

**FULLERTON COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE**  
**approved minutes**  
**1 November 2012**

**present, according to sign-in sheet**

At-Large	Dale Craig, Liz Kiszely, Pete Snyder
Business/CIS	
Counseling	Laura Almodóvar-Solé; Bryan Ouchi
Fine Arts	Jamie Perez
Humanities	Joe Carrithers, Jeanne Costello, Kim Orlijan
Library	Jane Ishibashi
Math/Comp. Sci.	Linda Shideler, Cheryl Duhme
Natural Sci.	Liliana Barabas; Jan Chadwick
Part-time	Josh Troesh
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 Nora Matti
Senate President	Rolando Sanabria
President-Elect	Sam Foster
Curriculum Council	Jennifer Combs
Treasurer	Mary Nolan-Riegle
Secretary	Brandon Floerke
Guests	FC President, Rajan Vurdien Student Equity Committee Chair, Chris Lamm Institutional Research committee Chair, Diana Kyle Callista Lee Annie Bianchino

I      **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:05P by Sanabria.

II APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

M/S/U (Nolan-Riegle/Craig) to approve minutes with clarifications.

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

M/S/U (Combs/Nolan-Riegle) to approve the agenda for this meeting.

IV PUBLIC COMMENTS

President Vurdien thanked faculty for all of our hard work and for making so many good things happen at Fullerton College.

Callista Lee reminded senators that the deadline for students to apply to study abroad in Rome is 7 November. The trip is in danger of not making, so she urged faculty to help her get the word out.

Chris Lamm made an announcement about the Food Bank. They passed a random inspection which is good. They continue to collect donations and solicit volunteers.

Chris Lamm also announced that Kindercaminata is slated for April 26 next semester, and she encouraged faculty to find a way to get involved.

V EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORTS

**President's report**

District Consultation Council: The difference between the NOCCCD FTES Work Group vs. the NOCCCD Budget Allocation Work Group was discussed. It was noted that the District Planning and Budget Group work is addressing one budget item at time. It has started with the FTES Allocation and the DSS Budget Allocation. After these items are addressed, they will move to additional items in the budget. Non-District Employees as Committee Members were discussed and it was noted that a workgroup is not under the same policies as a committee. Due to lack of support on this issue, the retired SCE Provost will continue as a member of the work group.

PAC: The proposed Enrollment Management Committee was discussed. The Deans did not support the proposal. The President indicated that he would consider all points of view and will provide his decision at the next meeting. The Student Success Committee provided a brief presentation on their ongoing work. Sanabria asked if they would conduct a presentation to Senate and they indicated they would rather wait until more of their work has been completed. The proposed Tech Committee was discussed and will be discussed under New Business. Lastly, the plan for the La Habra site was presented and the Chancellor and his staff will make the final decision.

## Treasurer's Report

Nolan-Riegle thanked senators who provided snacks.

### VI CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT<sup>1</sup>

65 of 204 courses from our fall 2013 Fast-Track approved by the Curriculum Committee yesterday, 10/31/12. The rest of the courses (139) will be on the 11/7 Curriculum Committee Agenda (some of these were addressed at the 10/31 meeting and just need a few things done/fixed in order to get quick approvals on them next week). This represents remarkable, awe-inspiring efforts on the part of discipline faculty and deans as well as the Curriculum Committee, including resource members.

Faculty originators should have thoroughly reviewed ALL comments in Tech Review, made changes as appropriate, asked questions if they had any, and explained any changes they did not make (in CurricUNET or in an email to me and their Division Rep) by today! Curriculum Committee members will start final review tomorrow and if changes noted in CNET have not been addressed by faculty courses may not be approved in time for fall 2013.

Faculty originators will need to keep an eye on their proposals in CNET and on email to check for any added comments as reviewers prepare to approve at the 11/7/12 Curriculum, Committee meeting. This is the LAST CHANCE for Curriculum Committee approval so any/all changes needed MUST be done before that meeting in order for these courses to move forward with an effective date of fall 2013.

Our VPI has committed to work with us to process approvals in time for December DCCC. It is still my understanding that he will not hold curriculum for recommendations for changes that require time for discussion before decisions are made.

