Hiring requests will only be considered when they are submitted by the department chair. All Counselor positions should be requested through the Counseling Department program review/annual update. Positions submitted without department approval will not be considered.

### Department:

**Discipline* (as it appears in the Catalog):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Is this a replacement request for a full-time position that has not been filled during the last five years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* if yes, provide the name(s) and dates of separation.

---

*Counseling: EOPS and Counseling: DSPS should be considered disciplines but all information must be submitted by the Counseling Department for Counselor positions in EOPS or DSPS or elsewhere.

---

### A. Staffing and Enrollment per Faculty: Departments that are Primarily Instructional Only

1. **Staffing** (50 points maximum allotted per rubric)

   - As provided by OIEA, how many additional full-time faculty can this discipline support towards reaching a 75/25 full-time to adjunct ratio? (1)
   
   - How many full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) in this discipline are currently reassigned outside of the department including Academic Senate officers, AFT representatives, and other campus-wide positions? Do not count non-teaching positions that are permanently assigned within the department such as chair, lab coordinators, and discipline-specific program coordinators. A list of all reassigned faculty can be provided by Academic Affairs. (2)
   
   - How many approved hires within this discipline are currently unfilled? (3)
   
   - How many growth positions in this discipline are being requested and prioritized before this position? Enter 0 for a replacement position. (4)
   
   - Enter (1) – (2) – (3) – (4) in the box below (round to one decimal place). This figure represents the total number of additional full-time faculty this discipline can support towards reaching a 75/25 full-time to adjunct ratio.
   
   - As provided by OIEA, how many full-time faculty taught in the discipline in the most recent fall term? (6)
   
   - Enter (5) / [(3) + (4) + (6)] below (round to one decimal place). This number measures relative need for additional full-time faculty based on the current size of the discipline, factoring in other growth requests. A value of 1 indicates that a discipline would need to double in size to reach a 75/25 ratio. The larger the value, the greater the relative need.

   - **Relative need:**

2. **Enrollment per Faculty**

   - As provided by OIEA, what is the discipline’s FTES / FTEF ratio for the most recent fall term available?

   - **FTES/FTEF**

---

For questions about Program Review Annual Update Planning process, contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement, 323-415-4152 OR arenasr@elac.edu.
1. **Staffing (50 points maximum allotted per rubric)**

   As provided by OIEA, enter the number of students for the most recent fall term relevant to your program.
   
   (1) ______

   How many full-time faculty are in your discipline, including retiring faculty? Counseling: EOPS and Counseling: DSPS should be considered separate disciplines and not counted with general Counseling.
   
   (2) ______

   How many growth positions in this discipline are being requested and prioritized before this position? Enter 0 for a replacement position.
   
   (3) ______

   How many full-time equivalent faculty positions in your discipline are permanently reassigned away from general duties within the discipline? (For example, Transfer Center Director)
   
   (4) ______

   Enter (2) + (3) – (4) in the box.
   
   (5) ______

   Please provide either a state-mandated or institution-set student per faculty target ratio. This ratio should take into account the “normal” duties of the faculty member, which may take them away from direct service to students.
   
   (6) Target ratio: ______

   Please explain in detail how the target ratio above was determined.
   
   Click here to enter text.

   Enter [(1) – (6)*(5)] / (6) in the box below (round to one decimal place). This is the number of additional faculty required to reach the target ratio.
   
   (7) ______ additional faculty

   Enter (7) / (5) below (round to one decimal place). This number measures relative need for additional full-time faculty based on the current size of the discipline, factoring in other growth requests. A value of 1 indicates that a discipline would need to double in size to serve students at the target ratio. The larger the value, the greater the relative need.
   
   Relative need: ______

2. **Funding**

   Please choose one of the following. Consult with your dean or Administrative Services if you are unsure of how to respond.

   A. ☐ This position will be supported by the existing budget for this area.

   B. ☐ This position will be supported by categorical or restricted funding. Please enter the name of the funding source. ______

      If this fund requires a match, can this match be fully covered by the existing budget for this area or this area’s division. Yes ☐ No ☐

      Please enter the ratio for a required match. ______

   C. ☐ This position will require an increase in the overall budget for this area.

   Though not directly part of the rubric, the HPC will use this information in conjunction with guidance from OIEA in evaluating the financial impact of this position on the college.
Please reference your most recent Annual Update and Program Review Self-Evaluation (PRSE) to answer the following questions:

1. (25 points maximum)
   How does filling this position align with the Program Plan and/or recommendations of your department’s PRSE?

2. (25 points maximum)
   In what ways will filling this position further your departmental efforts to develop or enhance new or existing programs and/or curriculum in ways that cannot be done by current faculty?

   Please list the department’s desirable qualifications for this position in preparation for the job announcement.

Oral Response to committee questions (Optional, but Highly Recommend).

Originator  Click here to enter text.

Department Chair  Click here to enter text.

Designated Dean’s Signature  Click here to enter text.
Rubric for HPC 2019-2020 Academic Year

1. When applying the rubric, the reviewers will assign zero points for any section left blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Staffing: Growth position</th>
<th>Staffing: Replacement position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 or more additional faculty members AND Relative need greater than 1</td>
<td>0 or more additional faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiply relative need by 50</td>
<td>Relative need between 0 and 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Less than 1 additional faculty member*</td>
<td>Less than 0 additional faculty members*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Points for this section are determined objectively through the application of the rules in this table.

B. Educational Program 50 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alignment with Program Review (25 points)</th>
<th>Program and Curriculum Development/Enhancement (25 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The position fulfills a specific need identified in the Program Review (25 points)</td>
<td>Clear and substantial benefit for program and curriculum development/enhancement, should have example (25 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The position is related to needs that are identified in the Program Review (20 points)</td>
<td>Moderate benefit for program and curriculum development/enhancement, limited example (20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The position is not directly related to needs identified in the Program Review ** (10 points)</td>
<td>Weak benefit for program and curriculum development/enhancement, no example (10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The position is not related to needs identified in the Program Review (0 points)</td>
<td>No benefit for program and curriculum development/enhancement (0 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** The reviewers will assign zero points when the applicant does not provide sufficient information to determine how the potential position relates to the needs identified in the Program Review.

2. Preparing the prioritized list for Senate.

HPC will apply rubric to assign points and thereby prioritize the merit of the position requests. To ensure accurate use of the rubric, the HPC will engage in a norming process by discussing their individual rankings. The Senate shall be informed of the collective rankings for each column in each section of the rubric. The HPC will provide this information to the Academic Senate with three summary lists: (1) requests in alphabetical order by department and noting the discipline and ranking, (2) all requests in rank order, and (3) requests separated into replacement and growth lists in rank order.

May 13, 2014—Approved by Academic Senate
October 28, 2014—Revised by Academic Senate
April 07, 2015—No change recommended by Academic Senate Executive Committee
November 24, 2015—Senate review as requested by College President
December 08, 2015—Revisions approved by Academic Senate
May 10, 2016—Academic Senate approved
May 22, 2018—Academic Senate approved