San Diego Continuing Education
Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee
Minutes

Tuesday, May 9, 2017
4:15 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., ECC, Rm. 121

ATTENDEES/ PROXIES	*Committee Members*	
	Kate Alder, Co-Chair	Neill Kovrig
	Timothy Pawlak, Co-Chair	Corinne Layton- Absent
		Mary LeDuc- Absent
	Don Aragon- Absent	Esther Matthew- Absent
	Marilyn Biggica- Absent	Pat Mosteller
	Jim Brice- Absent	Donna Namdar- Absent
	John Bromma	Jane Newcomb- Absent
	Kathy Campbell- Absent	Linda Osborn
	Sean Caruana	Sam Phu- Absent
	Robin Carvajal- Absent	Barbara Pongsrikul- Absent
	Lorie Crosby Howell	Leslie Quinones- Absent
	Ginger Davis	Cat Prindle- Absent
	Leah Gualtieri	Mary Prine- Absent
	Steve Gwynne- Absent	Lynda Reeves- Absent
	Lydia Hammett- Absent	Jane Signaigo-Cox- Absent
	David Holden- Absent	Tom Smerk- Absent
	Ann Marie Holzknecht- Absent	Richard Weinroth
	Magdalena Kwiatkowski	Carol Wilkinson

Agenda Item A:	Call to Order:

| DISCUSSION | The meeting was called to order by T. Pawlak at 4:07 p.m. Quorum concerns: 51% of representation. There are a total of 34 which would require at least 17 representatives to be present. Without a quorum, we cannot make a motion or make any voting decisions. FHPC does not conflict with the Brown Act. There's nothing that would prohibit to adopt a different standard. We need a quorum to do that. This should be the first agenda item, come fall. Proxy votes could occur in the absence of a quorum. We could also re-define our membership. Each committee is empowered to define the work of the committee itself. Another option could be to define voting membership could be one |

person from each program.
- o Based on attendance at the meeting and the ability to move forward on a quorum, we
- o As a group, we recommend decisions, not make them.
- o All committees under the Senates are Brown Act, all others are not. Senates derive their senates from the governing board.
- o Clarification of Program Chairs versus Co-Program Chairs was discussed.
- o Anyone who is a voting member, should designate a proxy if they are unable to attend.
  - ▪ One Proposal: Follow the current FHPC membership but only include Instructional Deans and one Program Chair Representative from each Program.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Vote	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item B: Review and Approval of Minutes:

DISCUSSION	**March 7, 2017 minutes**
	• The minutes draft was emailed to all committee members prior to the meeting for review.
	• Due to a lack of quorum, minutes will be approved electronically.
	• APPROVAL UPDATE: 6/1/17 Minutes were approved electronically, as is, with the following notation:
	    o Abstentions: Lynda Reeves
	
	April 20, 2017 minutes
	• The minutes draft was emailed to all committee members prior to the meeting for review.
	• Initials edit before sending out for electronic approval:
	    o Agenda A- Correct Robin's last name to reflect as Carvajal.
	• Due to a lack of quorum, minutes will be approved electronically.
	• APPROVAL UPDATE: 6/1/17 Minutes were approved electronically, as is, with the following notation:
	    o Abstentions: Lynda Reeves, Jane Signaigo-Cox

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Send out both March 7 and April 20 minutes draft for electronic approval by Committee.	• Ginger Davis	• ASAP

Agenda Item C: **New Business:**

DISCUSSION	**Timeline for Spring 2017** • When we started our discussion on faculty request submissions, we were going to put together a process to use this spring. The initial idea was to review the submitted program review reports and give faculty a chance to submit requests in the current year. With it already being May, we don't have time. • Our first goal, is to electronically approve our forms with a quorum, and begin utilizing the forms. • In April, there were questions around unexpected vacancies and how those were handled. In the past, these vacancies would still come to this committee. It's a negotiation versus a rule. In an unexpected vacancy, you would still use the Faculty Request Form. The idea was that if an unexpected vacancy happened after the program review report was submitted, the request would still come to this committee for recommendation. The opposing viewpoint would be that if someone submitted a request in the normal program review process, they could likely lose out if the unexpected vacancy is recommended.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item D: **Continuing Business:**

DISCUSSION	**Final Drafts**
	Faculty Request Form
	• The revised version, with changes/additions requested at the March meeting, was presented for approval.
	   ○ Section A:
	      ■ Add: Line Ratio of FT/PT Faculty- Support students in excelling since students are more successful when full-time faculty teach.
	      ■ Remove lines: 1) Reassigned Time for Department Chair, 2) Other Reassigned Time
	   ○ Section C:
	      ■ Correct spelling of rationale at bottom of page 2.
	• Due to a lack of quorum, the Faculty Request Form will be approved electronically.
	• APPROVAL UPDATE: 6/1/17 Faculty Request Form was approved electronically, as is, with the following notations:
	   ○ Suggested Changes: Jane Signaigo-Cox: Question D. Add a comma after transition. Attaching the worksheet with a live hyperlink for F would make it easier for them to accommodate. Maybe some information about using TOP code to obtain this information.
	Scoring Rubric
	• The revised version, with changes/additions requested at the March

	meeting, was presented for approval.
	• Due to a lack of quorum, the Scoring Rubric will be approved electronically.
	• APPROVAL UPDATE: 6/1/17 the Scoring Rubric was approved electronically, as is, with the following notations/discussions:
	○ Reject: Jane Signaigo-Cox: I think only using FTEF to justify a new position is inappropriate. FTES is critical given new funding criteria. Reward productive programs- lower FTEF yet higher FTES- and smaller programs that are requiring more faculty in order to grow their minimal FTEF.
	▪ Response: Kate: FTEF is only one of five criteria in the scoring rubric. Your concern about FTES could be clearly articulated and strongly advocated in areas B, C, and D of the rubric.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Make edits and send both forms electronically for vote.	• Ginger Davis	• N/A

Agenda Item E: **Roundtable:**

DISCUSSION	• Pat- There is current discussions regarding equalizing funding and making non-credit, credit. Looking at going to one single level for all non-credit.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item F: **Next Meeting**

DISCUSSION	• Fall 2017, TBD

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item G: **Adjournment**

DISCUSSION	• The meeting was adjourned by T. Pawlak at 4:59 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Submitted by Ginger Davis, Sr. Secretary, VP Instruction
Approved on: 10/18/17