

Faculty Replacements & Faculty Position Requests Ranking—A Historical Perspective

Replacing Retiring Faculty

A review of Academic Senate minutes reveals that while the Taft College Academic Senate did vote in January of 2012 to replace all retiring faculty (except one) that year, the senate did not adopt an official practice of doing so. This is reiterated in the February 6, 2012 minutes, which state that the senate “did not create an official policy to always fill positions as they become vacant,” although we did amend our ranking to include replacing Leslie Bauer’s position, as her retirement was announced subsequent to the other retirements. By September of 2012, the minutes document that faculty were under the impression that a practice to automatically refill retiring faculty was in place, though no prior minutes document the senate taking that position.

In September of 2012, Sharyn Eveland reported as “other” that the senate’s “faculty hiring process was not followed” after Jack Gallon retired as Learning Skills Instructor that summer and was not replaced. Vicki Jacobi stated that the Learning Support Division wanted to evaluate restructuring the position.

In October of 2012, Dena Maloney reported to the senate that Taft College had not complied with the 50% law, using \$95,000 less than half of total expenditures on classroom instruction, and that we had applied for an exemption.

In December of 2014, the Academic Senate voted to replace Computer Science at 100% when Linda West was to retire, but this did not happen.

In April of 2015, the Academic Senate voted to move Sonja Swenson’s salary line to 100% Studio Art on Sonja’s retirement, which did happen.

The Chancellor’s Office October 7, 2016 “Fiscal Services Memo 16-09” lists our actual fall, 2016 FON at 57.7 with a “Compliance FINAL” FON of 56.7.

I don’t know where we currently stand with 50% compliance or 75/25 but will investigate.

Ranking of Faculty Position Requests

The senate voted to adopt criteria for ranking faculty position requests in January of 2012. In February of 2012, IAR&P requested an analysis of the results to determine if bias was present in using the criteria, and objections were made about three of the criteria’s applicability to counseling positions, as well as the fact that different chairs were interpreting the criteria differently and applying different types of data to the same criteria. However, no formal action was taken to amend or abandon the criteria. By November of 2013, the ranking sheet had changed to no longer include the criteria as independently applied Likert scales totaling a score for each position, and the current form was adopted. The criteria remained the basis for chairs’ presentations, but over time, not all criteria were addressed in each presentation. It appears, from the information above, that the replacement of retiring faculty remained

an inter-related factor that the senate would consider as needed and adjust their recommendations accordingly.

The 2012 criteria, still used by some chairs in their presentations, are as follows:

- *Immediate Impact on Existing Programs
- *Impact on Major Requirements
- *Impact on Transfer/Completion for Certificate Programs
- *Distinction between GE and Programs (Gen Ed. is precedent) Transfer/CTE/Basic Skills
- *Number of Students Served
- *Student Need (professional services needed to help student success i.e. counselor)
- *Number of Other Faculty Remaining in Division
- *Linked to Program Review and Planning
- *Fits Mission of the College – CTE and Transfer, community needs, student needs
- *Campus/Faculty Resources
- *How Many Students in Each Major
- *Length of Time Position has been Vacant
- *Financial Cost of Instructors

In 2015, \$60 million was earmarked in the state budget for hiring of new faculty. Compliance with the Brown Act (that all senators had to be present to vote) provoked the senate to push back its ranking process to a meeting which all could be available to attend. However, before the senate had ranked position requests, other positions were already being flown at many other colleges. In an effort to be Brown Act compliant and have the ability to fly positions sooner, we voted to push ranking of faculty position requests to the August in-service, especially because projections for the following year's budget estimated an increase to \$82 million for faculty hiring. However, this projection was incorrect.

Possible Solutions

- 1) Move the ranking of faculty position requests to the January in-service. Encourage retiring faculty to make their retirement plans known to their chair prior to January. Rank retiring positions alongside new position requests. This would allow time to discuss existing and/or adopt new criteria, as Jennifer Altenhofel and Michelle Oja have proposed.
- 2) Keep the issues of retiring faculty and new position requests separate. Retiring positions could:
 - a) Deserve automatic refilling, in the eyes of the senate, regardless of new position requests, or
 - b) Be modified, per the division of the retiring faculty's discretion, and endorsed by the senate, still having precedence over new position requests