1st DRAFT – Attempt to make a rubric out
of existing faculty prioritization
criteria

DECIDING FACTORS	EVALUATION METHOD *(generally 0-5 points)*	SCORE
1. A vital program will cease to exist if the position is not filled. *Was this originally meant for programs who would lose accreditation? (nursing, EATM, RADTEC?)* *(We do not need this since these programs automatically get prioritized)*	There are currently (or will be) no full-time faculty: 5 N/A: 0	
2. The need to fill the position is based on a specific program need, such as specialization, area of expertise, or maintenance of program quality or safety concerns.	Lack of expertise will eliminate necessary course offerings and/or pose a safety concern: 5 Lack of expertise will result in lack of program breadth: 3 Lack of expertise is inhibiting ability to develop new courses: 1 N/A: 0	
3. The Full-time to Part-time ratio of faculty teaching the classes (as indicated by % FT in the Program Planning Data Report).	*5 pts: Instructional programs: Less than 30% of the sections in the department/program are taught by fulltime faculty members, or a minimum number of full-time faculty is required for accreditation or licensing of a program. Non-Instructional: Less than 30% of work hours are provided by full-time faculty.* *3 pts: Instructional programs: 30-60% of the sections in the department/ program are taught by full-time faculty members. Non-Instructional: 30-60% of work hours are provided by full-time faculty.* *1 pt: Instructional programs: More than 60% of the sections in the department/program are taught by*	

1st DRAFT – Attempt to make a rubric out
of existing faculty prioritization
criteria

	full-time faculty members. Non-Instructional: More than 60% of work hours are provided by fulltime faculty.	
4. A position generates FTES (considering % of productivity goal, aggregate WSCH, and other factors which indicate size and efficiency of program in generating FTES).	*(NUMBER WILL BE REPORTED BY IE)* *FILL RATE # suggested by Oleg* *7= The discipline FT/FTE hours +1 ratio is below 30%.* *5= The discipline FT/FTE hours +1 ratio is between 30% and 45%.* *3= The discipline FT/FTE hours +1 ratio is Between 45% and 60%.* *1= The discipline FT/FTE hours+1 ratio is between 60% and 75%. ----------------------* *Non-teaching faculty positions: 0-7= data equivalency rating**	
5. Demand for a program is projected to increase, based on current program growth, increasing need in the community and workforce, and/or greater opportunities for transfer of courses to other colleges.	**5 points:** There is a high level of growth potential in the program. The position is *essential* for the program to accomplish any/all of the following: 1) Meet community and workforce demand for CTE programs and certificates. 2) Continue existing program growth. 3) Help students meet transfer requirements. **3 points:** There is moderate growth potential in the program. Some community and workforce need for new faculty has been demonstrated. The position would be helpful but not required for the program to grow. **1 point:** The program can continue to meet projected	

1st DRAFT – Attempt to make a rubric out
of existing faculty prioritization
criteria

	demand with its current staffing.	
6. The programs or positions, whether teaching or non-teaching faculty, supports other programs or positions. *IS THIS MAINLY FOR COUNSELORS? HOW DO WE QUANTIFY THIS FOR OTHER PROGRAMS LIKE ENGLISH?*	**5 points:** Many applications of this position to other disciplines. Position helps many other programs meet their transfer or degree completion needs. Position often has ancillary benefits to students outside of its discipline. **3 points:** Moderate applications of this position to other disciplines. Position helps some other programs meet their transfer or degree completion needs. Position sometimes has ancillary benefits to students outside of its discipline. **1 point:** Few-to-no applications of this position to other disciplines. Position does not help other programs meet their transfer or degree completion needs. Position rarely, if ever, has ancillary benefits to students outside of its discipline.	
7. There have been recent retirements or other departures from the positions, as well as recent replacements for such positions.	(7) FT tenured retirement vacancy or failed hiring or failed tenure greater than 2 years duration. Current vacancy filled by adjunct or overload (5) FT tenured retirement vacancy or failed hiring or failed tenure last/current/upcoming academic year. Current vacancy filled by adjunct or overload (0) No current retirements or replacements	

1ˢᵗ DRAFT – Attempt to make a rubric out
of existing faculty prioritization
criteria

8. Appropriate facilities, support staff, and other material resources are available to support the position. *(Do we really need this category? Does it apply to all disciplines?*	(2) Faculty needed to teach classes and oversee existing infrastructure (1) Faculty needed to teach classes and oversee infrastructure projected to finish within next semester (0) infrastructure in progress for future	
9. OTHER: Any other considerations implicit in the program plans related to college mission, college-wide needs, and strategic directions.	In 200 words or less, the requestor will describe any other considerations and provide supporting documentation (0-3 points)	
	TOTAL	
ADDITION?: 11. Failed adjunct hires or trouble retaining adjuncts.	Critical courses required for degrees are not offered due to lack of adjunct faculty availability: 5 points (require documentation) Some required course offerings cannot be scheduled to meet student needs: 3 (require documentation) All required course offerings can be scheduled: 0	
	100 points?	

#1 Question

- Is it possible to reassess the criteria themselves before moving forward with rubric efforts?
  - Some of these criteria cannot be quantified or suitable for a rubric format or seem unclear in general or don't provide equality for all programs. Is it alright to leave some subjective?
  - The intent/history of the criteria are unclear, and we may be misrepresenting them with the points allocation due to their unclear nature.

NOTE

- If a program needs a replacement faculty member to keep their accreditation, then administration will make that decision.

1ˢᵗ DRAFT – Attempt to make a rubric out
of existing faculty prioritization
criteria

- Disciplines requesting full-time faculty positions will type in their arguments for each of the subjective criteria and possibly provide documentation to prove those arguments.

- The criteria that require statistics will be filled in by IE.

- Senators will do the actual scoring

Discussions:

- Is there an important criterion? – Extra points for retirement/failed tenure/failed search/state law that automatically puts them at the top of the prioritization list?

- Do we change it so just faculty vote? Other colleges do not have deans vote for faculty prioritization (and they do vote a different way than faculty) (if so, do we need to change in by-laws and constitution?)

RESOURCES:

- A sampling of other colleges' rubrics

https://vcccdventura-my.sharepoint.com/personal/jamie_whittingtonst1_vcccd_edu/_layouts/15/onedrive.aspx?id=%2Fpersonal%2Fjamie%5Fwhittingtonst1%5Fvcccd%5Fedu%2FDocuments%2FFaculty%20Prioritization%20Rubrics

Pierce College's rubric

- https://documentcloud.adobe.com/spodintegration/index.html?r=1&locale=en-us