

Feb 19, 2026 |

ARC Feedback for Draft Guiding Principles Rubric

Attendees: Carly Zufelt Lorelei Konopka Susan Campbell DL-GC-DEPTCHAIR
Aubrei Smith DL-GC-Facsen Karina Sokol-Tinsley Dr Tiffany Hernandez
Attached files: [Draft Guiding Principles Rubric](#)

Notes

- [ARC Rubric Presentation Slide Deck](#)
 - Feedback on general rubric structure 1 and 2:
 - What does it mean to have a “negative, neutral, positive” designation?
 - Does combining make things MORE difficult for our students? That would have a negative impact. Would it take away from current collaboration? That would have a negative impact.
 - Positive would be combining programs/FSAs that share advisors/resources to streamline student experience.
 - What threshold score are we looking for in order to make a yes?
 - That’s part of what we want feedback on.
 - Hoping there’s a natural break, but it will ultimately be up to the administration to make a final decision.
 - How are we going to rank the priorities in terms of how we make change? If proposals are ranked equally?
 - There will be a discussion should this happen. Nothing is weighted intentionally.
 - Why the 3 point scale and not 5? 5 points would provide more subjectivity.
 - Objectivity gets difficult with 1, 2, and 4. How do we assess the difference between a 1 and 2, for example, and should
 - The 3 point scale provides space for positive (3), no change/neutral (2), and negative change (-1).
 - Are we averaging the scores within each category? Net positive/negative? Have you taken test cases to see how this plays out?
 - We are running a “test” rubric at our meeting in two weeks.
 - A holistic score is what we’re looking for.
 - Where are we getting the suggested combinations of departments?
 - Department meetings; feedback forms; admin meetings; department size data.
 - What will service departments be evaluated on if not based on load? What is meant by the RFA language?
 - Service departments have different responsibilities that don’t equate exactly to academic department load.

- Follow up question- How is load being calculated? How are labs being accounted for?
 - Load not credit hour.
- Are we considering the role of the AGEC in load shifts?
 - We're considering load over 3 years.
 - Data includes fall and spring, not summer.
 - Much of the data we pull for faculty staffing.
- Would headcount be a better measure for efficiency of resource use?
 - Yes, a very good point. We went with the load data because it gives "extra" credit for labs.
 - Some classes are loaded in a way that teaching two courses will meet some faculty contractual requirements (labs, auto, etc), whereas other disciplines teach 5 to make load. This should be accounted for.
- If we focus only on headcount or load, are we improving the student experience?
- Does the rubric account for potential staffing?
 - ARC would recommend additional staffing (both RFA outlined and positions like lab techs).
 - Could we use the rubric to say, "this could be negative, but with this potential tweak it could be positive."
- Concerns that we have not talked to admin assistants, lab techs, advising, students, etc.
 - Chairs were given a lot of room to share and ask for feedback from their people.
 - We have broadly shared the feedback form.
 - All-campus town hall in May to collect feedback; admin will take it into account.
 - FOIs aren't changing, and neither are their analysts.
 - Much of the student facing services won't change.
 - Students don't know what they don't know- they don't have a connection to a reorg.
 - This doesn't change their instructors, courses, programs, etc.
 - This is internal restructuring that will indirectly benefit students as we're able to reallocate resources.
- We're not the implementation team. We give a preliminary score with context, and then the administration will review it. They could add data/perspective that changes the score.\
- Will departments be able to propose their own changes based on this rubric?
 - Yes, definitely. We've gotten some through the feedback form.
- Feedback Point 3

- Should we discuss regionalization and strategic alignment? How does our proposal sit in relation to other college organizational structures?
 - Would enhancing dual enrollment fit here?
- Feedback Point 4- None
 - What does maintain continuity of operations mean?
 - Could you run the program as needed with the expertise “in the room”. Ex: Psych and automotive- neither could run the other. It would cause a disruption.
- Feedback Point 5- None
- Question from chat (at 3:23pm): Can you provide some insight on how ARC will initially operationalize the scoring of proposals? Will each member have autonomy to score independently, and then ARC's score represents a mean score? Or will there be collective benchmarking via discussion and a single score arrived at...? Basically, I am curious about the route through which a score is assigned to an idea.
 - So far we've been working on consensus. There are 11 committee members, and we just incorporated the 3 deans. We haven't yet discussed how we work through these, but given that consensus has been our habit it's hard to assume we wouldn't this time.

Suggested Changes

- Use headcount instead of/in addition to load hours.
- Account for sections faculty teach in order to make load
- Make it more apparent that departments can offer proposals on their own.
- Pull dual enrollment data per FSA