I. Call To Order
The Meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order at 1:06 p.m. by Saul Panski.

II. Approval Of Agenda
Panski asked to add a discussion item on Flex Day Spring 2009 to the agenda. With this addition the agenda was adopted. Moved/Seconded Evans/Clark

III. Approval Of Minutes
No minutes for adoption

IV. Reports
None.

VI. Action Items
Panski asked to move the “Action Items” to the next item of business, changing the order of items to be reviewed. The group agreed,

Board Policy #2510: Participation in Local Decision Making.

Panski pointed out that the proposed revisions to the policy simply spelled out provisions of the Education Code outlining the areas under the purview of the Senate. He indicated that the item would be resubmitted to the Consultative Council with any changes approved by the body.
He also added that the revised language proposed was to be found in the same policy as it has been formulated for the ECCD.

Panski asked Dr. Harmon if she had any problems with the proposed revisions, since she was the only administrator present. She indicated that she did not.

Odanaka asked whether the policy should go to the Council or straight to the Provost. Panski indicated that all policies were being reviewed by the Consultative Council and that this was the appropriate body to which the item should be referred.

*Moved/Seconded Pratt/Evans. Passed with one abstention*

**Administrative Regulations #2511, Council Committee Structure)**

Panski indicated that the Administrative Regulations, as prepared by the District’s consultant and approved by the Consultative Council, had made many changes to the original document, including the omission of references to the Federation and the omission of specific numbers of faculty members on each committee. The item was being brought to the Senate to reflect necessary revisions, at which time it would be resubmitted to the Consultative Council for reconsideration.

Subramaniam expressed her frustration that many committees were not meeting regularly and that many faculty members were not actively participating in committees.

Panski agreed that a concerted effort was needed to make these committees functional and relevant; that they could not simply be listed on paper to impress external entities. He commended those committees which were meeting on a regular basis and maintaining records of their meetings and recommendations. Student Success and Planning and Budget were specifically cited as two very effective, functioning committees.

Subramaniam stated that some faculty were unaware that they were on a committee. Panski responded that the list of committees and committee members had been sent out to the entire faculty via email.
Dr. Harmon questioned the need for a Hiring Committee in the proposed AR. The Senate agreed that this committee and its purpose were already enumerated in contract, and the item was dropped from the AR.

Panski also indicated that the District should soon revisit these AR as there was a need to establish a Sabbatical Committee.

*The adoption of the AR with suggested revisions was Moved/Seconded West/Norton and passed.*

V. Discussion Items

Panski indicated that renewed emphasis was being given to effective transfer of students at the main campus. Some thought was also being given to reducing some fundamental basic skills classes as students in these classes had lower retention and persistence rates.

Odanaka added that ECC is looking at its policies related to students on academic probation.

Flemming indicated that the Chancellor had just addressed the Community College League and had stressed that basic skills remained one of the system’s main priorities.

Smith and Yahye were commended by Evans for their service on State Senate Committee. He also commended Halligan for his film on the methamphetamine epidemic in the Midwest and Maruyama for his receipt of the Fulbright Scholarship to Vietnam.

*Budget Update by Chief Business Officer*

Mr. Gerhard discussed the latest fiscal projections from the Legislative Analyst’s Office and the projected scope of the anticipated deficit. A deficit of approximately $14 billion dollars is anticipated for 20010-2011, increasing to as much as $21 billion dollars by 2011-2012. The problem was structural in nature and would not easily be addressed.
Compton, however, was fortunate in that we are in “restoration mode” and will continue to be funded based on actual growth through June 30, 2011, up to 6014 FTES.

He indicated that it was his recommendation to utilize Summer 2010 FTES for base funding for 2010-2011.

Dr. Harmon stressed that the current employment outlook in the state suggested that our enrollment will continue to grow.

Gerhard indicated that there is no projected State-wide COLAZ for four years because of the current economic and budget crisis.

Gerhard indicated that the time frame for AB 318 had ended but that we were already better off than we were under AB 318 guaranteed funding. The salient fact is that Compton is stable, solvent, and financially secure.

Harmon indicated that we would try to increase our space and capacity utilization by scheduling classes at various times, including afternoons.

Subramaniam stressed that we needed to maintain the appearance of facilities, particularly the restrooms.

Gerhard indicated that should we attain our FTES target this year, some additional discretionary funds would be available later in the fiscal year.

He also indicated that there remained a need to ensure substantive backfill for categorical programs. This year we had suffered a reduction in categorical program funding of $1.2 million dollars but had been able to backfill $600,000 to sustain these programs.

Gerhard indicated that there were ongoing discussions at the state level pertaining to relaxation of mandates under the 50% Law and the 75/25% Law.

Gerhard indicated that the Governor would present a revised budget in January, reflecting updated state projections.

Odanaka expressed his concern that a program such as EOP&S had taken an inordinate reduction in funding support, particularly since it addresses the need of a large number
of our full time students. Panski agreed that the faculty should have been consulted before decisions were made where to allocate backfill funds. He expressed a concern that categorical programs might be cut even further next year, and urged that the faculty be consulted in such an event.

Harmon indicated that Academic Affairs was completing its Annual Strategic Review and was considering budgetary implications.

Gerhard indicated that there was renewed discussion statewide about differential funding for such programs as physical education.

Panski thanked Gerhard for his comprehensive presentation and expressed relief that we are apparently going to remain in good shape fiscally, at least until 2011.

Flex Day Spring 2010

A proposal for Flex Day activities was presented by Subramaniam, Harmon, and Bernaudo. They indicated that Pratt had been involved in discussions on this topic as well. A tentative schedule, with breakout sessions was provided. Proposed activities included a presentation on the use of clickers for assessment; classroom management; faculty development planning; and data collection and interpretation for SLO assessment. While the Senate was not asked to formally approve the Flex plan, the group did endorse the plan with a consensus “sense of the Senate.”

Dr. Harmon indicated that there were also plans to have an orientation for adjunct faculty in the near future.

Odanaka indicated that there was a great need for a Faculty Handbook.

VII. Adjournment

Adjournment came at 3:07, Moved/seconded Pratt/Evans