

Recommendations to the Deans of Instruction for the Allocation of Instructional Resources, Fall 2006

Committee Members: Kate Dins, Susan Garber, Brooke Gondara, Laura Horani, Lauren Kuhn, Lynn Larsen, Esther Loanzon, Priscilla Loanzon, Peter Maphumulo, Danny Merrick, Fred Miller, Mike Neal, John Saito, Stuart Savin, Kurt Simonds, David Stout, Mary Lou Webb, Nancy Wilder

Introduction

Our charge was to recommend a process to the Deans of Instruction for the narrow purpose of determining allocation of FT faculty positions for the block hire in fall of 2006. First, our committee endorses the move to holistic, district-wide allocation of instructional resources. We also recognize that this is a major order change for the College.

We think it will be very important for the message to be sent clearly and repeatedly that we are undertaking this change, that we know it will not be easy, and that there will undoubtedly be mistakes made along the way. The key to making the process work will be close collaboration between faculty and administration.

Since the hiring process (including the Block Hire) will be affected most dramatically, programs represented on more than one campus should each have a representative on each hiring committee in the discipline. This is particularly important as transfers of FT faculty across the district become more common. The procedures for the transfer of faculty positions must be clear and consistently followed across the district.

We agree with the Deans of Instruction that it is important to have clearly articulated reasons for moving FT faculty positions across the district. Our hope is that the process and criteria we are recommending will be a helpful tool in achieving that end.

Proposed Process

We start from the premise that a vacant position will be filled in the department/campus at which the vacancy occurs, unless there are compelling reasons NOT to do so.

Step 1: Grouping of Programs into 3 Categories

Use the Spreadsheet from Institutional Effectiveness containing a series of quantitative measures to divide programs into three categories:

- Programs Operating within District Norms
- Low Resource Programs/Departments (those with resources below district norms)
- High Resource Programs (those with resources above district norms)

Consider additional criteria for putting programs into Low Resource group (= departments in which a vacant position would not be moved):

- Increasing enrollments and/or graduation rates (enrollment trends over the past five years)
- Necessity for comprehensive offerings at a campus to enhance core offerings
- Low ratio of full-time to part-time faculty on one campus in the subject area relative to the campus with the vacant position

Consider additional criteria for putting programs into High Resource group (= departments from which a position might be moved):

- Declining enrollments and/or graduation rates (enrollment trends over the past five years)
- Decline in program's relevance at the campus with the vacant position
- Stable/stagnant enrollment with limited capacity to grow (if growth is a goal)
- Higher ratio of full-time to part-time faculty compared to other programs or other campuses in the same subject area
- Reduction in projected demand for the program or subject in the future
- Low student persistence or completion rates
- Low success rate of students completing the program in state and national licensing exams.

Step 2: Three Different Scenarios

Scenario 1 (Maintain the Position at its Current Location):

If the vacancy occurs in a program that is within district norms or Low Resource, then fill it in the current program and location (do not move or reallocate the position).

Scenarios 2 & 3 (Consider Moving the Position from its Current Location):

If the vacancy occurs in a High Resource program either

- a) move within discipline to another campus to achieve greater balance
- or
- b) move to another program at the campus where it is needed most.

Answer additional qualitative questions to determine if moving the position is really warranted.

- What will the effect be on a program/department of taking the position away?
- How will moving the program affect comprehensive program offerings at a given campus?

- What are the student demographics? How will moving the program help students' access to the program where they need it most?
- How will moving the program from a campus affect other programs at that same campus (e.g. when students in other programs need courses in the program to be moved)?
- How might changing the course delivery mode, for example from face-to-face to DL, make it possible for the position to stay in its current location?
- How will moving the position contribute to creating a critical mass of faculty in the program/at the campus in order to keep the program thriving?
- How will moving the program affect any commitment PCC might have made to the community to offer a particular program?

If and when a position is moved, the Deans of Instruction should clearly articulate and disseminate the reasons for the move, using the criteria outlined above.