Officers & Executive Committee

President	**Christina Gold**	Co-VPs Faculty Development	**Briita Halonen & Cristina Pajo**
VP Compton Educ'l Center	**Saul Panski**	VP Finance and Special Projects	**Lance Widman**
Curriculum Chair	**Lars Kjeseth**	VP Legislative Action	**Chris Wells**
VP Educational Policies	**Chris Jeffries**	Secretary	**Claudia Striepe**

Senate Mailing List

Adjunct (1 yr term)
_____ (vacant)
_____(vacant)

Behavior & Social Sciences
Randy Firestone	11/12
Christina Gold	10/11
Michelle Moen	11/12
Lance Widman*	10/11
Michael Wynne	11/12

Business
Phillip Lau	11/12
Jay Siddiqui*	11/12
Kurt Hull	12/13

Compton Educational Center (1 yr term)
Jerome Evans	10/11
Chris Halligan	10/11
Tom Norton	10/11
Saul Panski	10/11
Estina Pratt	10/11
Darwin Smith	10/11

Counseling
Cristina Pajo	11/12
Brenda Jackson*	10/11
Chris Jeffries	10/11

Fine Arts
Ali Ahmadpour	11/12
Randall Bloomberg	11/12
Mark Crossman	11/12
Patrick Schulz	11/12
Chris Wells*	11/12

Health Sci & Athletics/Nursing
Tom Hazell*	10
Tom Hicks	10
Mina Colunga	12/13
Pat McGinley	12/13
Kathleen Rosales	11/12

Humanities
Brent Isaacs	11/12
Peter Marcoux	11/12
Kate McLaughlin	11/12
Briita Halonen	11/12
Jenny Simon	11/12

Industry & Technology
Patty Gebert	12/13
Harold Hofmann	12/13
Lee Macpherson	12/13
Douglas Marston*	12/13
Merriel Winfree	12/13

Learning Resource Unit
Moon Ichinaga	10/11
Claudia Striepe*	10/11

Mathematical Sciences
Michael Bateman	12/13
John Boerger	10/11
Greg Fry	10/11
Susan Taylor	11/12
Paul Yun*	10/11

Natural Sciences
Chuck Herzig	11/12
Miguel Jimenez	11/12
Teresa Palos*	10/11
Pete Doucette	12/13
_____(vacant)	

Academic Affairs & SCA
Francisco Arce
Karen Lam
Jeanie Nishime
Claudia Lee

Associated Students Org.
Jessica Lopez
Dalal Budri

President/Superintendent
Thomas Fallo

The Union   Editor

Division Personnel
Jean Shankweiler
Don Goldberg
Tom Lew

Counseling   Ken Key

Ex-officio positions
ECCFT President
Elizabeth Shadish
Nina Velasquez
Curriculum Chair
Lars Kjeseth
Institutional Research
Irene Graff
Carolyn Pineda

Dates after names indicate the last academic year of the senator's three year term, except for Compton senators who serve one-year terms. For example 11/12 = 2011-2012.
*denotes senator from the division who has served on Senate the longest (i.e. the "senior senator")

Academic Senate of El Camino College 2010-2011
AC152, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90506-0001   (310) 532-3670 x3254
www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicsenate/

November 16, 2010

SENATE'S PURPOSE (from the Senate Constitution)

A. To provide an organization through which the faculty will have the means for full participation in the formulation of policy on academic and professional matters relating to the college including those in Title 5, Subchapter 2, Sections 53200-53206. *California Code of Regulations.* Specifically, as provided for in Board Policy 2510, and listed below, the "Board of Trustees will normally accept the recommendations of the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters of:

    1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
    2. Degree and certificate requirements
    3. Grading policies
    4. Educational program development
    5. Standards and policies regarding student preparation and success
    6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
    7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process, including self-study and annual reports
    8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
    9. Processes for program review
    10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development, and
    11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate."

B. To facilitate communication among faculty, administration, employee organizations, bargaining agents and the El Camino College Board of Trustees.

ECC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS (1st and 3rd Tuesdays, usually)

FALL 2010		SPRING 2011	
September 7	DE Conference Room	March 1	Alondra Room
September 21	DE Conference Room	March 15	Alondra Room
October 5	Alondra Room	April 5	Alondra Room
October 19	Alondra Room	April 19	Compton Board Room
November 2	DE Conference Room	May 3	Alondra Room
November 16	Alondra Room	May 17	Alondra Room
December 7	Alondra Room	June 7	Alondra Room

CEC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS (Thursday after ECC Senate, usually)

FALL 2010		SPRING 2011	
September 9	Board Room	March 3	Board Room
September 23	Board Room	March 17	Board Room
October 7	Board Room	April 7	Board Room
October 21	Board Room	April 21	Board Room
November 4	Board Room	May 5	Board Room
November 18	Board Room	May 19	Board Room
December 9	Board Room	June 2	Board Room

Academic Senate of El Camino College 2010-2011
AC152, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90506-0001   (310) 532-3670 x3254
www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicsenate/

