I. Call To Order
The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m. by Saul Panski.

II. Approval Of Agenda
Motion to adopt agenda was moved by Estina Pratt and seconded by Michael Odanaka. Passed.

III. Approval Of Minutes
Motion to approve minutes of 4.DECEMBER.08 was moved by Norton and seconded by Jerome Evans. Adoption Passed.

IV. Reports

President’s Report.

EL CAMINO ACCREDITATION.

This was noted by S. Panski as “Warning” status, with ECC receiving nine recommendations, three of which pertained to Compton. These are in the areas of fiscal affairs, human resources, and educational/facilities planning.

In terms of fiscal concerns, Compton Center must show an ability to sustain itself outside of the Line of Credit (which is a re-payable loan). We must also show that we are conducting program review and that this process is linked to budget decisions.
In terms of Human Resources (HR), there are concerns with the Classified Staff, and there is a call for a Classification Study to be conducted and jobs adjusted accordingly. There is also some discussion of “right-sizing” the staff of the Center.

As it relates to planning, there is no Master Educational Plan for the Center, a plan that must be linked to facilities planning.

Panski reported that the Special Trustee and President Fallo are to meet with the ACCJC’s Executive Director on 2/24/09 to obtain clarification as to what the Commission is requiring to get El Camino off of “warning” status. Things are complicated because the Trustee is also charged with oversight of the CCCD and efforts to return to potential accreditation candidate status.

The other six recommendations pertain to such matters as curriculum, SLOS, distance education, program review and a link between budget and planning, and the code of ethics of the ECC BOT. Compton faculty must be involved in helping ECC resolve these issues as well.

ECC must submit a report on April 1, 2009, on the recommendations linked to program planning and budgeting and curriculum. It is hoped that this report will result in the college being removed from sanctions.

A second report must be submitted to the Commission on October 15, 2009, responding to the other six recommendations, including the three directly linked to Compton. It is to be understood that ECC and the Special Trustee will adopt a framework for the resolution of those matters linked to Compton. If all goes well, ECC should receive a clean bill of health on all of these matters by January, 2010.

Dr. Harmon indicated that at a manager’s meeting, it was made clear that ECC had not been placed on warning because of Compton.

Panski reported that at the ECC BOT meeting, three members of the Board specifically asked Dr. Fallo if the warning status had been caused in any way by the partnership. It was stressed that the warning status was primarily due to the failure of ECC to fully resolve recommendations contained in prior accreditation cycles. Dr. Fallo also indicated that he would seek clarification from the Commission on all these matters when he and the Special Trustee met with Commission representatives.
Dean Harmon said she was confident that issues related to program review, budget planning, and SLOS could be addressed in a relatively short period of time.

She added that we at Compton must keep focused on what we’re doing and informed those in attendance that we had already attained 99% of our spring enrollment goal.

Art Flemming demurred, stating that we needed to have 1700 FTEs to meet our goal and we were not there; he indicated that there were still some issues that required resolution, particularly as it concerned the formulation of an Educational Master Plan. It was stressed that the completion of this document was dependent on the receipt of data from ECC, the EMP must be data-driven.

It was agreed that a progress report on the Educational Master Plan would be provided to the Senate on March 19, 2009.

Panski stressed the importance of Compton faculty participating in the various program reviews to be conducted during spring. He stated that there were ten such disciplines. Dr. Harmon demurred and there was a conversation abut one of these, journalism, which she indicated we were not offering. Panski responded that this was the type of question that needed to be asked, since we have offered some journalism courses here and had our own student paper. Dr. Harmon indicated that we would need to look at such factors as employment options, transfer course requirements, and electives, and suggested that a body such as the Institutional Effectiveness Committee would need to determine whether such a program should be reinstated on our campus. The conclusion might be that students interested in taking journalism courses should go to the main campus.

Panski stressed that he was worried precisely about the structure of these review processes—what procedures would be following in making such decisions related to program viability, prioritization, and budgeting. This needed to be clarified.

