

MINUTES

OF THE
EL CAMINO COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
COMPTON CENTER FACULTY COUNCIL
October 22, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jerome Evans, Fred Lamm, Eugene Benson, Pam West, Darwin Smith, Estina Pratt, Chris Halligan, Michael Odanaka, Jose Villalobos, Saul Panski, Thomas Norton, Leonard Clark, Annaruth Garcia

13 Senators Present

ADMINISTRATORS PRESENT: 2
Dr. Susie Dever, Keith Curry

VISITORS PRESENT: 4
Aurora Cortez Perez, Chelvi Subramaniam M. Khalilzadeh, Ella Stewart

I. CALL TO ORDER

Council meeting was called to order at 1:10 pm by Chair Panski.

Saul Panski explained that in order to accommodate the schedule of the Administrative Dean of Academic Affairs, we were reversing the meeting order and beginning with the convening of the Faculty Council.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to Adopt (Council) Agenda: Jerome, Ahmad (moved/seconded). Passed

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Move to Approve Minutes of 1 October Benson, Ahmad (moved/seconded). Passed

IV. DISCUSSION

Panski provided an informal report on the ECC Academic Senate of October 21st. He mentioned that there was a proposal to purchase Metro passes for students en masse, with the cost perhaps to be offset eventually by higher student parking fees.

He also mentioned that at ECC there is preliminary discussion about developing an "Academic Program Discontinuance Policy" and stressed that we must monitor this process and be involved its formulation.

He also reported that ECC is reviewing its Local Minimum Qualifications in comparison to the latest State Minimum Qualifications. This will impact the FSAs which future hires will be placed in. He indicated that he had received assurances that any stricter local

quals adopted by the ECC departments would not be applied retroactively to either ECC or CEC faculty.

Panski pointed out that an Academic Program Discontinuance Policy is required if an institution contemplates laying off any full time faculty. Dr. Harmon indicated that typically such a policy might be applied to vocational programs where faculty are not meeting proficiency standards in a profession. Panski stressed that if a program is discontinued, the faculty in that program will lose their jobs.

Dr. Harmon responded by saying that if a program does not have adequate enrollment, it may be because the program is not adequately preparing students for jobs that are available.-

Manzoor asked Dr. Harmon to elaborate on her comments vis a vis vocational programs and she indicated that there are significant differences between academic and vocational programs. For example, with a vocational program the institution needed to evaluate with students are meeting the immediate employment needs of students and each program should have a comprehensive advisory board consulting them on employment needs and requirements.

Panski added that in the past the District had tried to discontinue programs and lay off faculty but without a clear Discontinuance Policy in place, had to back down and reverse its plans. Panski indicated that he would like to serve on any committee formulated to develop such a discontinuance policy.

Saul volunteered for any such committee, asking Dr. Harmon to convey this to Dr. Arce.

Dr. Harmon then made a presentation on the Faculty Development Plan forms and processes, including the list of institutional priorities; the list of materials to be included in an evaluatee's portfolio; and a rubric for evaluating a faculty member's implementation of the plan. She added that each faculty member would be asked to meet with a Dean to develop a three year professional development plan.

There was a great deal of discussion as to whether the District would fund the components of an individual plan. Panski indicated that if the District did not, it could hardly expect implementation on the part of the faculty member.

Dean Harmon stressed that the administration is determined to adequately fund professional development activities. Panski added that a Dean should not sign off on a faculty member's development plan if it was not prepared to provide him./her with the necessary technological and other support .

Panski indicated that since this item was on the agenda only as a "discussion item," it would be brought back to the 11/5/08 meeting for official approval.

V. ACTION ITEMS

The Council was asked to approve the composition of comprehensive evaluation teams.

Chris Halligan indicated that could not remember such a comprehensive evaluation process since his arrival at the institution and wondered whether it was designed to weed out the weak links. If so, why wasn't everyone being evaluated? Panski responded that all faculty will be evaluated over a three year period of time. He added that if the Special Trustee—who had essentially developed the evaluation process document—were there, he would strongly disagree that the evaluation process was intended to weed people out or serve as a preliminary step towards layoffs. Rather, he would argue that the process was designed to help individual faculty members evaluate in what ways they need to upgrade their skills or improve their instructional effectiveness.

Conversation centered on the team composition. Panski indicated that if a team had three member but not four, it should still go ahead and meet.

Norton volunteered to serve on Maruyama's evaluation team.

In response to the query as to who was responsible for selecting the members of each team, the response was that most Compton faculty on the teams were recommended by the Division Chairs and/or the faculty member being evaluated. The evaluatee, it was pointed out, is able to select one team member.

Van Niel concurred with Panski that the evaluation process was designed not to weed people out but to identify strengths and weakness, to see if a faculty member can be a more effective instructor. He added that the Ed Code makes it very difficult to get rid of a faculty member, He added that while faculty fear of possible lay-offs was real and well-placed, such layoffs would not be connected to the evaluation process but to a determination as to staffing needs and enrollment figures..
fear, so much discussion of possible lay-offs

Panski concurred that the widespread fear of a faculty layoff was inordinate to the actual situation. Dr. Dever stressed that we should be mindful that the evaluation process is faculty driven and that administrators do not get involved until the very end.

Moved Pratt/ Seconded Smith to accept the composition of the Faculty Evaluation Teams. Passed.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: Moved Halligan/ Seconded Pratt. Passed.