

**Fullerton College Faculty Senate  
approved minutes  
7 December 2017**

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

At-large	Julie Felender, Bryan Ouchi, Marcus Wilson
Business/CIS	Loretta Calvert, Brandon Tran
Counseling	Robert Gamboa, Lorena Marquez, Ruth Sipple
Fine Arts	
Humanities	Amy Garcia, Danielle Fouquette, Bib Lundergan, Jeanette Rodriguez, Matt Taylor
Library	Jill Kageyama
Math/Comp. Sci.	Kara Pham, Abraham Romero Hernandez, Linda Shideler
Natural Sci.	Mike Baker, Colleen Kvaska, Gretchen Stanton
Part-time	Sarah Gray, Zahra Ahmed
Physical Ed.	
Social Sci.	James Crippen
Tech./Engineering	
Associated Students	Taylor Gaetje
President	Josh Ashenmiller
Past President	Pete Snyder
Curriculum Comm.	Jennifer Combs
Treasurer	Karen Markley
Secretary	Heather Halverson
Guests	Carlos Ayon, Director of Institutional Research and Planning Dr. Gil Contreras, Vice President of Student Services Dale Craig, United Faculty, Bus/CIS Division Monique Delatte Starkey, Library Division Brandon Floerke, Humanities Division Rodrigo Garcia, Vice President of Administrative Services

Lisa McPheron, Director of Campus Communications  
Dr. José Ramón Núñez, Vice President of Instruction  
Dr. Greg Schulz, FC President

I CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:03P by Josh Ashenmiller.

II APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

**M/S/U (Wilson/Calvert) to approve the 16-Nov 2017 minutes.**

III APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**M/S/U (Markley/Wilson) to approve the agenda for this meeting.**

IV PUBLIC COMMENTS

Monique Delatte Starkey shared that United Faculty is creating a Diversity Subcommittee and an LGBTQ+ and Straight Allies Subcommittee. All faculty are welcome to join.

Marcus Wilson reminded the Senate that he is hosting his annual holiday party on 14-Dec.

Brandon Floerke shared the following statement:

I have an issue that I would like to be brought up at Senate, and that is the process that the Student Equity Committee has used to make recommendations regarding the 2 million dollar equity budget.

Full disclosure: I submitted a report as the SI Coordinator that was not recommended for funding. While that was disappointing, I have assurances that SI will still be funded via one source or another, hopefully at levels similar to the past. I am not here to advocate for my own or any other proposal that was rejected by the committee. Nor do I want to disparage the individuals involved on the SEC. However, I have some concerns about the process that was used by this committee that I believe are relevant to the Faculty Senate.

1. Historically, the SEC was a Faculty Senate committee, but recently there seems to be confusion about this. I think it is important that the exact nature of this committee is clarified.

2. The faculty sitting on the committee were not appropriately involved in the decision making process with regards to the budget recommendations.

There are twelve faculty representatives on this committee (one from each division and two at-large); plus it is co-chaired by a faculty member. However, the funding proposals that were submitted to the committee were not judged on their merit by the full committee. Instead a smaller group was used to score the proposals using a rubric that was included in the application. After that, the proposals were considered by a separate subcommittee that cast up-or-down votes to support each proposal.

Both the subcommittee that scored the proposals and the subcommittee that made the final vote had very limited faculty involvement. I believe only 2 or 3 of the twelve faculty members were involved in the critical decisions. This is because it was

decided that those faculty that had authored proposals should recuse themselves from the voting. As a result the committee had several administrators and managers, one or two students/classified, and only a couple faculty members.

Furthermore, the VP of Student Services was invited to join the subcommittee that made the up-or-down vote, despite the fact that he is not listed as a member or even a resource member of that committee.

I believe that the faculty members on this committee inappropriately forfeited the opportunity for the faculty as a whole to have a voice in these important decisions.

