

**Fullerton College Faculty Senate**  
**7-Dec 17**  
**President's Report, Josh A.**

1-Our next meeting is next year: Thursday, February 1<sup>st</sup>. Remember that next semester the Senate will elect executives for the 2018-19 academic year: president-elect, secretary, treasurer, and an additional at-large executive who will fill-in for Josh as president during Spring 2019 Study Abroad. Please talk to the Senate executives if you are interested in running.

2-You might recall that at our last Senate meeting three weeks ago we passed Comprehensive Flex Day Reform. In other words, in our Solomonic wisdom we split the baby in two. We called for the 10 hours of flex activities to be divided into two parts: one, five-hour mandatory flex day in the fall and the other 5 hours to be filled throughout the year by each individual faculty member—i.e., the old-fashioned flex contract.

The UF negotiating team is pushing to have all ten hours determined by individual faculty members, who would report their annual flex activities electronically. The Staff Development Committee would be responsible for the accountability process. Obviously, that last term “accountability process” is open to wide interpretation. UF is looking at how other colleges handle this, and I encourage interested faculty members to do the same.

3-The Anaheim Pledge is a collaboration between the Anaheim Union High School District (AUHSD), NOCCCD, Cal State Fullerton, and UC Irvine. There are several aspects to the Pledge, but the Pledge basically will make it easier for AUHSD graduates to move from one institution to the other. The main idea is to make course credits more easily transferrable and provide money for fees and scholarships. Community College Districts across the State are participating in Pledge/Promise programs. See, for example, the Long Beach Promise.

Chancellor Cheryl Marshall is interested in visiting a Senate meeting in the Spring semester to talk about faculty's role in the Anaheim Pledge. She is also talking about including FC faculty in a meeting with discipline colleagues in K-12 to talk about how our curricula can complement each other. We're especially looking at you, Math and English.

4-At the most recent Board of Trustees meeting, Dr. Schulz presented the FC Annual Report and Institutional Effectiveness Report. The IE Report is available to view:

[http://oirp.fullcoll.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/27/2017/12/2017\\_FC\\_Institutional\\_Effectiveness\\_Report\\_Final\\_Web.pdf](http://oirp.fullcoll.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/27/2017/12/2017_FC_Institutional_Effectiveness_Report_Final_Web.pdf)

The Annual Report is almost ready for the website.

5-At the most recent District Consultation Council meeting, DCC read a proposal from Robert Gamboa (Counseling Division faculty) to allow the College to award multiple certificates and degrees to graduating students who did not realize they qualified for more than one. Other District bodies are looking at the proposal (Board Policy Council, Student Team). It will be back on the DCC agenda in January or February.

Also at DCC, budget planners are looking at forecasts for the 2018-19 budget. Chancellor of Finance Fred Williams reported that the revenue projections for 2018-19 are “pretty decent.” Fred also reported there is a system-wide re-evaluation of hiring employees using “soft dollars,” or “categorical funds.” This is on the agenda for Monday’s Council on Budget and Facilities.

One example of soft dollars is the Strong Workforce Initiative. SWI money seems to be forthcoming in 2018-19, but as Chancellor Marshall put it, there are “strings attached.”

6-At the most recent President’s Advisory Council, Pres. Schulz announced that the first annual President’s Gala and auction raised \$36K for Fullerton College Foundation Scholarships. Mark your calendars for next year. The President’s Gala is rapidly becoming THE social event of the season.

### **Save-the-date notices**

7-From the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges: the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award, 5-Feb 18 app deadline. All faculty are eligible. One faculty member or group of faculty members per college can apply. \$5K. “This award seeks to honor the cadre of committed faculty who consistently rise to meet the challenges or students face ... [and] acknowledges an individual or group that is exceptional in contributing to the advancement of intercultural harmony, equity, and campus diversity and their college.”

8-The African American Education Network and Development Organization (A2MEND) and ASCCC are holding the 11<sup>th</sup> Annual African American Male Summit, March 1-2, 2018 at the Westin LAX. Deadline for presentation proposals: 15-Dec.

