December 11, 2015
To: Dr. Wolde-Ab Isaac, President RCC
From: Joint Chairs, R-DAS and ACTPIS

| Paul O’Connell | Kathleen Sell |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mazie Brewington | Tammy Kearn |
| Ginny Haguewood | Stephen Ashby |

CC: Tom Allen and Virginia McKee-Leone, co-chairs Strategic Planning
Mark Sellick, President Academic Senate
Attachments: Agenda from the meeting; minutes from the meeting
On Thursday December $10^{\text {th }}$, the R-DAS and ACTPIS leadership councils held a joint meeting to arrive at a prioritization to allocate eight new faculty positions. Thirteen of nineteen voting members from ACTPIS were present and 15 of 18 from RDAS, so both groups achieved a clear quorum. Two days prior to the joint meeting, members of each committee were provided via email with the principles from the Human Resources Staffing Plan, a summary of the current faculty hiring (positions being recruited, positions recently filled), the list of prioritized positions from each division along with rationales from the disciplines requesting positions, and all were asked to read once more the College Strategic Plan and Educational Master Plan.

The result of the voting, which took place after a presentation of principles and priorities from the joint chairs and a period for questions from the committee; a summary of the alignment of each division's requests to the principles and priorities established in the Educational Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, and the HR staffing Plan by division deans (in response to a committee request); and then comments from guests, is outlined below.

Seventeen (17) positions were forwarded from the division discussions. Each division had ranked its positions. The positions included were CIS, Accounting, Counseling, Library, Art, Music, History, Geography, Reading, English, Humanities/Philosophy, Communication Studies, Physics, Math (2 position requests forwarded), Life Sciences, and Chemistry.

The initial vote yielded the following results:

| CIS | 15 | Reading | 15 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Accounting | 1 | English | 19 |  |
| Counseling | 12 | Humanities | 2 |  |
| Library | 2 | Communication Studies | 6 |  |
| Art | 12 | Physics | 23 |  |
| Music | 11 | Math | 24 |  |
| History | 19 | Life Sciences | 11 |  |
| Geography | 14 | Chemistry | 11 |  |

The top seven slots were clear: Math, Physics, English, History, Reading, CIS, Geography.
Counseling and Art were tied for the $8^{\text {th }}$ spot at 12 each.
By consensus, the group decided, because the vote was so close, to do a second round that included all positions that received a vote of 11 or 12 .

The result of the second vote yielded the following result:
Counseling 5

Art 4
Music 5
Life Science 7
Chemistry 6
Again, the results were close, but the group determined that for this stop-gap process it would move forward with recommending Life Science for the $8^{\text {th }}$ slot.

Based on this process, the joint committees recommend allocating the eight new faculty positions (listed alphabetically) to CIS (for Cyber Security), English, Geography, History, Life Sciences (for microbiology), Math, Physics, and Reading.

The process made clear what many of us already knew: we have tremendous pent up demand and need for full-time faculty hires for our programs to run optimally and to really move forward with fully implementing pathways. As new hires become available in subsequent years, we are confident that the program review process will greatly facilitate the allocation of positions. But our process did clearly reveal real needs in Counseling (for tenure track, not just temporary positions), Art, Music, and Chemistry that this round was unable to meet. It is our sincere hope that these areas will be given consideration for full-time faculty hires as new positions become available. As many colleges are in the midst of a hiring boom, the ability of disciplines to meet their staffing needs with part-time faculty has become increasingly challenging, especially in areas, such as Chemistry, where potential applicants also have many opportunities in industry. We believe this process was open, transparent, and based on a careful consideration of college goals and priorities. We forward this recommendation to you with confidence that the joint committees arrived at a considered, sensible, and fair determination.

Sincerely,

