### Fullerton College

### Program Review and Planning Committee meeting notes

### 10-Mar 22 meeting, 3-4:30P, Zoom

**Present:** Mary Bogan (faculty, co-chair), Josh Ashenmiller (faculty, co-chair), Megan Beck (Classified professional, A&R), Doug Eisner (faculty, Hum), Aline Gregorio (Faculty, Soc Sci), David Grossman (PE Dean), Megan Harris (OIE), Chuck Helms (classified professional, ASC), Barry McCarthy (faculty, Bus/CIS), Rachel Nevarez (faculty, Tech/Eng), Ryan Osborne (classified professional, KBPK), Luciano Rodriguez (faculty, Math/CS), David Sarabia (Tutoring Center Coordinator), Todd Smith (faculty, Fine Arts), Ken Starkman (Dean, Tech/Eng), Matt Taylor (Guided Pathways Co-Chair), Cal Young (Nat Sci)

1. **Agenda and notes from last meeting (27-Jan 21) approved**
2. **Mega Meeting**
	1. Josh thanked Committee members for completing their readers’ reports and uploading them to the One Drive folder.
	2. Committee members reported no problems filling out timesheets and were reminded that 31-Mar is the last day to claim hours.
	3. The Committee then had an open discussion of issues that came up in reading the self-studies. They discussed what to add to the draft report to the Faculty Senate that members read in advance.
		1. We want to highlight outstanding extra-curricular activities that faculty provide for students, for example Horticulture and Foods & Nutrition working on a farm-to-table program, and Geography’s work on creating OERs.
		2. We want to report that this year’s self-studies are not only going to be read by the members of this Committee, but also by members of the Pathways work groups, the IIC, and the Instructional Success Teams (ISTs).
		3. We discussed how to report about “business as usual.”
			1. In other words, faculty members seem to know that the way to get funding for something is to include it in program review.
			2. The catch-22 is that we also know there are not enough dollars for most of those requests.
			3. There is usually enough funding for instructional equipment, materials, and supplies.
			4. New buildings and hiring new faculty get prioritized and funded largely outside of program review. Maybe we need to suggest that the College resurrect the idea of annual planning retreats.
		4. We want to shed light on internal inconsistencies, for example students getting vastly different labs because labs in some departments are better-funded than others. But the courses award the same lab credit hours.
		5. We will suggest that there is more than one way to skin the cat. In other words, the College should review program review. (Perhaps the IIC).
			1. Consolidated self-studies. Small departments in the same division could work on a collective self-study.
			2. Other committees on campus (SEAC, for one) should be doing their own versions of reviewing College processes. For example, why does the College attract such a small number of African American male students?
		6. Equity and inclusion
			1. Wide range: some departments moving forward, others stuck wondering if that means hiring quotas, others express uninterest.
			2. Our report to Senate should state that the College needs to define more specifically what having an equitable, inclusive, anti-racist faculty means in practice, and what steps departments can take to get there.
3. **Remaining Spring 2022 meeting dates (2nd & 4th Thu, 3-4:30P)**
	* 1. 14-Apr
		2. 28-Apr
		3. 12-May