Go ahead and pre-launch any/all other curriculum proposals at this time.

Next week we will develop the process for fast-tracking essential course and program revisions, as well as deletions, for fall 2013.

The goal will be to identify what is critical for fall 2013, all other proposals will be processed for fall 2014.

---

<sup>1</sup> What follows is the full text of Combs's report, repeated verbatim.

## VII ELECTIONS

No Elections.

## VIII OLD BUSINESS

### A. SLOs Update- Ken Collins—Tabled

Sanabria explained that Collins did not attend the meeting because he was still waiting on reports from some of the programs. He will come back to a future meeting to give an update.

## IX NEW BUSINESS

### A. Institutional Research Committee<sup>2</sup>

As an institution coming off of accreditation warning, Fullerton College is working diligently to foster a climate of data-driven decision making and planning. This was the basis of the recent instructional program review cycle and it seems, according to the evaluations completed by the IRC, to have been a very successful way for programs to conduct their self-studies.

It is the sense of the Institutional Research Committee that a great deal of the success of the instructional Program Review was due to the data available from the Office of Institutional Planning and Research. The IRC is concerned that the next round of program review, of the Administration and Operations along with Student Services and Support, will not have the same access to data and will therefore be at risk of producing self-studies of less use in the data-based decision making and planning cycles.

In the immediate present, Individual departments' needs for access to data and support from the Office of Institutional Planning and Research have an effect on success and retention at both the internal and external levels. Programs need to monitor the success, retention, persistence, graduation rates, etc. of their students. The only way to get this data is through the Office of Institutional Research. This is a serious concern. Moreover, access to reliable data is consistent with the strategic master plan of the District and the directives of the accreditation team.

It is the sense of the IRC, that as the demand for decisions based on empirical data has increased, the availability of the empirical data has decreased. This means we cannot make data-driven decisions as we evaluate the directives of the education plan, strategic plan and self-study processes. These processes require immediate access to research data.

---

<sup>2</sup> What follows is the full text of a report read by Nolan-Riegle on behalf of the IRC, repeated with minor revisions.

The IRC supports the College President in securing access to data on campus by filling the administrative position of Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. This is a permanent, on-campus position that was vacated by the death of Dr. Ken Meehan. Since the position was lost by attrition and not cut, re-filling this position is not dependent on November elections. The IRC strongly suggests that budgeted money be released to fill the position as soon as possible.

As a subcommittee of the senate, the IRC requests that the faculty senate take action on this issue. The committee would suggest that:

The Senate Executive Committee present the concerns formally to the president and discuss the solution to this need. The senate as a whole drafts a resolution requesting that the president fill the position as soon as possible. The senate send a letter to the president with the president stating our position.

The IRC would like to have a response in writing from the president by November 14<sup>th</sup> so the response can be distributed to the senators and discussed by them before their last senate meeting of the semester.

The concern of the IRC is that, absent this action by the senate, the researcher position may be moved off campus to the district. Since our campus has a need for local data and support, a researcher based at the district would not serve our needs.

M/S/U (Chadwick/Blanche) to direct the Senate Executive Committee to write a letter to the President requesting that he fill the vacant Institutional Researcher position, and to ask the President to respond in writing to the request by November 14.

#### B. Technology Committee

A proposal was brought to senate for the formation of a PAC Technology Committee. This committee will consolidate the three existing campus technology committees. The three committees were formed based on now-irrelevant reasons, and the sense is that the technology needs of this campus will be better served by one committee.

M/S/U (Blanche/Nolan-Riegler) to approve the proposed Technology Committee.

#### C. Program Review Committee

Revisions to the Program Review Committee were presented to senate by the committee chair, Jan Chadwick.

