

MINUTES OF THE  
**COMPTON CENTER FACULTY COUNCIL**  
April 22, 2010 Staff Lounge

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jose Villalobos, Leonard Clark, Manzoor Ahmad, Eugene Benson, Fred Lamm, Art Flemming, Darwin Smith, Michael Odanaka, Shirley Thomas, Jerome Evans, Chris Halligan, Thomas Norton, Estina Pratt, Saul Panski

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Pamela West, Shemiram Lazar, Marjerrita Phillips, Annaruth Garcia

**ADMINISTRATORS PRESENT:** Dr. Susan Dever

**VISITORS PRESENT:** Don Roach, Camela Aguilar, William Keig , David Maruyama

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:06 p.m., by Saul Panski

**II. Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved; Benson, Pratt (moved/ seconded).

**III. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of 4/8 (Council Minutes) were approved; Benson, Lamm (moved/ seconded).

**IV. Reports**

Reports were waived until the end of the meeting as the time available to the Council for meeting was circumscribed and there were two items that required consideration of action .

**V. Discussion**

None

**VI. Action**

**Resolution on the Proposed Realignment of Academic Divisions**

Leonard Clark presented and spoke in support of a resolution against the proposed realignment of the academic divisions. He referred to a letter written by three of the Chairs lat year (Lyles, Roach, Subramaniam) objecting to a proposed reorganization then that would have separated Humanities, Social Sciences, or Math/Science from the supervision of the Dean of Academic Programs, stressing linkages between the three central to transfer, coordination of curriculum and the successful implementation of learning communities.

He added that there was now a proposal to again realign the divisions, and specifically move Math/Science to the supervision of the Dean of CTE., which would create significant problems.

Panski added that both the Federation President and Council Chairperson had voiced their opposition to this proposed realignment at the Board meeting of 4/20/10 but had received no response at that time.

Don Roach amplified the Math/Science Division concerns, arguing that if the rationale for the realignment was to equalize the workload of the Deans, then the Dean of Academic Programs should be given a Coordinator to assist her. The proposed realignment, he stressed, would negatively impact transfer students and run counter to the alignment of divisions at ECC. He decried the implementation of “experiments” on the part of new administrators and added that this type of experimentation is what had led to the loss of Compton’s accreditation. He wondered why an area geared to transfer was to be placed under CTE and whether it had broader implications about the external view of the institution. He added that when the new Vice President Compton had met with division faculty on this proposal some time before, she stated that the realignment was a done deal.

Panski stated that should the resolution be approved, the matter could be referred to the ECC Academic Senate, the body overseeing the Council.

Flemming asked what reasons were being given in favor of the proposed reorganization. Panski stated that he wished that a representative from Academic Affairs were present to respond but he had heard the following reasons given: 1) equalization of workload for the Deans and 2) promoting linkages between math/science, CTE to enhance employability. He had also been told that in the past Mathematics at Compton had reported to the Dean of Vocational Technology, so the proposed realignment was not radical in nature.

There was vigorous discussion of the matter, followed by a recommendation (Pratt) to take the matter to the ECC Senate or the State ASCCC (Manzoor).

Panski stated that the way to move this matter forward was to bring it to the ECC AS and then, if necessary, to the ECC Board of Trustees.

Roach suggested deferral of these two proposed actions at this time, since the Division was hopeful that Dr. Fallo would soon meet with the faculty on this matter. He asked, however, that the resolution, if approved, be copied to Vice President Perez, Dr. Cox, and Dr. Fallo.

**The resolution was moved/seconded by Manzoor/Lamm and passed by acclamation.**

### **Faculty Involvement Initiative**

Halligan discussed a letter to the faculty for which he sought Council approval.

He suggested that it be sent via email and accompanied by a print copy in each mailbox . He decried the poor attendance at the meeting and stated that faculty should be attending important meetings such as those of the Senate and Council. He wanted to urge faculty to become empowered and involved.

Odanaka noted that what was needed was outreach to those members of the faculty who were not involved in the life of the institution.