Panski also added that the new Curriculum Advisory Committee was being formed in part to meet the concerns of FCMAT but it too needed to have a clearly enunciated mission and purpose.

Panski concluded this part of the discussion by indicating that plans called for ECC to inactivate a large number of courses; to move forward on integrating SLOS into the program review and curricular process (though how is unclear).
and to review distance education offerings for rigor, retention, and academic success. We will need to participate in this effort as well.

Panski was pleased to report that the California State budget appeared to be very supportive of community colleges in terms of apportionment, fees, and categorical program support. However, there was no COLA for 08-09 or 09-10. He added that it was possible that the Federal stimulus bill was also being reviewed to determine whether California community colleges would be able to benefit from additional resources.

Panski also reported some very good news, that the Systems Office had agreed to fund Compton on its enrollment growth until it reached its prior FTES of 6400. Enrollment growth for Compton would be considered “restoration” funding and not subject to the growth formula in the state budget of some 3%. This is vital to our effort to become fiscally stable in the near term. He added that we were currently funded at 4480 FTES but were confident of reaching 5200 FTES this year; this would result in receiving significantly greater funds.

Art Flemming pointed out that we will then need to sustain this enrollment level and grow even further next year to avoid having to reimburse the State. He added that there were a number of issues related to FTES that the Budget and Planning Committee will need to review.

Panski pointed out, as well, that this good news does not mean that there will be no budget reductions. He reminded the group that CBO Grivitch had indicated that we will need to reduce the level of spending next year by up to $1.4 million dollars, to avoid the need to use the line of credit for future operational expenses. Recommendations on how to reduce the budget will also be decisions before the BPC in the weeks ahead.

Panski pointed out that the faculty believed that enrollment growth required offering more class sections but that the administration did not strongly agree with this scenario, for them higher productivity per section and allocating resources in high-demand areas were key to a successful growth strategy.

Panski then reported to the Senate that Dr. Billie Jo Moore would henceforth represent the Compton faculty at weekly meetings of the College Council at El FCMAT
Dr. Harmon reported that the FCMAT evaluation team was being reconstituted and that we were utilizing a new process to respond to FCMAT concerns. The Academic Affairs team visit, she added, had been postponed to mid March, specifically March 16th. She stated that it was the hope of the management team that our scores would rise so significantly in the near future that we would not require the services of FCMAT in eighteen months.

**Administrative Reports**

**CURRICULUM ADVISORY COMMITTEE:**

Dr. Harmon indicated that a Curriculum Advisory Committee was being established to serve as a liaison with the ECC Curriculum Committee and to address the concerns of FCMAT. This committee would include the Interim Dean of Academic Affairs, Compton’s two voting representatives on the ECC Curriculum Committee (Odanaka and Panski) our SLO Coordinator (David Maruyama), our representative to the ECC Distance Education Committee (Paul Flor) and eight faculty members selected by division to represent Compton at ECC Division Curriculum Committee meetings.

Dr. Harmon indicated that the group would have its first of several monthly meetings on March 12th and would undergo a training session on “curriculum review” presented by ECC Curriculum Chairperson, Janet Young.

Panski stressed that it was vital that Compton DCC reps attend curriculum meetings, both to voice Compton faculty concerns and to bring colleagues news on curricular initiatives and revisions taking place.

It was pointed out that both the ECC Academic Senate and the ECC Curriculum Committee had endorsed the plan to establish a Curriculum Advisory Committee at the Center.

Dr. Harmon also urged faculty to let students know that scholarships were available.

**INSTITUTIONAL STANDING COMMITTEES:**

Panski concluded the meeting by indicating that the Compton BOT had approved a revised Institutional Standing Committee structure, recognizing the Consultative Council. During this process the now redundant Tenure Review Committee had been eliminated and the Faculty Hiring Committee had been renamed the “Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee.”
NO Action Items.

A Motion to adjourn was introduced/seconded by Estina Pratt and D. Smith Passed. Meeting adjourned at 1:58 p.m.