9-There are two faculty seats on the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. One seat is open for any faculty member who wants to nominate him or herself by noon on 15-Dec. Find out more here: <http://www.asccc.org/board-governors-nominations>.



**Fullerton College Faculty Senate  
Winter Session Task Force recommendation, 7-Dec 17**

The Winter Session Task Force recommends that Fullerton College add a five-week Winter Session to the academic calendar. Winter Session should be similar to Summer Session, meaning that Winter Session will be a separate academic term for the purposes of calculating full-time and part-time faculty teaching loads. Winter Session should NOT be a subset of Spring or Fall semester. It should be a stand-alone academic term. For this reason, we recommend calling the term “Winter Session” instead of “Winter Intersession.”

Here are some additional principles for Winter Session.

1. Student services, such as the Library, the Student Health Center, the Tutoring Center, and the Veterans Center, must be open during Winter Session.
2. Each department will decide which classes are appropriate to offer during a five-week term.
3. Faculty members will choose to teach a Winter Session class on a purely voluntary basis. As in Summer Session, they will not be assigned a class against their will.
4. Faculty members recognize that Winter Session will reduce the number of days between academic terms. This will make it necessary for instructors to submit grades on time, so that the Financial Aid and Registrar’s Office can do the work necessary for students to begin the next term.
5. If it is decided that there will be a “unit cap” on how many Winter Session classes a student can take, the unit cap should be 5.0 units.
6. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) should track the students who take Winter and Spring classes to see if students are indeed using Winter Session to advance more quickly toward a degree (instead of just taking fewer Spring classes).

Here are some issues about which we need more information before we can arrive at consensus.

1. Winter Session will have an impact on the Spring calendar. It will not be possible to have Spring Break AND finish classes before Memorial Day Weekend. We feel that we need survey results from faculty and students before making this choice.
2. Does a five-week Winter Session mean that Spring Semester will begin on the sixth week of the year? (For example, in 2019, would Spring begin on 5-Feb 19 or 12-Feb 19?) In other words, does there have to be week of no instruction between Fall and Winter?
3. If the answer to #1 is that there will be no week between terms, then what happens to Spring Convocation?



## **Fullerton College Faculty Senate Building User Groups Proposal, 7-Dec 17**

### **Building User Group (BUG) formation**

1. All BUGs will include administrators, faculty members, classified professionals, and students.
2. Selection of BUG members will be made by the shared governance groups: the Associated Students, Classified, and Faculty Senates.
3. BUGs may break into subgroups. For example, one subgroup may focus on classroom design. Another may focus on the placement of electrical outlets and light fixtures. Changes in plans must be approved by the whole BUG.
4. The lead faculty member(s) on each BUG should receive release time commensurate with the size, complexity, and duration of the building project.

### **Building User Group function**

1. After the District has decided on the budget, building location, and building footprint, BUGs will participate in decision making in every stage of construction through completion.
2. The BUG shall determine whether a change in plans is “minor” or “major.” All changes in plans must be subject to BUG approval, even after the State architect’s office has approved building plans.
3. The BUG shall be informed of the parameters of the project, including but not limited to budget, timeline, and building size.
4. BUG members should be present at all meetings so they can approve, with signatures, any changes to plans. So that all constituents (students, faculty, administrators, classified professionals) are represented, BUG meetings and discussions should include all members.
5. Substantive participation requires realistic timelines.

## Overview:

---

The Institutional Effectiveness and Research Committee (IREC) is a Faculty Senate committee with both at-large positions and divisional representation positions. The charter of IREC is to evaluate the effectiveness of campus and district processes as they relate to the 10+1 charge mandated for the Faculty Senate.

The Fullerton College Senate Exec, on behalf of the Fullerton College Senate, has requested that IREC review the current Faculty Allocation process at Fullerton College. This report consists of the review of the Faculty Allocation process, an evaluation of the effectiveness of this process, and some committee recommendations for the Senate.

