

## Hiring Prioritization Process - COMMENT sheet

Document Line #	Name	COMMENT	RESPONSE
3	J Holbrook	Typo – fill rather than filled and position to position(s)	
5	J Holbrook	<p>I am not sure why a previous year priority does not matter. If for some reason there is no money to hire a faculty member, even if this position was listed as the first priority, to have to start the process over again is a significant problem and waste of time in process.</p> <p>If our process is reliable and the position is important given all of the vetting, the prioritized position should remain valuable from cycle to cycle.</p>	
8	J Holbrook	Along with the requisite resources – I have not seen this section in the current documents. There are planning items that have been prioritized with “no resources” nor funding status or funding resources. Given the current process this sentence does not make complete sense to me? It is my understanding that PPR creates a list of <i>their</i> understanding and position of needs.	
8-9	J Holbrook	By the time our planning process is complete we are already in a new environment. A dynamic process needs to be identified somewhere in the process.	
10-12	J Holbrook	This section creates structure which is ok, but my concern is the time line for all of these layers of approval delay an already protracted and political process. Is there a way that people (i.e. staff) are prioritized in one place and rapidly forwarded to the next level while things are prioritized in another time line? I have concerns of heterogeneity within some homogenous thinking process.	
13-15	J Holbrook	Another layer of input. There is structure without definition as to failure. There is some association between action and cognition with the explanation	

## Hiring Prioritization Process - COMMENT sheet

Document Line #	Name	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		required, but what happens if this group decides to reorder the previous group? Do the previous groups have recourse or does the bigger / higher group have the approval? There are issues between expertise and authority. The experts have already made a decision and now the authority does a different list. This creates tension between the authority and the experts.	
18	J Holbrook	Same questions on process.	
19	J Holbrook	<p>FON needs to be spelled out. This policy does not indicate only academic employees. Do all employees impact the FON? The two variables of people and funding make this problematic and static. There is no mechanism for the dynamic issues that have been discussed in many meetings.</p> <p>This continues to create this very large level of structure.</p>	
21-22	J Holbrook	Do each of these groups get to rearrange the order?	
28	J Holbrook	<p>I am not sure of the position Classified Senate President as necessary in this decision making loop. I appreciate the idea of sense making from the largest possible group.</p> <p>Has this process been forwarded to the Classified Senate for comments?</p> <p>How will the Academic Senate incorporate those comments?</p> <p>I can support the idea of fixed budgets and known processes with positions. This known variable will help stabilize positions.</p>	



**Hiring Prioritization Process - COMMENT sheet**

<b>Document Line #</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>