3. The faculty on the committee that represented their divisions also did not do enough to gather input from their constituent faculty or the faculty senate with regards to the proposals that were submitted. I notice for instance that their recommendations have not been brought to today's senate meeting. At least I do not see them on the agenda. Nor have I heard of any equity decisions being discussed in division meetings across campus.

4. The result of the process I am describing overwhelmingly favors proposals that were made on the Student Services side of the college at the expense of proposals that came from the Instructional side. I believe that all of the proposals that received a flat "no," were from the Instructional side.

The college receives 2 million in equity money, 3-5 million in SSSP money, and \$300,000 in BS money. Of those three budgets the only one where the majority of the funds are allocated to what I consider instructional programs is the BS budget.

5. The rubric scores that were given to the equity proposals bear no relationship to the final up-or-down vote. Some proposals with very low scores were funded, and others with very high scores were not. The criteria given to those of us who submitted proposals do not seem to have had a bearing on the final decisions. The language of those criteria were used sparingly and inconsistently in the justifications for the final choices made

6. Some of the proposals that have been funded seem exorbitant in their costs. One proposal will serve a population of roughly 130 students with a price tag of \$225,000. That is \$1,760 per affected student.

I would like to reiterate that I am not here to disparage my colleagues. I assume that everyone involved acted as they saw fit, with the best interest of students at heart. However, the reason that we have shared governance is to ensure faculty input in such processes, and in this case, I believe that we did not live up to our mandate. I urge the senate to look further into this matter when they return in the spring.

## V EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORTS

### **Updates from Dr. Schulz:**

Dr. Schulz shared that the Fullerton College President's Gala raised over \$37,000 to support the Foundation Office's endowed scholarship programs. He thanked those who participated in this event.

Dr. Schulz shared that he spoke with Irma Ramos, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, and she informed him that she has sent out an invitation to those serving on the Adjunct Hiring Procedures Work Group to attend a meeting in early spring.

Dr. Schulz provided the Senate with a handout regarding FC funding requests for Strong Workforce funds.

Dr. Schulz thanked faculty for their hard work on behalf of students.

**President's Report, Josh Ashenmiller**

Our next meeting is next year: Thursday, February 1st. 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.

At the last Senate meeting three weeks ago we passed Comprehensive Flex Day Reform. The motion passed 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.

Josh stated that the UF negotiating team wants to have all ten hours determined by individual faculty members, who would report their annual flex activities electronically. Jennifer Combs clarified that during negotiations, the District seems open to not having mandatory flex days. 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. Jennifer reminded the Senate that UF’s goal is to ensure that faculty, through the shared governance process, are making the decisions about flex activities.

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.

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

The Annual Report is almost ready for the website.

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. Josh stated that some counselors had informed him that this proposal had not been presented to their division. He also stated that perhaps the proposal could be presented at the 1-Feb Senate meeting.

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.”

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.

Josh gave the following save-the-date notices:

- From the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges: the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award, 5-Feb 18 application 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.”
- The African American Education Network and Development Organization (A2MEND) and ASCCC are holding the 11th Annual African American Male Summit, March 1-2, 2018 at the Westin LAX. Deadline for presentation proposals: 15-Dec.
- 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>.

#### **Treasurer’s Report, Karen Markley**

Karen Markley thanked Zahra Ahmed, Danielle Fouquette, Bob Lundergan and Gretchen Stanton for providing snacks for the meeting.

### **Curriculum Chair Report, Jennifer Combs**

Jennifer reported that the Curriculum Committee attended a demonstration of a new Curriculum Management system from the company Fullerton College purchased our online catalog system from, LeapFrog. This new system, CIM, is more promising than expected, and peaked their curiosity as a possible replacement for CNET however there are still a lot of unanswered questions. One strength of this system is the promise of customizability, but a weakness is a very limited ability to make modifications ourselves (changes have to go through their developers). Committee members will have the opportunity to check it out and play with it in the spring and will share more information as they experiment and get answers to their questions.