## Executive Summary:

---

The Faculty Allocation process consists of two parts, the Faculty decision-making process and the Administrative decision-making process. The Faculty part of the process consists of a Faculty Allocation Committee organized by the Faculty Senate. Each Division has a member on this committee. The Faculty Allocation Committee meets and, through consensus, produces a ranked list of Faculty positions requested by the Divisions. Once this list has been created, it is submitted to the Senate and then to the college President.

The parallel process involves the Division Deans. Each Dean comes up with one or more Faculty positions identified as necessary for the Division. At a meeting of the Deans Council a final ranked list of positions is created jointly by the Deans. This list is then forwarded to the college President, who creates a final list, which will be submitted to the District.

There are two critical elements of these processes, how the initial Division-level recommendations are arrived at, and how are the final ranked lists of positions created. The initial Divisional recommendations should be driven by faculty discussions at the department and division level, while the final ranked list should be the product of evidence-based joint decision making.

Based on our investigation, it is the finding of IREC that the faculty-driven allocation process generally follows best practices while the Dean-driven allocation process does not necessarily follow best practices. The recommendations of IREC concerning this process are:

- Create or better define the process whereby Division/Department faculty provide input to the educational criteria used to justify a new/replacement position.
- Create or consistently use a new/replacement position form at the Divisional level of the process. This position form should be developed and reviewed by Division/Department faculty
- Create a single Divisional list of ranked positions by doing away with the Deans allocation process and have the Dean participate in the Division-level recommendation process.
- Have the college President communicate to the Senate the reasons for any changes made to the final ranked list prior to submission to the District.
- Have DCC (District Consultation Council ) discuss Faculty allocation requests and forward a recommendation to the Chancellor

## Faculty Allocation Criteria

---

There are two main criteria used (or should be used) to allocate new/replacement Faculty positions. These are educational needs and economic constraints. Educational needs include:

- Number of courses offered
- Kinds of courses offered (basic skills, transfer, vocational)
- Number of full-time Faculty in the area
- Student demand and potential growth of enrollment
- Number of current part-time faculty and ability to hire new part-time Faculty
- Initiation of new programs and/or revision of current programs as reflected in Program Review
- Current Faculty expertise in a subject area

The economic constraints would include:

- Availability of on-going District funds needed to hire new Faculty
- Availability of on-going college funds needed to create and support new programs for which the Faculty member will be hired
- Current FTFO (full-time Faculty Allocation) from the State Chancellor's office

The educational needs criteria are best evaluated by the full-time faculty in a Department or Division because Faculty have the expertise to evaluate the educational needs and the requirements for additional or replacement full-time Faculty. The Division Dean and college Vice Presidents are better able to evaluate the economic constraints of hiring new or replacement Faculty. However, educational needs should outweigh economic concerns unless there are clear and compelling economic reasons that supersede educational needs.

## Current Faculty Allocation Processes:

---

The current Faculty Allocation process results in the college President presenting a single ranked list of needed positions to the District. There are currently two parallel Faculty Allocation processes, one conducted by the Faculty Senate and the other conducted by the Division Deans. While there is no documented purpose to have two different processes to allocate new/replacement Faculty, a possible reason is that the Faculty process considers the education needs of a Division while the Dean's process considers the economic constraints.

The general steps to the Faculty process include:

Step 1: Faculty in departments meet and put forward a list of new/replacement positions based on education needs. This list is presented to the department coordinator.

Step 2: In either a general Division meeting or in a Department coordinator meeting, a single list of new/replacement positions is created.

Step 3: The Divisional member of the Senate Faculty Allocation committee is given this list of new/replacement positions along with the educational needs criteria used to decide on these positions.

Step 4: The Senate Faculty Allocation committee meets and comes up with a final ranked list of positions for all Divisions. This is done in an open meeting and a conclusion reached by consensus. This list is forwarded to the Senate President.

