AAC Colleagues,

At our retreat on June 13, I am doing a brief overview of the Faculty Staffing process. Jerry Miller is not able to attend, otherwise he would be presenting as well.

Attached is the Faculty Staffing Rubric for 2015-16. Last year was the first time the Faculty Staffing Committee actually assigned points to each item, totaled the points, and then aggregated all the scores together to see which applications rose to the top. The process was similar to a hiring committee in that respect. Overall, the aggregated scores were sufficient to create consensus about the top 10-15, and then some deeper dialogue about those that were on the borderline.

Attached are three samples that scored well overall:
- Sociology (Petaluma)
- KAD -Dance (Santa Rosa)
- Industrial and Trade Technology- Diesel

What makes these applications among the best? (none were prefect, but all had strengths)
- They specifically and fully addressed each criteria in the rubric.
- They used the rubric to structure the document
- They clearly bolded and/or numbered the items to make scoring easy for the committee members
- They had a strong grasp of the data and summarized it accurately and succinctly
- They made a compelling case, both quantitatively and qualitatively
- They provided insights that only those with experience and expertise could provide
- They explained apparent weaknesses (such as a low average class size due to pedagogical constraints)

What applications were weaker?
- The Narrative Summary was vaguely formatted or incoherent in structure
- Some of the rubric criteria were not addressed or not addressed fully (because the rubric was new, we also considered PRPP information)
- They had a weak grasp of their own data
- They actually misrepresented the data or exaggerated the implications of the data
- They failed to make a compelling case, either quantitatively or qualitatively
- They used emotional appeals instead of reason and analysis

My recommendations to deans for 2016:
- Ask for Faculty Staffing Narrative summaries in advance of the deadline, and review them
- Require a clear structure (numbering the items to match the rubric is a good idea)
- Help your departments make a strong case; if a weak application comes in, work collaboratively with the chair to submit a stronger argument
- Be on top of the data yourself and discourage exaggeration and vague interpretation of data

In order to assure accurate comparison data for every discipline, my office now provides updated data (through spring 2016) to the committee. The Faculty Staffing Committee now receives this data directly in spreadsheet form:
- Number of certificates and majors awarded

- Fill rates for each discipline
- Average class size for each discipline
- Full time vs. Hourly percentage load

Human Resources provides this data:
Number of times a pool was opened and number of interviews (note- there were problems with some of this data last year, so corrections were accepted from deans)

If you have the time, please read over some of the examples, and bring any questions that you have to the retreat.

Best regards, Kris

Kris Abrahamson, EdD
Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences