

~~2022-2023~~ 2023-2024

VVC FACULTY HIRING PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

I. OVERVIEW OF FACULTY HIRING PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

II. FACULTY HIRING PRIORITIZATION COMMITTEE (FHPC) MEMBERSHIP

III. TIMELINE

IV. RUBRIC COMPONENTS WITH CORRESPONDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USE

I. OVERVIEW OF FACULTY HIRING PRIORITIZATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

1. Each academic year, as part of the College's Program Review process (PRAISE), Department Chairs/Area Coordinators/Discipline Faculty will have the opportunity to request faculty hires, providing relevant data and a narrative justifying the need for a full-time position.
2. All Program Review Updates will be uploaded to the College's Assessment Management System (~~TracDat/Improve~~ Nuventive). PRAISE reports are reviewed and discussed by area Deans.
3. Deans consult individually with each Department Chairs/Area Coordinator/Discipline Faculty within their unit regarding the unit's Program Review components (Narrative, Data and Program Planning and Augmentation). If a faculty hire is being requested, the hire is discussed between the Dean and the Department Chair. At this time, Deans can make recommendations, including but not limited to, recommending the Department add more narrative or data to support the faculty hire request.
4. The Request for Faculty Hire gets forwarded on to the Non-Voting Member of the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (FHPC), regardless of whether Dean and Department Chair

are in agreement on the hire. The Dean can provide brief narrative in support or showing opposition to the hire, for consideration by the FHPC.

5. Each year, prior to the evaluation of the faculty position requests, members of the FHPC will be trained in using the criteria on the Prioritization Rubric by the *Academic Senate/non-voting* member of the committee during the initial FHPC meeting of the year. Data will be used as much as possible in evaluating the requests, but as every program is different, many factors must be considered. Not all criteria are hierarchal in nature.
6. The FHPC will review the data from the PRAISE reports and will evaluate each request on the basis of the specified criteria (See Prioritization Rubric and Directions).
7. In the event that the FHPC needs more information, the co-chairs of the committee may ask for a representative from the department in question to come forward to answer questions about the position; however, no presentations will be made.
8. The initial ranking will be done by ballot as follows: each member will assign a score to each rubric category for each position request. The total of the average scores in each rubric category will determine the initial ranking. The initial ranking may be revised as described in below.
9. Once the draft list has been completed, any member of the FHPC can suggest an override of a ranking. Overrides are permitted when a supermajority (8/12) of the committee members votes to re-rank a single position.
10. Once a prioritization/replacement list is completed, **the non-voting member of the FHPC forwards the list to the Academic Senate for a vote. Once voted upon, the list is then sent to the President / Superintendent with a cover sheet that indicates voting outcomes.** ~~it will be presented to the college Superintendent President and the Academic Senate.~~ Should the president override any of the ranked/replacement positions, they present a detailed written explanation of that decision to the Academic Senate within one month.
11. The timeline shown in Section III is for the typical prioritization and faculty hiring cycle.

LEGAL MANDATE AND/OR ACCREDITING AGENCY REQUIREMENT

Faculty positions which are legally mandated and/or mandated by an accrediting agency are prioritized highest to ensure the College is complying with any/all Federal, State and/or local laws and safety requirements and accreditation requirements respectively. For units requiring a faculty member based on these criteria, departments must provide proof of the need and a brief narrative directly to the following: the President / Superintendent, the Executive Vice President of Instruction, and the Academic Senate Executive Board. These constituents will meet to discuss the request and respond within 2 weeks of receiving the appeal for additional faculty for legal mandates or accrediting body requirements.

CATEGORICALLY-FUNDED FACULTY HIRES

Categorically funded programs are established by the California legislature to provide state mandated minimum standards to a targeted group of students who are either disabled, disadvantaged, or have financial need. Thus, it provides funding to serve students without any cost to the District's general fund. The goal of categorical funding is to ensure access and maximize the potential for success of otherwise at risk students. Given the nature of these funds, faculty positions which are categorically-funded can be immediately filled with the consent of designated campus leadership and the Academic Senate and categorically-funded faculty positions do not undergo the Faculty Prioritization Process described within this document. Programs wanting to utilize their categorical funds for faculty should still enclose their request for a faculty member within the program review so the campus can properly maintain documentation and can close-the-loop on the request (i.e. provide updates, feedback, potential Return-On-Investment calculations, etc.)

DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN FHPC AND SUPERINTENDENT / PRESIDENT

The FHPC spends weeks prioritizing requests for faculty hires based on criteria agreed upon by all applicable campus constituencies. Their work is thorough and time-consuming. In the event the Superintendent/President is not in agreement with the order of prioritized hires given by the FHPC, they will report out to the Academic Senate Executive Board (ASEB) with reasons for deviation from the list. ASEB can request a meeting to discuss what may be viewed as substantial deviations from the FHPC's rankings. The objections will be documented and stored for future consultation, if needed. Documentation may be consulted in the event of failed searches (see below for process on failed searches).

FAILED SEARCHES

A failed search is defined as ***one in which candidates were interviewed but no one was hired***. There can be several reasons for a failed search, including but not limited to:

- Top candidates accepted other offers, remaining candidates did not seem hireable
- A small pool with uncompetitive candidates
- Candidates looked hireable on paper, but in-person interview was not promising

If a search has failed, the decision to re-float the position or to cancel the hire must be reached between the

Academic Senate Executive Board and the Superintendent / President.

In the event a search is cancelled, ASEB and the Superintendent / President can revisit the FHPC prioritized list, and fill another position based on the prioritized list. (Given that the decision is made within the same academic year, the option is to move down the prioritized list, and not deviate to other requested faculty hires without substantiated justification.)

II. FACULTY HIRING PRIORITIZATION COMMITTEE (FHPC) MEMBERSHIP

(12 VOTING, 1 NON-VOTING)

- ~~Four~~ **Three** (3) leadership appointed by the Superintendent/President
 - Vice President for Instruction (1)
 - Dean (Instructional or Non-Instructional) (~~1~~ 2)
 - Presidential designee from administrative team (1)
- ~~Nine~~ **Ten** (9 ~~10~~) Faculty appointed by the Academic Senate
 - One (1) Academic Senate President – Committee Chair
 - Four (4) instructional faculty (one from each school)
 - One (1) VVCF faculty member
 - One (1) AFT Part-Time Faculty United member
 - One (1) student services faculty
 - One (1) library or distance education faculty
- **Non-Voting Member – Process Facilitator**
 - One (1) Non-Voting Member of Committee (Recommendation that this member either be the Instructional Program Review Coordinator, a Designated Academic Senate Representative or another designated instructional coordinator).

III. TIMELINE

Timing of faculty hires during the fiscal year can have bearing on the quality and scope of candidates who apply. Therefore, the committee will abide by a timeline which will have the highest likelihood of gaining the most qualified and diverse pool of candidates.

By Sept. 15

1. **ASEB selects faculty membership to serve on committee; administration selects their designees to serve on the committee. Non-Voting Member contacts committee members to prepare them for the year's review process.**

By Oct. 1

2. **Units requesting a faculty hire must submit their request by October 1st. Requests for faculty hire are submitted through Nuventive as a component of the Program Review process on a faculty request form. Units requesting a faculty hire MUST complete their Program Review reports by the designated**

Program Review deadline, which is different than the faculty request deadline.

3. Non-Voting Member has compiled the list of all faculty requests for prioritization.
4. Non-Voting Member has collected and organized all corresponding data required for the rubric rankings. (This includes both data from within the Program Review Dashboards, and any other data needed from Human Resources or Institutional Research). Each request is organized as its own portfolio, which includes all request information, narrative and supporting data for FHPC members to make their decisions.
5. Non-Voting Member calls for first meeting of FHPC. The first meeting functions to: (1) deliver all portfolios within a single packet to members; (2) train/refresh members of the FHPC how to use the rubric; and (3) remind FHPC members of the timeline to be followed.
6. FHPC has convened for the first meeting. Committee is given a period of time (1 – 2 weeks) to review the data and make their own assessments within the rubric.
7. In consultation with the FHPC, the Non-Voting Member schedules a reconvening date for the committee to meet and go over rankings (approximately 1 – 2 weeks from the initial meeting date).

By Late October

8. The FHPC has convened for collective ranking. The Non-Voting Member facilitates the discussion for the committee to collectively assess each request.
9. The Non-Voting Member prepares the final and collective ratings to be delivered to the Superintendent-President, and the Academic Senate for action.

