

Person 1

Counseling positions were ranked in the top three because of the need for counselors. The program reviews for counseling and ALD were outdated, but the need for counselors was clear based on other program reviews (such as History, English and Child Development). History (ranked 5): PDLs and reassigned time have depleted the History department. English (ranked 4): Decreased ratio of FT faculty over next two years is of concern especially with retirements and the need for basic skill instructors who are FT.

Person 2

I agree that hiring in either ESL or PE at this point is not logical. I would hope that in some of these positions (mathematics, history, counseling), if two qualified applicants were finalists, we would be able to hire both of them; based on the program review data, those three disciplines appear the most likely to be able to support two FTEF hires.

Person 3

1) Suggest only initially opening nine positions and hold some in reserve. This provides the President some latitude as the year evolves. Also to prioritize faculty positions beyond what is required based on "we have 11" is not serving the institution as a whole. The question is, shouldn't the allocations be used more effectively given some time and not just meeting a number goal?

2) BSS History, Psych, Child Development and FA Music Tech need additional staff. English Comp is a growing area and new blood would be beneficial. Math requires additional faculty for new programs and also the expansion of basic skills and transfer sequences.

3) Moved Counseling to 9. This is based on the outreach counselors have been absorbed into Counseling already. The funding for new counselors would be better served by better organizational structure as well "more" automation. The automation would also provide a level of consistence not found by hiring new counselors.

4) Removed the ALD Counselor. The role of ALD should be discussed at the college level; how much of the FH mission is to provide support to students that can never benefit from even the lowest level basic skills courses? The number of students enrolled in ALD has dropped 14% between 10F and 11F. The original program plans had a large number of PT but these were to support the classes which have been removed from ALD. The Veterans task is an important area but has a time value which will fade as we go forward. This would be better served by a trained veteran-impact PT faculty.

5) Removed the Librarian, Coordinator for three reasons. The overall vision and requirements for the LRC are not clear. FH should not hire faculty without identifying what skills will be required going forward. The position could be easily filled by PT faculty with current knowledge and new PT assigned as new focus areas identified. There are Article 19 faculty available to fill some of the positions.

6) I don't support identifying any faculty beyond the 9. This leads to bad feelings if people believe they are #12 and the President needs to change priorities mid-year. This concern became apparent when the "roll-over" statements were made last year and priorities changed. We should not box ourselves in early on.

Person 4

Although these are not in the original rankings from last year, I disagree that we should go back and stick to what we originally decided. Things have changed dramatically in the past year, and while I believe in a careful examination of things past, I believe that such an examination should lead to a discussion of "how can we do this better". Second chances are rare indeed in this life. It should always be seen as an opportunity to improve on the past, not relive it.

Persons 5-8

No written additional rationale.