possibility of making an announcement of retirement positions for which the paperwork has been recently submitted
- b. FCHC Taskforce Report: Qualitative and Quantitative Measures 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading (Short/Pink)
- i. L. Pink stated the taskforce met once more after the previous April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. Within the presentation, he provided a summary of decisions regarding the new process that had already been agreed upon as a committee on the March 7<sup>th</sup>, April 4<sup>th</sup>, and April 18<sup>th</sup> meetings.
  - ii. L. Pink stated that the following question had been raised after the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting: How will multiple proposals for a single discipline be addressed? The quantitative spreadsheet only accounts for a single position, and therefore, multiple proposals will be need to ranked in a certain manner since multiple proposals of the same discipline cannot be equally ranked. The following two solutions were proposed:

1. Option #1: Create a fictitious position in the discipline, as if filled, to establish its quantitative ranking
2. Option #2: Only allowing for a discipline to propose only one position

L. Pink noted that the new process stated there would be no limit on the number of proposals. He also stated the taskforce recommended option #1.

- iii. The committee discussed the following points:
  1. The former procedure allowing for multiple proposals within one discipline and incorporating prefilled points
  2. If there were multiple proposals from the same discipline, option #1 would be followed in that they would all be ranked individually, but within the structure of the new process
- iv. L. Pink stated that the following question had also been raised: Should the presentation piece be continued? The taskforce recommended to discontinue the presentations. The committee reviewed the qualitative portion of the proposal.
  1. The committee agreed to discontinue the presentation piece, but allow for questions during the qualitative portion of the proposal.
  2. The committee discussed the following points:
    - a. Utilization of a rubric for the qualitative portion
    - b. Binary (on/off) switch
    - c. 50%/50% weight between the quantitative and qualitative pieces
    - d. The minor differences by decimal percentage in ranking between each proposal within the Adjunct Percentage by Discipline spreadsheet; adjusting the spreadsheet to reflect the actual percentages which would mean a tighter spread at the end
    - e. Ranking by the number of sections offered in each discipline; discussed at the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting and the committee members agreed that this would not be included as a factor in the ranking process; varying definitions of a 'section'
    - f. Ratio of the department sizes and the effect in ranking when adding/subtracting a faculty member
  3. The committee voted and agreed the ranking would be based on the nuanced approach of actual percentages.
  4. The committee voted and agreed to move forward effective Fall 2019 the new process of Qualitative and Quantitative Measures in generating the Fall 2019 Ranked Prioritized List.

V. **New Business**

- a. Faculty Contract Hiring Committee College Governance Change Proposal 1<sup>st</sup> Reading (Kjartanson/Short/Pink)

- i. L. Pink stated the taskforce was given the responsibility of reviewing the Faculty Contract Hiring Committee College Governance Handbook's language. The taskforce believed the general procedures were restrictive due to timeline constraints. Therefore, the taskforce drafted language for sections 1 through 5 in order to provide more flexibility and autonomy to the committee and to revise the terminology to reflect the new process.
- ii. M. Kjartanson stated she will send the revised language to the committee members by email. Upon review, committee members can send suggested edits to her. She stated that her concern is that in order for the process change to be effective Fall 2019 upon the committee's vote and agreement, it most likely should not have to go through the extensive, year-long process for approval.
- iii. M. McMahon stated that the process change proposal should be forwarded to the College Governance Committee for review and to ask if this can be utilized by the Faculty Contract Hiring Committee without undergoing the shared governance process.
- iv. The committee discussed the following points:
  1. The co-chairs having the charge to ensure proposals go through the shared college governance process in a timely manner
  2. Whether or not the Faculty Contract Hiring Committee reports to the Academic Senate per the Collegiality in Action meeting
  3. Establishing a timeline in order to meet deadlines

VI. **Adjournment**

- a. Motion to adjourn the meeting by M. Kjartanson; seconded by L. Pink; motion to adjourn carried. The meeting adjourned at 3:02 P.M.