1. The committee has found that their work should focus on scouring the reports coming out of Program Review to identify “themes” rather than to develop “goals.” They feel that the existing shared governance bodies such as the PAC are more suitable bodies to develop goals. To this end, the PRC proposed a revision to the mission and purpose of the committee for the senate’s approval. The new language is copied below:

“Formed by the Faculty Senate in fall 2010, the Program Review Committee promotes and supports the systematic self assessment of instructional programs, student support services, and administrative/operational areas throughout the college. To that end, the Program Review Committee designs self-study documents, reads and evaluates the self-studies and provides feedback to writers. A key purpose for the committee is to identify common themes found across the various program reviews. The college themes identified by the committee are presented to Faculty Senate for ratification, forwarded to the President’s Advisory Council (PAC) for endorsement and used to inform the campus process of developing college goals. The Program Review Committee provides both the identified themes as well as a complete list of requested resources. As part of a continuous quality improvement process, the committee engages in ongoing review and revision of templates and processes associated with Program Review. Members shall serve staggered terms (when feasible) with one half the committee elected / appointed /selected new for each program review cycle. The Program Review Committee reports to the Faculty Senate.”

M/S/U (Chadwick/Snyder) to accept the proposed revisions to the Program Review Committee dated 10/16/2012, and that the senate will advocate for those changes at PAC.

2. Some people on the PRC feel that the two-year cycle is too short and want to move to a three-year cycle. Senate engaged in a lengthy discussion as to the potential advantages and risks of such a plan. No consensus was reached (nor was it sought—as Chadwick was not asking for a formal vote on the matter). It was agreed that the senators should take the discussion back to their divisions to get further input regarding the efficacy of moving to a three-year cycle.
3. The PRC was disappointed to see that the faculty allocation process for the current year seemed to ignore the Program Review process. Only 8 of the 17 faculty positions that were identified as priorities through this process had faculty position requests in their Program Reviews. The PRC believes that the recommendations that come out of Program Review ought to drive planning, and this includes faculty allocation.

#### D. Student Equity Committee<sup>3</sup>

Chris Lamm of the SEC offered a report to update faculty on their work. They continue to work on a set of recommendations for the college to improve equity, and they are re-examining the 2008 Student Equity Plan. Some of the key issues that the committee is looking at are: redesigning the Financial Aid Office; campus signs; Institutional Research; the campus website; Staff Development; the FC Food Bank; ensuring a safe campus environment for all students with emphasis on LGBT students, veterans, and AB 540 students. Lamm emphasized that they are being careful to work with the programs and groups involved in each of these areas before formally submitting recommendations to the President.

#### E. MyGateway email for classes –Tabled

#### F. Supplemental Instruction

Annie Bianchino from Natural Sciences brought forward an issue regarding Supplemental Instruction. The Student Success Committee is launching a new SI program. The Natural Science division received word from the VPI that they would have to adapt their model of SI to the model developed by SSC. The primary distinction between the two models is that Natural Sciences have the faculty members lead the SI, while the SSC model has students leading SI.

Natural Sciences objects to the change for several reasons. First, Bianchino explained that she is on the SSC and never got the impression that they were developing an SI model that the rest of the campus would have to adopt. They feel that this was thrust upon Natural Sciences without going through the proper process. Second, they are funding their SI from a grant that was earned based on the description of their existing model. Third, they feel that the faculty in the affected division should make the decisions regarding how to serve their own students. Fourth, they argue that their model is effective.

As it stands, the VPI indicated by email that there has been miscommunication regarding to this issue, and he would like to discuss it with the Natural Science division. After much discussion in senate, no action was taken. Instead, faculty are waiting to hear from the VPI.

### X LIAISON REPORTS **Associated Students**

AS is working hard to get the word out about how Prop 30 will impact students.

---

<sup>3</sup> This report was given out of order. Lamm, due to a prior commitment had to give her report earlier in the meeting, but I included it here, where it falls on the agenda.

AS is also eager to work more closely with faculty on issues that impact the campus. In particular, how can we get AS committees and Senate subcommittees can work together. Sanabria urges the AS representatives to bring a formal proposal to the senate, and assured AS that we would be very open to that idea.

### **United Faculty**

UF is waiting to see what will happen with Prop 30 and intend to monitor how the election results will impact decisions at the district.

The Joint SLO committee is meeting for the first time on 7 November to discuss SLO's and how the contract obligation is enforced at the campuses and from division to division.

### **Adjunct faculty**

No report.

The meeting adjourned at 4:58pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brandon Floerke  
Secretary