Step 5: The Senate list is presented to the Senate and then forwarded to the College President.

The Dean's process for identifying new/replacement is much more opaque.

Step 1: The Division Dean creates a ranked list of new/replacement positions. The process whereby the Dean comes up with list is not clearly documented. Some Deans discuss new/replacement positions with their Faculty and others appear to create a list based on their own understanding of the Division (or for other undisclosed reasons).

Step 2: The Dean takes their list to a Dean's Council meeting, which is chaired by a college Vice President, and the Deans vote on ranking the positions (typically, an anonymous vote). It is assumed that some type of discussion among the Deans and VP take place.

Step 3: The Dean's ranked list is presented to the College President.

Once both lists are presented to the college President, a final list is created (hopefully based on the Faculty and Dean's list) which is then sent to the District. The District process for creating a final list of new/replacement positions is, like the Dean's and President's processes, generally opaque.

### Evaluation of current Faculty Allocation Process:

---

The current Faculty Allocation Process can be evaluated on the following criteria:

- How well does the process allow Division/Department faculty to provide input in the creation of the Division new/replacement allocation list.
- How well does the process provide transparency so Faculty understand the reasons for the creation of the final Division list and for the creation of the final College list.

Using these two criteria, the Faculty Senate allocation committee process is closer to meeting these criteria than the Dean's only process. Since the Faculty Allocation committee has representation from each campus Division, there is a built-in channel to the Division faculty. If the Divisional representative on this committee does his/her job, and the Division faculty meet to discuss new/replacement faculty hires, and the Faculty Allocation committee meetings (as well as the Senate meetings) are open to anyone, Faculty have the ability to not only participate in the Senate's process but observe how the final list is created.

Since the Deans process involves a Dean alone making a decision about staffing needs, and attending a meeting of the Deans Council (which is not open to Faculty) to create the final list, these two criteria do not seem to apply to the Dean's Process.

### Committee Recommendations:

---

The recommendations from IREC regarding the Faculty Allocation Process are:

1. Create or better define the process whereby Division/Department faculty provide input to the educational criteria used to justify a new/replacement position. While there are designated faculty representatives on the Senate Faculty Allocation committee, the processes within the Division whereby the committee representative communicates with Division Faculty should be more formalized. This could be done by recording the date/time

of the meeting or have Faculty sign to indicate that they were asked for their input.

2. Create or consistently use a new/replacement position form, which should be initiated by Division/Department faculty. The position request form should include space to record the reasons for requesting a new position as well as space to record evidence. The evidence would include academic criteria such as enrollment trends, program review documentation, and other criteria specific to the Division/Department.
3. Create a single list of ranked positions by using a single allocation process and discontinuing the Dean Allocation process. This process would include:

Step 1: Announce to the Division/Department Faculty that they can request a new/replacement position and distribute the new Position Request form.

Step 2: The Departments/Divisions would allocate time at their regular Department/Division meetings to discuss this issue, allowing the Dean to be part of the general discussion.

Step 3: Submit the Division/Department request for new/replacement positions to both the Dean and to the Senate Faculty Allocation representative. The Dean can add the economic criteria to the request and add it as part of the Senate Faculty Allocation process. The Deans recommendations can be attached to the document considered by the Faculty Allocation committee but the allocation request will not depend on the Dean's endorsement.

Step 4: The Senate Faculty Allocation committee will meet at an announced time to discuss the prioritization of the Division/Department requests. This meeting will be announced through the Senate and will be open to any Faculty to attend.

Step 5: The final list created by the Senate Faculty Allocation committee will be submitted to the college President.

Step 6: The College President will make a final determination of the prioritized list and will report to the Senate, at a regular Senate Meeting, the final decision. If requested by the Senate, the College President will document the criteria and process used to determine the final list of new/replacement positions.

4. The new/replacement positions will be presented to the District Consolation Council (DCC) as an agenda item and discussed by DCC prior to being submitted to the Chancellor.