

Resolution of the Fullerton College Faculty Senate on the NOCCCD Comprehensive master Plan Draft of October 2011

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) of the NOCCCD should present a framework for the Fullerton College's educational and facilities plans;

As written, the 2011-2020 Educational Plan serves the following specific purposes:

- To establish clear direction for the college by envisioning the future in the light of internal and external trends and influences.
- To serve as a primary resource for the development of other plans.
- To inform the community of the College's present situation, needs, and future plans, and to forge closer relationships with community members.
- To identify the limitations, strengths, and capabilities of the College and to offer options for the future.
- To provide a basis for sound decisions regarding expansion and modification of technology and facilities.

WHEREAS, the educational plan within the CMP should support the college's mission, be based on best available data, and provide the rationale for the facilities plans;

The first part of the CMP addresses Fullerton College's focus on student success. The CMP also includes educational initiatives that were jointly developed by the members of the Campus Planning Committee, the District Steering Committee, and the consultants with the purpose of providing direction to the College and rationale for the facilities plans.

WHEREAS, the CMP should be authored by experts in the field of education based on best available data, and needs and perspectives of the faculty and staff of each department who directly serve students in a multitude of capacities;

The Fullerton College Campus Planning Committee was comprised of 4 faculty members, 6 managers, 2 classified professionals, and a student representative. Three additional managers and 2 additional classified professionals served as resource members to the committee. HMC hired Pat Caldwell who retired as Vice President, Student and Community Advancement at El Camino College and then served as Interim President of Copper Mountain College. Dr. Caldwell has worked for 17 years in the California Community College System.

Extensive interviews were conducted by HMC of individuals directly serving students across the campus. The interviews asked managers, faculty and staff members to describe the current scope of the division or department; to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the department or administrative function; to consider the demographic trends that might affect

the department or service, such as the number of non-English speaking residents, increasing population in the service area, increasing college-age population; to look at economic trends that might affect the department or service, such as unemployment rates, job growth, state budget or college budget; to evaluate other trends such as latest curriculum delivery, ADA accessibility issues, technology trends, or one-stop-shop concepts; to consider any changes or plans at the local, regional, state or federal level that may affect the department; to address any changes on campus in the coming years that will impact the department; and finally, any consideration of right-sizing of the department in the coming years.

The first meeting at Fullerton College to discuss the CMP was November 10, 2009. All meetings were open to any college employee who wanted to attend. Most all of the meetings on campus included individuals beyond the designated committee.

WHEREAS, the CMP does not address the recommendations of the 2008 equity plan, nor provide the educational vision, guidelines, and direction needed to support student success and equity;

The FC 2008 Student Equity Plan recommended three goals to increase student success, retention and persistence rates. Those goals are advising goals, academic goals, and affective goals. The plan asserts that early advising of students is essential in order to place students in appropriate coursework and to develop workable education plans to guide students. The plan also recommends that academic preparation including emphasis on academic support services and foundational courses is essential to success. Finally the plan promotes increasing the students' sense of belonging on campus through efforts to make education personally meaningful, and supportive.

There is nothing in the CMP that is contradictory to the recommendations of the 2008 equity plan. As noted in the original objectives of the CMP, the CMP will be used in conjunction with other planning documents. These other documents will indicate the specific means that the colleges will meet the Strategic Directions of the District.

WHEREAS, the college's program reviews should inform the educational and facilities plans within the CMP, and the program reviews on which the plan is based were completed in 2009, and do not address current college goals or district strategic directions;

The CMP has taken longer than originally anticipated because the BOT requested additional input from the community and from the colleges and SCE. As such, the CMP was more of a picture in time of the program reviews available to the process.

As the May 2011 draft CMP and the October 2011 draft CMP were distributed to the campuses for review, all departments had the opportunity to update the program descriptions to include

the most up-to-date data available. In some cases this included information that is being included in the fall 2011 program reviews.

Again, the CMP is designed to be used in conjunction with other planning documents.

WHEREAS, the process of preparation of the CMP should be transparent, inclusive, and responsive to feedback;

The process used by HMC to prepare the CMP was transparent, inclusive, and responsive to feedback. Meetings at the campuses were open to anyone and the work of the committee was regularly announced to the campuses. A shared governance model was used to form the campus committee.

The drafts of the CMP were shared with campus constituencies through their representatives on the committee. Extensive changes were made to the draft documents based on feedback from the constituencies. HMC was responsive to making the changes requested by the campus and if they did not make a particular change they provided the rationale for exclusion.

The BOT expressed their disappointment at the first production of the CMP. HMC was responsive to the requests from the BOT and hired a new consultant to conduct additional interviews with staff members and to re-analyze the data presented to make it more meaningful to the CMP.