~~2. ASEB selects faculty membership to serve on committee; administration selects their designees to serve on the committee. Non-Voting Member contacts committee members to prepare them for the year's review process.~~

By Early November

10. **Program Review Deadline.** ~~Programs must have submitted their program reviews, which would include their requests for faculty hires.~~ The Non-Voting member of the committee confirms that those units requesting a faculty hire have submitted their Program Reviews. Failure to submit the Program Review will nullify the request for a faculty hire.
11. The Academic Senate disseminates and votes upon the prioritized list and then it is sent to the Superintendent / President with a cover sheet indicating voting results.

~~Non-Voting Member has compiled the list of all faculty requests for prioritization.~~

By Mid-November

12. The Superintendent/President considers the ranked list, requests appointments with stakeholders and can request additional data and justification as needed.
13. In the event the Superintendent/President is not in agreement with the order of prioritized hires, they will report out to the Academic Senate Executive Board with reasons for deviation from the list. ASEB can request a meeting to discuss what may be viewed as substantial deviations from the FHPC's rankings. The objections will be documented and stored for future consultation, if needed. Documentation may be consulted in the event of failed searches (See **Disagreement between FHPC, ASEB and Superintendent / President** section).
14. Superintendent/President announces the number of positions to be tentatively funded for the next academic year. (Faculty hires will require Board of Trustees approval, but tentative approvals for faculty hires can be pushed through to ensure the timely filling of vacant or needed positions).
15. Chairs, or those who will chair hiring committees, are notified by the President / Superintendent to initiate the hiring process. Chairs assemble their committees and begin meeting to set up the hiring paperwork. Job descriptions are reviewed and updated, if necessary. Committees work to finalize their paperwork to have positions posted during the Winter Intersession.
- ~~16. Non-Voting Member has collected and organized all corresponding data required for the rubric rankings. (This includes both data from within the Program Review Dashboards, and any other data needed from Human Resources or Institutional Research). Each request is organized as its own portfolio, which includes all request information, narrative and supporting data for FHPC members to make their decisions.~~
- ~~17. Non-Voting Member calls for first meeting of FHPC. The first meeting functions to: (1) deliver all portfolios within a single packet to members; (2) train/refresh members of the FHPC how to use the rubric; and (3) remind FHPC members of the timeline to be followed.~~
- ~~18. FHPC has convened for the first meeting. Committee is given a period of time (1 – 2 weeks) to review the data and make their own assessments within the rubric.~~
- ~~19. In consultation with the FHPC, the Non-Voting Member schedules a reconvening date for the committee to meet and go over rankings (approximately 1 – 2 weeks from the initial meeting date).~~

By Early December

~~20. The FHPC has convened for collective ranking. The Non-Voting Member of the Committee facilitates the discussion for the committee to collectively assess each request for faculty member.~~

~~21. The Non-Voting Member prepares the final and collective ratings to be delivered to the Superintendent President, and the Academic Senate, where the results are disseminated and voted upon. Once voted upon, the list is sent to the Superintendent / President with a cover sheet indicating voting results.~~

By Mid-December

~~22. The Superintendent President considers the ranked list, requests appointments with stakeholders and can request additional data and justification as needed.~~

By End of Fall Term

17. Hiring committees have met and all paperwork is completed so that HR initiates the process for faculty hiring during Winter intersession.

~~23. Superintendent President announces the number of positions to be tentatively funded for the next academic year (Faculty hires will require Board of Trustees approval, but tentative approvals for faculty hires can be pushed through to ensure the timely filling of vacant or needed positions).~~

~~24. Chairs, or those who will Chair Hiring Committees, are notified by the President / Superintendent to initiate hiring process with new year as of January 1st.~~

~~25. In the event the Superintendent/President is not in agreement with the order of prioritized hires, they will report out to the Academic Senate Executive Board with reasons for deviation from the list. ASEB can request a meeting to discuss what may be viewed as substantial deviations from the FHPC's rankings. The objections will be documented and stored for future consultation, if needed. Documentation may be consulted in the event of failed searches (See **Disagreement between FHPC, ASEB and Superintendent / President** section)~~

During Winter Break

18. Job postings are available on HR website.

~~1. HR initiates the process for faculty hiring. Programs are officially notified if their requests for faculty hires were approved.~~

~~2. Academic Senate begins process for full-time hires.~~

- ~~3. Programs with approved faculty hires work with HR to prepare job descriptions, and all needed administrative work to prepare for hires.~~


During Spring Semester


19. Following job posting timelines, committees conduct paper-scoring and follow through on interviews and any required activities.

