




CLASSIFIED HIRING PRIORITY (CHP) COMMITTEE

President's Cabinet-Spring 2022

- The purpose of the CHP Committee is to review classified personnel requests made during the Program Review process and create a ranked list.
 - The CHP Committee utilized the updated rubric and questions developed in 2019-2020 for the 2021-2022 Program Review cycle
 - The Committee included another question on the request form to prioritize and center Equity in the requests.
- 

- The CHP Committee composition was consistent from 2019-2022:

Ellen Engels, Chair

Marco Chavez

Andrea Lelham

Monica Romero

Joe Benedito

Alexi Balaguer

Karla Trutna

Gity Nematollahi

Lorenze Legaspi

Notes regarding CHP Recommendation List

- Only one position request per form
- Highest and lowest scores are removed
- Final scores are calculated to an average
- The maximum average score that can be achieved is 25
- Positions with tied scores are listed in alphabetical order only
- Shared position requests are first scored individually and then combined for a final average
- None of the ranked positions had valid documentation of Health & Safety nor Accreditation regulations
- Note that the Position Request process cannot be used for position reclassification.

Program Review
Classified Hiring Priorities Committee
Scoring Rubric
2021-2022

CRITERIA	HIGHEST LEVEL – 5 POINTS	MID-LEVEL – 3 POINTS	MINIMUM LEVEL – 1 POINT	NOT ADDRESSED – 0 POINTS
Use of data in response	The response has relevant data that is integrated in a meaningful manner that supports the substantiated need.	The response has some data in support of the substantiated need.	The response has very little data and/or is not connected to the substantiated need.	The response does not include any data.
Current: Capacity (volume–how much) Productivity (speed–how fast)	The response clearly defines current productivity/capacity issues and addresses current methods that attempt to meet the substantiated need.	The response somewhat defines current productivity/capacity issues and addresses current methods that attempt to meet the substantiated need. Response may be missing some key information.	Response is not clear, or no explanation of information is provided to understand capacity / productivity issues and current methods that attempt to meet substantiated needs. Response is missing key information.	The response does not address the question.
Increasing Demands/ Growth	The response clearly defines how the requested position will affect the department/program’s increasing demands/growth. The response also identifies the impacts if the position is not provided.	The response somewhat defines how the requested position will affect the department/program’s increasing demands/growth. The response somewhat identifies the impacts if the position is not provided.	The response is not clear and is lacking sufficient information to determine the department/program’s increased demands/growth. The response does not identify the impacts if the position is not provided.	The response does not address the question.
Address Equity	The response clearly indicates in detail what role the position will have in regards to equity.	The response indicates what role the position will have in regards to equity.	The response slightly indicates what role the position will have in regards to equity.	The response does not address the question.
Impact on Outcomes	The response clearly links the position request any of the following department, program, and/or College: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes (SLOs) • Goals • Mission • Strategic Direction • Equity • Excellence 	The response somewhat links the position request any of the following department, program, and/or College: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes (SLOs) • Goals • Mission • Strategic Direction • Equity • Excellence <p>The response does not include enough details.</p>	The response does not link the position request to any of the following department, program, and/or College: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes (SLOs) • Goals • Mission • Strategic Direction • Equity • Excellence <p>The response does not provide details.</p>	The response does not address the question.

San Diego Mesa College
Classified Hiring Priorities Committee
2021-2022 Ranked List

Rank	Program	Position Title	TOTAL Max 25 pts
1	Fashion (FASH)	Instructional Lab Technician / Trades	23.4
2	Learning Resources	Administrative Technician	22.6
2	Work-Based Learning	Program Support Technician	22.6
3	Business Services	Administrative Technician	21.0
3	Mesa Tutoring & Computer Services (MT2C)	Administrative Technician	21.0
3	Mesa Tutoring & Computer Services (MT2C)	Instructional Support Supervisor	21.0
4	Mesa Tutoring & Computer Services (MT2C)	Instructional Lab Technician/Learning Resources	20.6
4	Mesa Tutoring & Computer Services (MT2C)	Instructional Lab Technician/Learning Resources	20.6
5	Mesa Tutoring & Computer Services (MT2C)	Media Technician	19.8
6	Office of Communications	Web Designer	19.4
7	Learning Resources	Administrative Technician	19.0
7	Office of Communications	Administrative Technician	19.0
8	Office of Communications	Multimedia Specialist	18.2
9	Art-Fine Art (ARTF)	Instructional Lab Assistant	17.8
9	Learning Resources	Administrative Technician	17.8
10	STEM Programs	Instructional Lab Technician/Learning Resources	17.4
11	Athletic Training Room	Athletic Trainer	15.4
11	Learning Resources	Instructional Support Supervisor	15.4
12	Office of Institutional Effectiveness	Research & Planning Analyst	15.0
13	Exercise Science (EXSC)	Gardener-Groundskeeper	14.8
13	Financial Aid	Student Assistance Technician/Financial Aid	14.8
13	Financial Aid	Student Services Assistant	14.8
14	Art-Fine Art (ARTF)	Instructional Lab Technician/Art	14.6
14	Exercise Science (EXSC)	Instructional Lab Technician/EXSC	14.6
15	Music (MUSI)	Instructional Assistant/Music*	14.4
16	Learning Resources	Media Technician	14.2
17	Student Accounting	Accounting Technician	13.6
18	Disability Support Programs & Services (DSPS)	Instructional Assistant	13.0
18	Exercise Science (EXSC)	Sports Information Director/Event Coordinator	13.0
19	Office of Resource Development	Research Associate	11.2
20	Office of Institutional Effectiveness	Programmer Analyst	11.0

Ranking Notes:

- * 50% position request

Process Notes:

- All committee members scored all positions
- Highest and lowest scores removed
- Final scores are calculated to an average.
- Shared positions requests are first scored individually and then combined for a final average
- Positions with tied scores are listed in alphabetical order only
- None of the positions requests had required Health and Safety nor Accreditation regulations