WHEREAS, an evaluation of the previous CMP and its implementation should inform the process of preparation and implementation of the new CMP;

The earliest meetings of the CMP committee that began meeting in late 2009 discussed the 1999 EMP and the limitations of that document. It was pointed out that the 1999 document was more of a facilities master plan than an educational master plan.

From the beginning, the goal of HMC was to first conduct the educational plan analysis and forecast before doing the site analysis. The initial educational plan analysis took more than four months of data collection, including the analysis of demographics, long-range enrollment and WSCH forecasts; the first set of strategic initiatives; and the review and validation of this information by the campus committee.

Once the BOT asked for additional work on the CMP, the educational plan was reevaluated, but it was the initial work of the committee and HMC that drove the facilities portion of the CMP. Thus, the educational plan did drive the facilities plan of the CMP.

WHEREAS, the data presented within the plan are incomplete, contain methodological inconsistencies, do not adequately characterize incoming student populations, and lack consideration of emerging fields of study;

When is data collection ever considered to be complete? In an extensive plan such as the CMP, data collection and analysis must stop at some point in order to complete the document. The analysis of the trend data and demographics provided in the CMP are a combination of efforts of the HMC educational experts and the Director of Planning and Research from the college. There may not be 100% agreement between these two entities as to the inclusion of certain data and the exclusion of other data, but the data is sound.

WHEREAS, proposed basic skills programs in the SCE plan directly conflict with existing programs in the Fullerton College plan;

Much controversy has arisen because a statement was included in the October 2011 draft of the CMP that said there was “consensus” among a group of district employees at an all-district CMP meeting in January of 2011. The “consensus” was about moving certain levels of English which were below college-level English to SCE. Many FC faculty members wrote about their opposition to this statement listing the various reasons for the opposition.

When HMC representatives met with college representatives in November 2011 to discuss the October 2011 draft CMP, it was agreed that the language in Chapter 2 that stated, “The dialogue about the future role reached consensus that SCE should offer non-credit basic skills two or more levels below collegiate level,” would be modified to exclude the suggestion of consensus. Although the original language did go on to say that further discussion with much broader participation would be needed to explore this idea, the HMC representatives agreed to modify the language.

WHEREAS, the CMP does not sufficiently include the needs of Career Technical Education programs;

There is a great deal of information about Career Technical Education programs in the CMP including information from the Technology and Engineering Division, the Business and CIS Division and the Fine Arts Division, the three areas at FC that include the most CTE programs.

WHEREAS, the facilities plans support some programmatic needs, such as Fine Arts, they do not adequately support programmatic needs in other programs, and, in the cases of Horticulture and child Development, recommend actions that will harm those programs;

When the facilities portions of the plans were discussed with the campus committees, there was no opposition raised about the proposed relocation of the Child Development Center or of

the Horticulture Department. Some discussion ensued about the need to move either of these facilities, but the need to move the M & O operation to the south side of Berkley was also considered as a crucial need. Different committee members raised issues about one proposed site versus another but ultimately the group reached consensus on the proposed facilities plan.

The campus committee also discussed the need to provide dedicated space for the Humanities Division. This was accommodated by the addition of a classroom building to replace the 1100 building.

As indicated in the response below, when and if the District is in a position to update facilities for the Horticulture Department and the Child Development Center further discussions should occur to weigh the possibilities of new locations or renovation of existing spaces.

WHEREAS, the plan should ideally provide a prioritization of facilities needs and a timeline for meeting those needs; and that any implementation of facilities plans should be thoroughly discussed and vetted with campus constituents prior to its implementation;

A prioritization of facilities needs is included in the facilities document. The expressed goals of HMC were to develop new structures and remodel existing structures with the least disruption to the college environment and with the lowest possible need for swing space. Everything in the CMP is a proposal with buildings included as “place holders” until final plans are drawn sometime in the future. It is impossible to develop a useful timeline for adding or remodeling facilities without knowing the future funding situation at the state level. Suggesting that this CMP should include a timeline is unrealistic.

WHEREAS, the plan’s authors relied on input from a select group of people, repeatedly ignored proposed revisions, did not conduct adequate follow up interviews with persons directly affected by the plan, and did not adequately disseminate the plan to campus or community constituents;

As noted in answers previously provided, the plan’s authors did not rely on input from a select group of people. The plan was developed in a shared governance model where members of the committee were responsible to gather feedback from their constituency groups and bring that feedback to the table for discussion. The draft plans were disseminated to the whole campus on numerous occasions for input.

WHEREAS, no evaluation of the previous master planning process nor its implementation has been conducted to inform the current master planning process and its possible implementation;

The earliest meetings of the CMP committee that began meeting in late 2009 discussed the 1999 EMP and the limitations of that document. It was pointed out that the 1999 document was more of a facilities master plan than an educational master plan.