Jennifer stated that programs of 8 units or more can now be submitted for state approval and once state approved can be included on student transcripts (previously 12 or more units were required). In addition, the Office of Instruction is investigating entering low unit certificates into Banner so they could be tracked and reported for Strong Workforce funding.

#### VI ASSOCIATED STUDENTS, Taylor Gaetje

Taylor reported that AS will be distributing free scantrons during finals week, and maybe snacks and beverages. Students of Distinction nomination forms are now available. When asked about an AS resolution in support of Winter Session, Taylor stated that AS had written one but had not met recently to review it.

#### VII ELECTIONS, Pete Snyder

Institutional Integrity Committee (3 faculty needed, and division but Soc Sci, 2017-19) **Matt Taylor (Hum)**

Student Equity Committee (one year terms) **Cynthia Guardado (At Large)**

RFP Food Services Committee representative **Loretta Calvert (Bus/CIS)**

Curriculum Committee Representatives to GE Committee **Gary Graves (Bus/CIS) and John Ison (Hum)**

#### VII OLD BUSINESS

**Winter Session Task Force recommendation**

**M/S/P (Markley/Combs) to approve the Fullerton College Faculty Senate Winter Session Task Force recommendation.**

Nays: Pham, Romero Hernandez, Shideler

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?
4. If part-time faculty members teach a Winter Session class, will they be working so many hours in one week that it will trigger some sort of Affordable Care Act mechanism?

Chancellor Marshall has called a meeting for 18-Dec to make a decision about offering a Winter Session. This is an open meeting. Danielle Fouquette noted that there is not time for Associated Students to meet and discuss this before 18-Dec. Taylor

Gaetje stated that she would inform AS senators about the meeting. When asked about why this meeting needed to be held in December it was clarified that the Financial Aid Office and Banner consultants need the dates for the academic calendar a year in advance. Linda Shideler shared that faculty in the Math Division are in favor of a shorter Winter Session of 24 days and want spring semester to end by June 8. Danielle Fouquette shared that English faculty are concerned about teaching ENGL 100 in five weeks and would prefer a six week session. Dr. José Ramón Núñez stated that faculty would decide which courses are taught, not administrators. When asked if adjunct faculty would be able to teach, Dale Craig stated that Chancellor Marshall is looking into that issue and will hopefully have more information at the 18-Dec meeting. This discussion led to adding a fourth question to the approved recommendation.

**Building User Groups Work Group (BUGWUG) recommendation  
M/S/U (Markley/Snyder) to approve the Fullerton College Faculty Senate  
Building User Groups Proposal.**

Building User Groups Proposal:

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.

**Guided Pathways Self-Assessment**

**M/S/U (Wilson/Snyder) to approve that the Faculty Senate President can sign the Fullerton College Guided Pathways Self-Assessment.**

**IX NEW BUSINESS**

**Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee report on Faculty**

**Allocation**

The Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee (IREC) presented its report on faculty allocation for a first read. The report includes the Dean's process for identifying new and replacement positions. When asked about this, Dale explained that the process used by faculty is transparent but the process used by the Dean's is not. It was the "Sense of the Senate" that a formal request be made to Dean's Council asking for a detailed description of their process.

**Joint Senates / United Faculty meeting in January**

The Joint Senates/United Faculty meeting typically takes the place on the Wednesday or Thursday the week before the spring semester begins. Due to the flex day already planned for 25-Jan, the Senate did not think this meeting was needed this year. In the future, this meeting could be proposed as fulfilling the required hours for flex activities. If approved for flex in the future, this would likely increase faculty attendance at this meeting.

**X LIAISON REPORTS**

**United Faculty, Dale Craig**

Dale stated that he will attend the 18-Dec meeting regarding Winter Session.

**Adjunct Faculty United, Zahra Ahmed**

Zahra shared that Adjunct Faculty United is having a membership drive. They are working with Staff Development to develop trainings that could be offered for adjunct faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 4:57P.

Respectfully submitted,  
Heather Halverson, secretary