Prior to Next Cycle

20. FHPC reconvenes, debriefs, and evaluates the process (in order to improve it).
21. If there is a yearly change in the Non-Voting Member of the committee, the Non-Voting Member of the committee needs to be selected for this duty and trained on how to help facilitate the process.

IV. RUBRIC COMPONENTS WITH CORRESPONDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USE





~~*Block 1 does not have a “weight.” The FHPC must use its discretion in weighing requests falling into this area.~~

*Block 5 4 does not have a “weight.” The FHPC must use its discretion in weighing extenuating factors. Scoring here can make up for low rankings in other areas of the rubric.

BLOCK 1: LEGAL MANDATE AND/OR ACCREDITING BODY REQUIREMENT

~~Block 1 addresses the imminent demand for a faculty hire. This block is considered outside of, and of more urgency than subsequent blocks. Categorically funded faculty positions except student equity and achievement, strong workforce are automatically included as legally mandated consideration. If the requested faculty hire is designated as a Block 1 priority, the request for faculty hire will be included directly in final consideration to the Superintendent President. The FHPC will continue to rank the hire according to the conventional rubric components to provide the Superintendent President with the general ranking as well.~~

1a. Legally Mandated

- ~~▪ Faculty positions which are legally mandated are prioritized highest to ensure the College is complying with any/all Federal, State and/or local laws and safety requirements.~~
- ~~▪ Proof of legal mandate must be provided by the program requesting the faculty position.~~
- ~~▪ Outside expertise from other campus units may be required to assess the validity of legal mandate claims.~~

1b. Accrediting Agency Requirement

- ~~▪ Faculty positions which are mandated by an accrediting agency are prioritized highest to ensure the College is complying with accreditation requirements.~~
- ~~▪ Proof of accreditation agency requirement must be provided by the program requesting the faculty position.~~
- ~~▪ Outside expertise from other campus units may be required to assess the validity of accreditation agency requirements.~~

BLOCK 1: LEGAL MANDATE AND/OR ACCREDITING BODY REQUIREMENT	CRITERIA	Hire is not required	Hire is required	Score
		0	1	

1a	Legally Mandated Hire – Federal, State or Local	Not Mandated by Federal, State and/or Local Government	Mandated by Federal, State and/or Local Government	
1b	Accrediting Agency Requirement	Not Mandated by External Accrediting Body	Mandated by External Accrediting Body	
<p>This block is not weighted within the general rubric. Programs not mentioning issues relating to Legal mandates or necessities are not penalized, while programs affirming a legal mandate or necessity are considered separately. If score is greater than 1, request for faculty member automatically gets forwarded on in prioritized pool for Superintendent – President approval or consideration.</p>				

BLOCK 2 1: REPLACEMENT FACULTY or PREVIOUSLY PRIORITIZED FACULTY POSITION

Block 2 1 addresses the need to replace a faculty member due to vacancy (e.g. retirement, attrition, etc.) This block is weighted at 20%.

21a. Replacement

- Replacement request due to tenure track attrition is given special consideration and weighted up to 20% on Block 2 scoring rubric.
- Any/all extenuating circumstances from administration must be presented to the Faculty Prioritization Committee for consideration and deliberation.
- In the case of an unexpected departure of a tenured faculty, the use of the Faculty Emergency Hire Procedure will be initiated immediately.

21b. Previously Prioritized Faculty Position

- Special Consideration is awarded to previously prioritized faculty positions which did not result in a hire.

BLOCK 2 1 : REPLACEMENT FACULTY OR PREVIOUSLY PRIORITIZED FACULTY POSITION	CRITERIA	No Need	Extreme Need	Score	Weight
		0	5		
21a	Replacement request due to lack of a tenure track position due to attrition or a faculty retirement	No attrition or retirement.	Tenure track position loss due to attrition, retirement or extenuating circumstances		
21b	Faculty position was previously prioritized, but for a variety of possible reasons, was not able to be filled within the timeframe.	No previously prioritized faculty hire.	Evidence of a previously prioritized hire and failure to fill position.		
					20%

BLOCK 3(I): INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM STATUS (60%)

Block 3 (I) is for the ranking of programs requesting instructional faculty hires. This block reflects the quality and scope of the Program Review narrative in demonstrating a compelling need for faculty hire, the current status of the program in relation to its growth, and the consideration of program key performance indicators. While criteria in this block are rated on a 0 – 3 scale, the weight of this section is 60%.

