

FULLERTON COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE
approved minutes
18 October 2012

present, according to sign-in sheet

At-Large	Dale Craig, Liz Kiszely, Ricardo Salas, Pete Snyder
Business/CIS	Marcus Wilson, Nancy Woolridge
Counseling	Laura Almodóvar-Solé; Bryan Ouchi
Fine Arts	Jamie Perez
Humanities	Joe Carrithers, Jeanne Costello, Angela Henderson; Cathy Collopy-O'Donnel; Kim Orlijan
Library	Jane Ishibashi
Math/Comp. Sci.	Linda Shideler, Cheryl Duhme
Natural Sci.	Mike Baker; Liliana Barabas; Jan Chadwick
Part-time	Josh Troelsh
Physical Ed.	Tim Byrnes, Pam Lewin
Social Sciences	Gigi Blanche; Robert Byde; Julie Felender
Student Services	vacant
Tech./Engineering	Jose Miranda, Peg Donahoe
Associated Students	Daniel Moldovan
Senate President	Rolando Sanabria
President-Elect	Sam Foster
Curriculum Council	Jennifer Combs
Treasurer	Mary Nolan-Riegle
Secretary	Brandon Floerke
Guests	VP of Instruction, Terry Giugni

I CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:04pm by Sanabria.

II APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

M/S/U (Nolan-Riegle/Henderson) to approve minutes with the request that PE faculty provide evidence regarding New Business: Section B: Priority Registration.

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

M/S/U (Troesh/Combs) to approve the agenda for this meeting.

IV PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jane Ishibashi announced that planning has begun for the second annual Worldfest event. The committee is soliciting faculty involvement. Contact Cecilia Arriaza (714) 992-7087 or carriaza@fullcoll.edu for more information.

V EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORTS

President's report

Sanabria once again noted that it has been a very quiet beginning to this academic term, as we await the outcome of the November elections. If Proposition 30-passes, then the district may hire as many as fourteen new full-time faculty members. If the prop fails, they will likely hire no new faculty.

Treasurer's Report

Nolan-Riegle thanked those who provided snacks.

VIII CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT¹

The Curriculum Committee as a whole, division reps and all of our resource members, are working hard to accomplish the truly challenging goal of processing 200+ new courses identified by FC faculty as necessary to continue to serve students in disciplines affected by the changes to repeatability. The rationale for our "fall 2013 repeatability fast-track is explained below:

Fullerton College is a place where students come to build skills to compete in Art, Dance, Music, Theater, Communications, and other vocational and academic fields. Many of our students have limited if any access to learning opportunities in these disciplines prior to attending FC or outside of what we offer at Fullerton College.

The new courses in the fall 2013 repeatability fast-track are needed in order for FC to continue offering these career and transfer preparation experiences to our students. The state allows us to create "families" of courses for this purpose.

These "new courses" that make up the "families" are not additions to what we do in these disciplines, just new ways of "packaging" the learning experiences we currently offer via course repeatability.

¹ What follows is the full text of Comb's report, repeated verbatim.

The state imposed deadline of fall 2013 does not allow us to follow our traditional curriculum approval process...there is not enough time to fully flesh out written descriptions of the different levels of each course or to fully discuss any major changes to pedagogy in a discipline during this very limited window we have to get courses on the books in time to serve our continuing students in these disciplines.

Questions about what we teach and how will continue to be discussed, and decisions about changes may be made, yet these discussions take time. Changes to the learning opportunities offered at Fullerton College should not occur as a result of requiring standards for curriculum approval that are unreasonable given the time constraints.

Our priority is to maintain the rigor and integrity of our instruction in these disciplines and that requires rapid processing of curriculum for fall 2013.

This is not ideal as it means we will have imperfect curriculum until we have the time to clean it up, but it is necessary to serve our students in the upcoming academic year.

The curriculum approval process for this fast-track has been modified to allow for all reviewers to provide input at the same time. When review is complete, proposals are forwarded to faculty originators who must thoroughly review all comments in CNET and then make the changes suggested where appropriate, or explain the reasons why suggested changes were not made when they "take action" to move the proposal forward. Division Reps will be working with faculty to get the changes made ASAP and when they are confident reviewers' suggestions have been addressed the proposals will go to the Curriculum Committee for approval.

We will be creating our DCCC agenda request reports this week for all the new courses proposed for fall 2013. We will use these so that articulation, catalog, and other key components of these new courses can be checked and changes can be made as needed. This "DCCC agenda check" will provide the opportunity for our resource members to review courses and to indicate where any important corrections still need to be made. We will make these changes before we present the courses at DCCC.

Our goal is for review to be complete no later than 10/29 so changes can be made as needed to prepare for Curriculum Committee approval on 10/31. We will have one last chance to approve new courses in time for December DCCC at our Curriculum Committee meeting on 11/7.

This timeline would allow our Curriculum Specialist the time she needs to submit all of these new courses to the state.

It will also provide our Catalog Coordinator with the time she needs to create all these new courses in the catalog and Banner, and to add them to the fall Schedule of Classes when that is developed.

In addition, we still have course revisions, including the removal of repeatability from hundreds of courses required by law, and program revisions to process for the fall 2013 catalog. These are the next steps after we complete the processing of the new courses and clearly we will need time to process these as well.

If we are unable to meet the timeline set by the Curriculum Committee (December DCCC), the next DCCC meeting is February 2013, so BOT approval would be delayed until March and we would not be able to submit these 200+ new courses to the state until after BOT approval. The people who input curricular changes will have a very short time to do that work, articulation could be compromised if we miss those deadlines, and we will be hard pressed to get course and program revisions processed in time for fall 2013.

So, we have asked our VPI to work with us to accomplish our goals in the established time frame and he has agreed to make every effort to review proposals quickly to allow them to be revised by faculty and approved by the Curriculum Committee on 10/31 or 11/7.

We are cautiously optimistic that we have a plan and the necessary commitment to that plan from faculty, deans, our classified professionals, our VPI, our President, and the District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) to accomplish our curriculum goals for in time for implementation in fall 2013.

VI ELECTIONS

Two vacant at-large Faculty Senate positions were cancelled for this academic year, since we were unable to fill them.

Liz Kiszely was elected to serve on the Innovation Fund Task Force.

VII OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposed changes to the Basic Skills Committee

At our previous meeting, the senate approved a motion advocate at PAC for changes to the Basic Skills Committee (changing the name and membership of the committee). At the PAC meeting, a resource member of that committee objected to the changes, and asked for the opportunity to go back to the Basic Skills Committee to change their minds. The proposed changes were therefore tabled at PAC. Sanabria and Costello (the chair of the committee) both agreed that this did not respect the

shared governance process. They argued that the recommendation came from the committee and should have been decided at PAC. It is not the right of a resource member to stop a proposal while it goes through our shared governance system.

B. FC Enrollment Management Update

VPI Guigni returned to the Senate with data from 2007 to present regarding EDB Expenditures, Sections, FTES, and LHE by division. Discussion ensued. Why had we given money back to the district instead of offering more classes in 2011-12? Aren't the FTES number misleading, since they do not take into consideration the backfill used to cover unfilled retirements? Why did PE receive disproportionate cuts to FTES? Guigni indicated that he is working on a model that will report data by division that takes LHE and reassign time into consideration. He also encouraged Senators to email him questions in advance of his visits so that he has an opportunity to prepare careful answers.

C. NOCCCD FTES Work Group vs. NOCCCD Budget Allocation Work Group

President –Elect Foster discovered some confusion at the district level regarding the “NOCCCD FTES Work Group” and the “NOCCCD Budget Allocation Work Group.” Budget Allocation Work Group was formed this semester in response to our calls for an investigation into how the colleges in the district are compensated per student hour—in particular the disparity between the amounts of money Cypress receives compared with Fullerton. The FTES Work Group was formed last Spring to look at many issues related to FTES. Foster came to realize that somehow these two committees seem to have been combined, and this has created confusion about the purpose of the FTES committee. Sanabria told the senate that they intended to bring this issue to the Chancellor.

VIII NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed FC Enrollment Management Committee

M/S/U (Snyder/Nolan-Riegle) with two abstentions to approve the Enrollment Management Committee proposal.

There was some discussion about adding more faculty positions to the committee. It was argued that this would create wider representation, especially since different divisions might have different concerns about how enrollment gets managed on campus. Others were concerned that it would prove too difficult to fill the positions if there were too many. Therefore:

M/S/A (Carrithers/Costello) with five opposed and four abstentions that the senate would whenever possible elect no more than one faculty from the same division to sit on the Enrollment Management Committee.

Other concerns were also voiced. Craig was concerned the idea of the committee is

too “top-down,” and could potentially lessen the voice of faculty and deans in enrollment decisions. Kiszely wanted to see the job the EMC assigned to PAC.

B. NOCCCD DSS Budget Allocation Work Group: Non-District Employees as Committee Members

The model for how DSPS is allocated in the district has led to gross inequity. As it stand now, FC teaches over 50% of WSC in the district (Weighted Student Count—a formula that reflects the number of students and the “weight” of the resources required to accommodate them). However, FC only receives 39% of the allocation. The result is that FC is backfilling DSS with approximately \$250,000 per year. Meanwhile SCE and Cypress combined served less than 50% WSC, yet combined receive over 60% of the funding. In the spring a district work group was formed to look into this issue. SCE has appointed a non-employee to serve on the committee as their representative. FC leadership is protesting the non-district employee sitting on this work group.

C. Proposed Technology Committee—Tabled

IX LIAISON REPORTS

Associated Students

Moldovan distributed a flyer about Proposition 30.

United Faculty

The UF Newsletter addresses the new board policy on closed-circuit surveillance. The union is strongly opposed to the policy in its original form, as well as its more recent revisions.

Adjunct faculty

No report.

The meeting adjourned at.
4:55

Respectfully submitted,
Brandon Floerke
Secretary