

**San Diego Continuing Education
Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee
Minutes**

Monday, February 24, 2020
2 p.m. – 3 p.m., ECC, PDC 106

ATTENDEES/ PROXIES	Committee Members/Guests	
	Michelle Fischthal, Co-Chair	Megan Leppert- <i>Absent</i>
	Timothy Pawlak, Co-Chair	Andrei Lucas
		Esther Matthew- <i>Absent</i>
	John Bromma	Sam Phu- <i>Absent</i>
	Lisa Cork	Shirley Pierson
	Lorie Crosby Howell	Lynda Reeves
	Marquest Glover- <i>Absent</i>	Rachel Rose
	Michelle Gray	Cassandra Storey
	Veleka Iwuaba- <i>Absent</i>	Claudia Tornsauer
	Jan Jarrell	Carlos Turner Cortez- <i>Guest</i>
	Neill Kovrig- <i>Absent</i>	Carol Wilkinson
	Corinne Layton	

Agenda Item A: Call to Order

DISCUSSION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting was called to order by T. Pawlak at 3:05pm.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Agenda Item B: Review and Approval of Minutes

DISCUSSION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 19, 2019 Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/S/C by consensus with the following edits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 2- Agenda Item C: Faculty Resource Request- Correct spelling of Vessel to VESL so that the faculty position reads as ESL VESL Contract Instructor. Page 3- Agenda Item C: Faculty Resource Request- Remove Parent Education so that the faculty position reads as Child Development Instructor. Abstentions- None Discussion- None

ACTION ITEMS	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize minutes and post them on the master calendar. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ginger Davis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before the next meeting.

Agenda Item C: New Business

<p>DISCUSSION</p>	<p>Reopening the discussion regarding membership and the distribution of voting among members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Background and purpose for reopening this agenda item was shared. At the December meeting, the committee discussed the current voting structure approved in September 2019, allowing two votes per program (one vote by the program dean and one vote by the program chair). For deans overseeing multiple programs, a vote is allowed per program, which leads to multiple votes by one person. The committee currently reflects an equal distribution and membership between all stakeholders. As an institution, if we want to model our shared governance after a democratic model, historically the practice has been one person, one vote. It is important we discuss how many votes one person can have on this committee.• M/S by Claudia and Rachel for a new voting model to allow each person one vote (One-Person One-Vote).<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Discussion:<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Our current system was designed to give each program area, equal representation. If we move to the one per person, one vote model, a decision will be needed to determine which programs only get one vote. We would need to decide how to support deans with multiple programs.– One consideration could be to look at the size of a program. Emeritus would receive two votes even though the program is producing 1/3 of the enrollment within SDCE. Programs that are not split out should not be penalized.– Each program that is represented has one program chair representative. With eight deans and nine program chairs on the committee, there is a balanced distribution of votes.– We have moved from 9-13 programs; not all programs are listed on the committee roster. Per the governance handbook, even though they are not identified and listed on the membership roster, they are considered part of the committee.– Larger programs, over time, will dominate the smaller programs. If more votes are allowed due to program size, they will naturally end up with more contracts.– In the event a committee has uneven representation (i.e. more administrators than program chairs), we may need to consider restructuring the membership to even out votes.– The purpose of the committee is to provide equal representation to each program. It is not fair to program chairs without an administrator if we move to a one vote per person model. This is about equity and equal program representation across the board. Changing the structure of a committee should not take place to address an issue in a program.
--------------------------	---

- Each program should have equal representation regardless of the size of the program. ESL is the biggest program and the current voting model does not benefit the overall program. It is only fair for each program to have equal representation.
- Background was provided on the committee’s current role in reviewing faculty requests. Rather than scoring and prioritizing requests for consideration to the president, faculty requests are identified as having met all/most/some conditions to address their unit’s need and readiness for implementation. Requests are recommended as a pool to the president for final approval.
- Additional discussion occurred around examples of voting for deans with multiple programs.
- Issue with the use of the word equitable. From a participatory governance system, committee members have not historically voted more than once.
- The function of the committee has changed to creating pools of faculty requests. As a result of this change the requirement for representation is less of a concern than when the role was to rank requests. This should be considered when deciding on a voting model for the committee.
- With the pool system, every contract faculty request proposed is equally considered.
- We could consider administrators not vote. Only program chairs which will support the one person one vote model.
- The current voting model was developed to align with the program review and the resource allocation processes.
 - In Favor: Claudia, Carol, Michelle G.
 - Not in Favor: Lorie, Shirley, Lynda, Cassandra, Corinne, Timothy, Michelle F., John
 - Abstentions: Jan, Andrei, Rachel
- The motion did not pass. We will revisit this motion as needed as the committee’s purpose and structure change.

What to meet on for all future meetings

- Future committee meetings will be held when there is a specific item needed to be discussed.
- At this time, since there are no current items to bring forward for the remainder of the year, the March, April and May meetings will likely not be held.
- Depending on the governor’s final budget, items may come up for discussion. Faculty higher dollars could impact community colleges and provide opportunities for future hiring.
- M/S/C by Timothy and Michelle F. to keep the remaining committee meetings calendared but if there are no items for discussion, meetings will

	<p>be canceled one week prior to the meeting date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In Favor: All members ○ Not in Favor: None ○ Abstentions: None
--	---

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

Agenda Item D: Roundtable

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Newsom’s Office Appointment Secretary will hold an event at ECC on April 23rd, time TBD, for individuals interested in serving as a representative on any of the governor statewide committee posts. More information to follow.
-------------------	--

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

Agenda Item E: Next Meeting

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 23, 2020, 3pm in PDC106/Zoom
-------------------	--

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

Agenda Item F: Adjournment

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was adjourned by T. Pawlak at 3:59 p.m.
-------------------	---

Submitted by Ginger Davis, Administrative Secretary, VP Instructional Services
 Approved on: 4/26/21