Pratt suggested that such outreach be part of Flex Day activities and that faculty should be reminded that participation on committees and other involvement in the affairs of the institution was a contractual obligation ,

Maruyama reminded the group that faculty are expected to complete a yellow card each semester, listing committee and other involvement. He said that we can either choose the ways in which we become involved or be told what we will do.

The Chairperson was asked to request of Vice President Perez to include a session on campus involvement in the fall Flex Day schedule.

Panski stressed that if the faculty did not unite in common purpose we will never become an accredited institution again, that such involvement is essential to implementing Dr. Cox's plans to prepare a prototype "Self Study" as a prototype leading to potential candidacy with the ACCJC. We must build a faculty leadership for the future and build internal ability to perform all the functions required of a viable college. One step in this direction was sending younger faculty members to an accreditation workshop sponsored by ACCJC that same week.

Manzoor stated that some people are not reached out to and that there was a perception that the Senate and Federation are "in bed" with the administration. There was sharp disagreement with that statement on the part of Smith and others. He said that past events, and especially the faculty layoffs, had seriously demoralized the faculty,

Halligan argued that we should empower each other and recognize that it is the faculty that preserved the institution, that are the true heroes in the Compton saga.

Smith pointed out that getting the majority of faculty members involved in the affairs of the institution was a long-standing problem. He recalled the lack of faculty involvement in community outreach activities during the accreditation crisis.

Maruyama noted the lack of spring courses, rain on pianos (i.e., difficult learning environment), stress, and an aging faculty all as factors dampening faculty involvement in institutional affairs.

Conflicts with schedules;

In response to criticism of the Senate and Council, Panski asked rhetorically how involved were the Senators themselves . Did they respond to requests for agenda items ? Did they report back to their faculty and bring back their concerns to the body? He added that if Senators/Council Members were critical of the leadership were they equally self-critical of their own role as members of the body?

Flemming offered statistics on the age of the faculty, pointing out that of the eighty-four full timers, only seventeen are under fifty years old and forty-one are sixty or older.

**Motion to approve letter to faculty moved/seconded (Norton/Smith) and passed by acclamation.**

### **Report from Plenary Session**

Moving back to the agenda item for “Discussion”, the group heard a report from Smith on the just concluded Plenary session of the ASCC and specifically about the resolutions related to accreditation and the ACCJC.

Smith recounted the strategy and rationale behind pulling the resolution considered by the ECC and CEC Senates and its replacement by a newer resolution. It was argued that the original resolution was too pointed at Dr. Beno and that it was premature in nature. The original resolution—or its intent—remains available to the ASCCC if needed.

He added that Jane Patton, ASCCC President, had taken the unusual step of speaking on a resolution before the body , urging removal of the original resolution and approval of the substitute motion, both authored by the same individual. He added that the substitute motion, when voted upon, received unanimous support from the members.

Panski suggested that the ACCJC had surely noted the intent of the original resolution and the scope of unhappiness with the Commission that had generated it but suggested that the substitute resolution was strategically wiser, as it gave the ACCJC an opportunity to demonstrate its responsiveness to stated concerns and did not back it (and its leadership) into a corner. It will avoid the ASCCC from getting ahead of the Chancellor and the Consultative Council on accreditation concerns.

Dr. Dever noted that at an accreditation workshop taking place this week, Dr. Beno made several comments which indicated that she was aware of the discontent with the Commission on the part of member institutions..

Panski lauded the contributions of Smith to the Compton and State Senates and noted that Darwin is a celebrity and veritable “rock star” at Plenary sessions.

Panski added that consideration was being given to inviting Dr. Beno to ECC and Compton in the fall, to outline the steps needed for Compton to gain accreditation as a college once again. He added that as part of the discussions related to the Partnership

MOU, ECC and the CCCD were to agree upon a timeline for the eventual submission of Compton as a candidate for accreditation.

## **VII. Adjournment**

Pratt, Smith (moved/ seconded a motion at 2:25 p.m.