Non-Instructional faculty hires are assessed through Block 3(N), as the factors under consideration for non-instructional faculty hires are unique.

3a. Program Review Narrative Quality and Scope

- The FHPC Members are given relevant portions of Program Review narrative to subjectively assess need for faculty hire. FHPC members must be able to support their ranking with evidence from the narrative.

3b. Program Growth (Raw and Percent)

- The FHPC Members are given program growth data to reflect upon need for faculty hire. No minimal benchmarks for growth are listed as various programs can have unique circumstances and/or benchmarks for growth. FHPC members must be able to support their ranking of growth based on supporting evidence and/or expertise of the program in question.

3c. Consideration of Program Key Performance Indicators (KPI) relevant to Instructional Unit

- The FHPC Members are given a spec sheet of all program Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to reflect upon need for faculty hire. No minimal benchmarks are set to determine hires as data can be interpreted in various ways. (Example: Poor student retention, success, and/or completion rates could be a sign of requiring more faculty to help improve outcomes, or it can be a reflection of a program not performing well for other reasons. As such, the data must be reviewed with a critical eye towards context and circumstance.)
- The spec sheet for instructional faculty hires given to the FHPC members could include the following KPI:
 - Full-Time Faculty: Students (Ratio)
 - Full-Time Faculty : Part-Time Faculty (Ratio)

- Student Success Rates alongside Institution Set Standards (ISS)
- Student Retention Rates alongside ISS
- Transfer Rates alongside ISS – if applicable
- Job Placement Rates alongside ISS – if applicable
- Licensure Pass Rates alongside ISS – if applicable
- Program Assessment Compliance
- Program Curriculum
- If applicable, Labor Market Indicators and data to reflect Community or industry need.

BLOCK 3.2 (I): INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM STATUS	CRITERIA	No Need	Limited Need	Considerable Need	Extreme Need	Score	Weight
		0	1	2	3		
3.2a	Program Review Narrative Quality and Scope	Program Review Narrative does not effectively demonstrate need	Program Review Narrative reflects limited need	Program Review Narrative reflects considerable need	Program Review Narrative reflects extreme need		
3.2b	Program Growth (Raw and Percent)*	No Growth	Marginal Growth	Increasing Growth	Substantial Increase in Growth		
3.2c	Consideration of Program Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**	KPI do not reflect need	KPI reflect limited need	KPI reflect considerable need	KPI reflect extreme need		
							60%

BLOCK 32 (N): NON-INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM STATUS (60%)

Block 32 (N) is for the ranking of programs requesting non-instructional faculty hires. This block reflects the quality and scope of the Program Review narrative in demonstrating a compelling need for faculty hire, the consideration of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) relevant to non-instructional units, the consideration of current industry best practices and external factors, and the overall contribution of the program to student success on campus. While criteria in this block are rated on a 0 – 3 scale, the weight of this section is 60%.

32a. Program Review Narrative Quality and Scope

- The FHPC Members are given relevant portions of Program Review narrative to subjectively assess need for faculty hire. FHPC members must be able to support their ranking with evidence from the narrative.

32b. Consideration of Program Key Performance Indicators (KPI) relevant to Non-Instructional Unit

- The FHPC Members are given a spec sheet of all designated program Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to reflect upon need for faculty hire. No minimal benchmarks are set to determine hires as data can be interpreted in various ways.
- The spec sheet for non-instructional faculty hires given to the FHPC members could include the following KPI:
 - Trends in student use of these units/areas/resources
 - Counselor to student ratio
 - Librarian to student ratio
 - Cooperative Education Instructor to student ratio
 - Full-Time Faculty : Part-Time Faculty (Ratio)
 - Other data as seen relevant or appropriate

32c. Consideration of Current Industry Best Practice and External Factors

Education Code, Title 5, ACCJC accreditation standards and industry best practices must be considered in relation to the hire of non-instructional faculty. To this end, the FHPC may review data presented by units requesting faculty hire to explain the need for a hire. The FHPC will rely upon the non-instructional units to present this data to the committee. External expertise may be used to assess the validity of presented data. Some of this data could include:

- Data from peer institutions
- Considerations of Title 5 and Ed Code compliance or recommendations
- Survey data from Chancellor’s Office, IPEDS or other professional sources
- Accreditation standards that impact program

