

INTRODUCTION

In early January, the state appointed trustee (Peter Landsberger) at the Compton Educational Center (Compton Center) contacted the California College Brain Trust (CCBT) about performing a large scale faculty development planning project for the full-time faculty at the Center. The concept of the planning effort was that discipline related faculty from other colleges would be identified and they would then work individually with each full-time faculty member at the Compton Center to create a faculty development plan for that person. The full-time faculty at the Compton Center were aggregated into related disciplines so that wherever possible one outside consultant could be assigned to that group. Obviously in places where there were large numbers of full-time faculty (e.g. English/ESL, Math, Nursing, Counseling) the group would be too large for one consultant and more than one would need to be assigned. In the end, no outside consultant had more than five assigned faculty members and in cases where the discipline was very specific (Art, Spanish); the outside consultant was only assigned one Compton Center faculty member.

The CCBT selected Darroch “Rocky” Young (Chancellor, Emeritus, Los Angeles Community College District) to be the leader of the project and Randy Lawson (Executive Vice President, Santa Monica College) to be his assistant. Twenty-four faculty consultants were chosen by the project leaders. The faculty represented five different colleges with the largest numbers coming from Santa Monica College and Pierce College. All of the faculty consultants were chosen because of their recognition as master teachers along with demonstrated experience to work in a collegial manner for purposes of improving instruction and student success. A list of the 24 faculty consultants is provided in the Appendix along with a list of the full-time faculty at the Compton Center with whom they were assigned to work with on this project.

After selecting the faculty consultants, the two project leaders met with the faculty and administrative leadership team of the Compton Educational Center on February 5 to discuss the content and timelines for the project. It was agreed that the faculty leaders would introduce the project to the faculty at the spring institutional flex day and the Compton Center administration would distribute a brief questionnaire to the Compton Center faculty so that they could prepare a self-assessment development plan prior to meeting with the consultant. It was also decided at the February 5 meeting that the scope of the consultant comments should go beyond just the original charge of developing individual faculty development plans. In particular, each of the consultants was requested to comment on three additional areas. First, do you have any recommended department, program, or curriculum changes? Second, have you observed any institutional problems that need to be addressed? Third, did you find that any of the observations in the FCMAT Academic Achievement Report were inaccurate?

The project was launched on February 28 at a meeting at the Compton Educational Center which was attended by all of the consultants and all of the faculty and administrative leaders from the Compton Educational Center. At the meeting (or shortly thereafter), the consultants received the relevant program review documents, course outlines and teacher syllabi. They also received selected institutional research, an organization chart, their faculty assignments (with contact information), a suggested protocol for meetings with faculty, the Compton Center faculty self-

assessment questions, a template for their final report, a campus map, college catalog and parking permits. The consultants also received the six-page extract from the FCMAT Report that was entitled Academic Achievement. During the meeting there were presentations by the Compton Center representatives on the history of Compton College, the accreditation problems, the conversion to Compton Educational Center and the recent FCMAT Report. There was also a presentation on student demographics. All of this was important because it was the belief that all of the consultants needed to have a full understanding of the context in which the institution was operating and the environment within which the faculty was teaching. It was also emphasized that this was a project that was intended to have a positive outcome of how to improve student success and move the college forward under their difficult circumstances.

The consultants then individually arranged their meetings with the Compton Center faculty. The stated expectation was that there would be at a minimum an initial meeting, a classroom observation and a follow-up meeting to gain agreement on the recommended faculty development plan. All of the reports were to be completed by April 18 but some consultants were granted extensions to April 25.

On April 28, a meeting of the consultants was held so that the project leaders could review the common themes they had identified to be sure that they were adequately representing the consultants' commentary.

This final report is being presented in five parts: Institutional Issues; Observations on the FCMAT Report; Department, Program and Curriculum Recommendations; Faculty Development Plans; and Appendices. The first two parts represent a compilation and integration of consultant comments. The department, program and curriculum recommendations are primarily as stated by the consultant. The individual faculty development plans are a verbatim copy of the consultant report.