

**Fullerton College Faculty Senate
approved minutes
21 May 2015**

present, according to sign-in sheet

At-large Gigi Blanche, Dale Craig, Angela Henderson, Flor Huerta, Diana Kyle

Business/CIS Ming Scott, Marcus Wilson

Counseling Robert Gamboa, Bryan Ouchi

Fine Arts Carl Stanaway

Humanities Jeanne Costello, Danielle Fouquette, Kelly Kim, Bob Lundergan, Mike Mangan

Library Monique Delatte Starkey

Math/Comp. Sci. Bill Cowieson

Natural Sci. Jan Chadwick

Part-time Kendrick Kim, Michael Schulze

Physical Ed. Pam Lewin

Social Sci. Bob Byde, Karen Markley

Student Services

Tech./Engineering Marie Perez

Associated Students

Senate President Sam Foster

President-Elect Pete Snyder

Curriculum Comm. Jennifer Combs

Treasurer Kim Orlijan

Secretary Josh Ashenmiller

Guests Carlos Ayon, Director of Institutional Research
Darlene Jensen, Director of Student Affairs
Bob Jensen, Dean of Fine Arts

Scott McKenzie, Dean of Technology and Engineering
Paul McKinley, Director of Disability Support Services
Karen Rose, Director of Special Programs

I CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:07P by Pres. Sam Foster.

II APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

M/S/U (Wilson/Costello) to approve the 7-May 15 minutes.

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

M/S/U (Markley/Kendrick Kim) to approve the agenda for this meeting.

IV PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

V EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORTS

President's report, Sam Foster

The State's May Budget-Revise: The Revise reported more revenue than expected, so the education budget is trending upward. (Nevertheless, for some reason the COLA has dropped from 1.85% to 1.2%.) There is an additional \$75M for hiring new faculty members, which was a result of advocacy by the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges (ASCCC). Our District has decided to increase FC's growth allocation from 2% to 5%. The State has also set aside \$150M for deferred maintenance and instructional equipment.

Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Council: The IECC and Vice Chancellor Cherry Li-Bugg are taking a proactive approach to accreditation. They are planning to work with accreditation work groups on both campuses to help write parts of the self-study that deal with campus-district relations. They also plan to draft a functional map of District governance.

Jan Chadwick also reported from the IECC. The State has created Partnership Resource Teams to make site visits to colleges that ask for help with institutional effectiveness goals, for example: faculty development, SLOs, enrollment management. The main goal is to help colleges avoid receiving accreditation sanctions.

Treasurer's Report

Kim Orlijan thanked Jeanne Costello, Monique Delatte Starkey, Robert Gamboa and Brian Ouchi for food and beverages.

VI ASSOCIATED STUDENTS REPORT, Chris Leon

No report.

VII CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT, Jennifer Combs

[Text below submitted by Jennifer Combs.]

The highest priority of the Curriculum Committee is to facilitate the development and approval of curriculum, including all course and program proposals: Over 400 course proposals and 62 program proposals were developed, processed and approved with an effective date of fall 2015. Approximately 420 course proposals and 43 program proposals are currently in the curriculum approval process for fall 2016. These require DCCC and BOT approval in fall 2015 for submission to the state in time to meet 2016 catalog deadlines.

In addition, the CC has addressed the following procedural/policy changes:

- 1) Streamlined the approval process, including the addition of a “launch” deadline and adjustment of approval timelines to maximize chances for timely state approval.
- 2) Modified our approval process timelines to address the excessive workload for Curriculum Division Reps (currently 10+ hours per week outside of meeting time) and the tidal wave of proposals that requires immediate attention from Reps multiple times each semester.
- 3) Developed and implemented closer scrutiny of program proposals to improve clarity and accuracy, especially in terms of reflecting course changes and expressing unit ranges.
- 4) Expanded the list of verbs on the Bloom’s taxonomy list, giving faculty originators more freedom as they describe their objectives, SLOs and assignments.
- 5) Continued work on ADTs (transfer degrees) in order to facilitate student success and ease of transfer. We expect ADTs in Anthropology and Economics to be State-approved this summer. There are new ADTs under development in Film, TV & Media Studies, Biology, Chemistry, and Nutrition & Dietetics.
- 6) Facilitated, through Fast-Track approvals, the publication of Program-Level SLOs in the FC Catalog to meet accreditation expectations.
- 7) Discussed and endorsed the recommendation of the SLOA Committee to change the format of SLOS by removing the language leading up to the measurable verb from all SLOs. This recommendation was approved by the Senate.
- 8) Developed a process for updating SLOs in CurricUNET and eLumen for accuracy and consistency through assigning the task of updating and reporting back on updates to a trained support staff person (to be provided by the VPI Office). When SLOs are approved by the Curriculum Committee and documented in our minutes, they will be updated in CNET, and in eLumen (if this is acceptable to the SLOA Coordinator) then an email notification of the updates will be sent to the Curriculum Chair/Specialist and the SLO Coordinator/Data Steward to document the updates (see 4-Dec 14 minutes for details).
- 9) Recommended a “Pass-along” policy for CSU GE and IGETC approved General Education coursework completed by students at other colleges to facilitate Associates Degree completion. This recommendation was approved by the Senate.

- 10) Initiated review of our FC Distance Education policies and best practices. Collected division policies/procedures and recommendations for best practices from multiple sources.
- 11) Explored creating a Technical Review Chair position and/or a curriculum executive board. A Tech Review Chair and Curriculum Exec would support the work of the chair and the committee to ease workload and streamline workflow through technical review support, training, and the creation/updating of resource guides for reps and faculty. This would also allow curriculum work/projects identified by the committee as important to be implemented sooner and more comprehensively.

[end of submitted text]

On the topic of curriculum and in light of Accreditation standards, Senators discussed the process for adopting best practices for on-line instruction.

VIII PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT, Jan Chadwick

Reporting SLOAs on eLumen will go live this Fall. Because this process will require a lot of guidance, Jan requested that the SLO Committee shall give a report at every Senate meeting. Currently, faculty can log in to eLumen through Mygateway.

The PRC is getting ready for non-instructional program review, which will begin in the fall.

In order to help faculty members with eLumen, the PRC will offer drop-in sessions at the Teaching Effectiveness Center.

IX INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE REPORT, Diana Kyle

As part of its Planning Process Report, the IREC reviewed qualitative data from focus groups. Diana circulated IREC's draft report of the results. The major themes of the report are reprinted below.

[inserted text]

Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee (IREC) Planning Progress Report to Senate, 21-May 15 Initial Focus Group Themes

This is an interim report. The IREC will present the Executive Summary report at the first meeting of the Fall semester (3-Sep 15).

Focus Groups (2014-15): Dean's Council, Campus Senate and Shared Governance Committees (2), Managers and Directors (2)

Ground Rules: Please, only one person speaks at a time. Please do not use the names of anyone in the group. Refer to number if necessary. No side conversations. Everyone participates and no one dominates. All experiences are equally important and equally valid.

Focus Group Questions

Depending on the group the term “department” was replaced with “committee,” “work area,” etc.

1. Thinking about your department, how are decisions made?
2. Where do you see your department in the overall planning process at FC? In other words, where does your department fit in the planning model?
3. To what degree do you feel your department has input in the planning process and the planning decisions at FC?
4. What do you feel is the greatest weakness in the campus planning process and decision-making process?
5. What do you feel is the greatest strength in the campus planning process and decision-making process?
6. Is there something important about the planning process that we’ve missed?

Major Themes

1. Discontinuities in leadership (particularly the Vice Presidents and institutional research) impact the planning process through changes in priorities, how the process works relative to whom to report to, value of work performed, and how the planning process works.
2. The cohesiveness of campus planning is weak and there are too few conversations about planning. The planning cycles tend to be in three-year increments. No records are kept in many meetings and the memory of conversations is lost. Moreover, the data to make meaningful planning decisions seems void.
3. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) does not seem to be an instrumental part of the planning process. The office has been without a permanent director for several years. Presently, there is a permanent director and plans to hire additional research analysts and support staff.

For the most part, the OIRP does not furnish information needed to make planning decisions. Campus training is needed to identify and interpret data needed for planning decisions. There are planning symposiums once a year for a select group only. Many people on campus do not know much about the planning process or what is actually planned. The OIRP needs more support. (Note: The last planning symposium in spring 2015 was helpful and the IREC’s suggested Council of Committee Chairs was adopted.)