BLOCK 3 2 (N): NON- INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM STATUS	CRITERIA	No Need	Limited Need	Considerable Need	Extreme Need	Score	Weight
		0	1	2	3		
3 2a	Program Review Narrative Quality and Scope	Program Review Narrative does not effectively demonstrate need	Program Review Narrative reflects limited need	Program Review Narrative reflects considerable need	Program Review Narrative reflects extreme need		
3 2b	Consideration of Program Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**	KPI do not reflect need	KPI reflect limited need	KPI reflect considerable need	KPI reflect extreme need		
3 2c	Consideration of Current Industry Best Practice and External Factors	No compelling evidence of need based on these factors.	Minimal evidence of need based on these factors.	Considerable evidence of need based on these factors.	Extreme needs based on these factors.		
							60%

BLOCK 4-3: ALIGNMENT TO CAMPUS VISION and/or STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT (20%)

Block 4-3 is for the ranking of programs based on their alignment with any/all campus initiatives and directions. While criteria in this block are rated on a 0 – 3 scale, the weight of this section is 20%.

4-3a. Alignment with Campus Mission, Values and/or Priorities

- The FHPC Members are given relevant portions of Program Review narrative to assess program’s ability to connect to one, any or all of the following campus priorities:
 - District Goals in Educational Master Plan
 - Key Priority Areas within the Educational Master Plan
 - Guided Pathways
 - Strategic Enrollment Management (if applicable)
 - Other initiatives mentioned in any of the campus’ governing documents and strategic plans.

4-3b. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Factors (Program or courses within Program include Ethnic Studies component(s) or Diversity and Inclusion outcomes are prioritized or DEI is prioritized in other ways)

- Programs which are offering, or in the stages of planning to offer, Ethnic Studies components, are prioritized for faculty hire.
- Program has prioritized DEI initiatives in demonstrable ways.

BLOCK 4-3: ALIGNMENT TO CAMPUS VISION and/or STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT	CRITERIA	Below Standard	Marginally Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Score	Weight
		0	1	2	3		
4-3a	Alignment with Campus Mission, Values and/or Priorities	Program direction, as well as program's request for faculty hire, is not in alignment with Campus' Mission, Values or Priorities.	Program direction, as well as program's request for faculty hire, demonstrates minimal alignment with Campus' Mission, Values or Priorities.	Program direction, as well as program's request for faculty hire, demonstrates some alignment with Campus' Mission, Values or Priorities.	Program direction, as well as program's request for faculty hire, align well to the Campus' Mission, Values or Priorities.		
4-3b	Program or courses within Program include Ethnic Studies component(s) or Diversity and Inclusion outcomes are prioritized or demonstrated DEI in other ways	No growth/movement or progress in this area.	Does not adequately demonstrate realistic level of commitment to the College's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion vision and policies.	Demonstrates some level of commitment to the College's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion vision and policies. Program would likely still benefit from qualified faculty hire to support these College initiatives.	Demonstrates strong commitment to the College's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion vision and policies. Program would benefit from qualified faculty hire to support these College initiatives.		
							20%

BLOCK 54: OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Block 54 is for the ranking of programs based on matters relating to extenuating factors raised by program requesting a faculty hire. Block 5 does not have a “weight.” The Faculty Prioritization Committee must use their discretion in weighing extenuating factors. Scoring here can make up for low ranking in other portions of the rubric.

54b. Extenuating Circumstances

- Within the program review, the program may introduce extenuating circumstances ~~outside matters included either in Block 1 or the components found in the general rubric.~~ Here, the FHPC can assess the request in consideration of extenuating circumstances.

BLOCK 54: OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	CRITERIA	No Need	Limited Need	Considerate Need	Extreme Need	Score
		0	1	2	3	
54a	Extenuating Circumstances	Program does not demonstrate an extenuating circumstance to request additional faculty hire.	Program does not provide convincing or compelling or sufficient evidence for need in this area.	Program provides evidence that there is some need in this area.	Program provides ample evidence and supporting data to demonstrate a high need in this area.	
This block is not weighted within the general rubric. Programs not mentioning issues relating to factors are not penalized for not being considered within this block. Programs facing deficiencies in other areas of rubric who do cite extenuating circumstances for a faculty may benefit from this section for consideration of an additional faculty hire.						