4. Flow of information from one committee to another is problematic. Information is not shared. A lack of connection not only among committees but among different campus offices, divisions, departments, deans, employee groups, etc. is present. This hinders effective decisions and impacts planning. In addition, there is a lack of cohesiveness in planning and decisions. Some of this seems to be due to too few meaningful conversations about planning. Related to this concern is that the vocal minority (from small group meetings) may be the

opinions used by administrators in planning decisions. Others that are not vocal may not have an opportunity to voice their opinions.

5. There is a lack of faculty involvement in campus committees. This impacts planning and decisions and overburdens others. Most of the discussions at Faculty Senate relate to controversial issues. Actual planning seems void. While Senate and others are part of the President's Advisory Council (PAC), planning decisions seem to be weakened due to a lack of information from the OIRP, campus committees, faculty, and support staff.
6. The Council of Committee Chairs was suggested several times since this planning study began.
7. Important planning documents and reports are sent to the entire campus community and only a few days are allowed for suggestions or concerns. The timing falls short of allowing decisions in the process to be shared by the campus community.

*** Kudos to Dr. Chadwick for suggesting the Council of Chairs to the IREC Spring 2013. While this suggestion was passed forward to others, it was not acted on until 2014. This suggestion was widely favored.

[end inserted text]

X ELECTIONS, Pete Snyder
Technology Coordinating Council: **Richard Smead (Bus./CIS)**

Faculty Allocation Committee, Technology and Engineering Division: **Celia Assef (Tech./Eng.), Marie Perez (Tech./Eng.)**

Student Success Committee, Fine Arts Division: **No candidates.**

At-large Senator, 2015-17: **Diana Kyle (Soc. Sci.)**

XI OLD BUSINESS
Extended day budget

There is a proposal at the District to insert a category into the extended day budget model for "program-based funding," based on the Colleges' overall course completion rates. (Senators interpreted this to mean retention rates.) Senators discussed how this might create perverse incentives for faculty members. (I.e., don't allow failing students to withdraw—keep them in your class to the end of the semester, otherwise your College will lose extended day funding.)

Senators discussed further questions. Does this model seem to make sense? If there are specific areas that have low retention rates, for example distance education classes, then does it not make more sense to direct funding into improving retention strategies in those courses, rather than to withhold funds from the entire College? Is

this a reasonable basis for funding allocation decisions? Is it a reasonable incentive to take away money that would allow Colleges to offer more classes?

It was the sense of the Senate to oppose the proposal.

XII NEW BUSINESS

Study Abroad program, Doug Eisner

Tabled until next meeting, 3-Sep 15.

Faculty Senate Awards and Recognitions

On behalf of the Senate, Sam Foster presented framed certificates of appreciation to several long-serving administrators who are retiring. There was much applause.

Karen Rose, Director of Special Programs

Paul McKinley, Director of Disability Support Services

Darlene Jensen, Director of Student Affairs

Bob Jensen, Dean of Fine Arts

Scott McKenzie, Dean of Technology and Engineering

At the next Board of Trustees meeting, Senate president, Pete Snyder will present the Senate's Administrator of the Year Award to outgoing FC Pres. Rajen Vurdien.

President-Elect Pete Snyder assumed the office of Senate President. He now holds the gavel.

Pres. Snyder recognized the senators who have reached the end of their terms: Dale Craig, Jeanne Costello, Angela Henderson, Diana Kyle, Jaime Perez, Gregory Nguyen, Leonor Cadena, Pam Lewin and Jeff Vanderpool.

Senators gave an ovation and lovely parting gifts to outgoing Senate President Sam Foster.

XIII LIAISON REPORTS

United Faculty

UF is collecting members' ballots on the proposed salary increase. Voting ends tomorrow. The Board will vote next week on Tue, 26-May 15. Senators discussed the "contingent negotiations" that accompanied the salary increase. In other words, the District insisted that certain non-salary items be part of the final agreement. The District has never done this before.

Adjunct Faculty United

No report.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05P.

Respectfully submitted, Josh Ashenmiller, secretary