November 16, 2010

AGENDA & TABLE OF CONTENTS

M. ADJOURN – 2:00		

Committees

NAME	CHAIR	DAY	TIME	ROOM
Senate				
ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING (SLOs)	Jenny Simon	2nd & 4th Mon.	2:30-4:00	Library 202
COMPTON ACADEMIC SENATE	Saul Panski	Thursdays	1:00-2:00	CEC Board
COMPTON FACULTY COUNCIL	Saul Panski	Thursdays	2:00-3:00	CEC Board
CURRICULUM	Lars Kjeseth		2:30-4:30	Board Room
EDUCATION POLICIES	Chris Jeffries	2nd & 4th Tues.	12:30-2:00	SSC 106
PLANNING & BUDGETING	Arvid Spor	1st & 3rd Thurs.	1:00 – 2:30	Library 202
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT	Briita Halonen Cristina Pajo	2nd & 4th Tues	1:00 – 1:50	West Lib. Basement
CALENDAR	Jeanie Nishime	Sep 30	3pm	Board Room
ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY	Jim Noyes, Virginia Rapp	Sep 24 Nov 12	12:30 – 2:00 pm	Library 202
Campus				
ACCREDITATION	Francisco Arce , Arvid Spor, Evelyn Uyemura			
BOARD OF TRUSTEES	Ray Gen	3rd Mon	4:00	Board Room
COLLEGE COUNCIL	Tom Fallo	Mondays	1:00-2:00	Adm. 127
DEAN'S COUNCIL	Francisco Arce	Thursdays	9:00-10:30	Library 202
CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY		.		
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT	Arvid Spor	1st & 3rd Thurs	9-10:00 am	Library 202

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES

2nd November 2010

Adjunct Faculty
_____vacant

Behavioral & Social Sciences
Firestone, Randy	X
Gold, Christina	X
Moen, Michelle	X
Widman, Lance	X
Wynne, Michael	X

Business
Siddiqui, Junaid	X
Lau, Philip S	X
Hull, Kurt	X

Counseling
Jackson, Brenda	X
Jeffries, Chris	X
Pajo, Christina	X

Fine Arts
Ahmadpour, Ali	X
Bloomberg, Randall	X
Crossman, Mark	
Schultz, Patrick	
Wells, Chris	X

Health Sciences & Athletics
Hazell, Tom	
McGinley, Pat	X
Rosales, Kathleen	
Colunga, Mina	X
Hicks, Tom	X

Humanities
Isaacs, Brent	X
Marcoux, Pete	X
McLaughlin, Kate	X
Halonen, Briita	X
Simon, Jenny	X

Industry & Technology
Gebert, Pat	X
Hofmann, Ed	X
MacPherson, Lee	
Winfree, Merriel	X
Marston, Doug	X

Learning Resources Unit
Striepe, Claudia	X
Ichinaga, Moon	X

Mathematical Sciences
Bateman, Michael	X
Boerger, John	
Fry, Greg	X
Taylor, Susan	X
Yun, Paul	X

Natural Sciences
Doucette, Pete	X
Herzig, Chuck	X
Jimenez, Miguel	X
Palos Teresa	X
_____vacant	

Academic Affairs & SCA
Chapman, Quajuana	
Arce, Francisco	X
Nishime, Jeanie	X
Lee, Claudia	X

ECC CEC Members
Evans, Jerome	
Norton, Tom	
Panski, Saul	
Pratt, Estina	
Halligan, Chris	

Assoc. Students Org.
Budri, Lala	X
Lopez, Jessica	

Ex- Officio Positions
Shadish, Elizabeth	X
Kjeseth, Lars	X

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:
J. Young, K. Key, B. Jaffe, Mediha Din (B&SS)

Unless noted otherwise, all page numbers refer to the packet used during the meeting, not the current packet you are reading now.

The fifth Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2010 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:35pm in the Distance Education Center.

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp.6 -13 of packet] from the September 21st Academic Senate meeting were reviewed. Ms. Jeffries noted an addition to a statement made by Ms. Budri (pg10) and a typo (pg 10). C Gold noted that Compton Education Center should be changed to Compton Community (pg. 7) The minutes were approved as amended.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS
President's report – Christina Gold (henceforth CG)
        [See packet pp.14 – 20]
CG informed the Senate that the meeting would need to be adjourned earlier than normal at 1:45pm to accommodate another class. CG also informed the senators that the Associated Students were outside on the lawns getting students to sign petitions supporting the Winter Session.
CG noted that the **College Council** minutes for October 11th, 18th, and 25th were available [see pp14-19 of packet] Facilities had talked about the flooding that had occurred in the Humanities and Arts and Sciences buildings.
The BP and AP 5055 Enrollment Priority will be brought back for further discussion next week.
CG had opined that the College Council meeting minutes were not detailed enough, and had made a request for more detailed minutes from the College Council meetings.
The **ASCCC Area C Meeting** had recently taken place at Whittier. CG thanked CW for driving her there. CG felt a little background to the ASCCC was in order and shared that:
- The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges fosters the effective participation by community college faculty in all statewide and local academic and professional matters; develops, promotes, and acts upon policies responding to statewide concerns; and serves as the official voice of the faculty of California Community Colleges in academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate strengthens and supports the local senates of all California community colleges."
- Plenary Sessions occur when representatives from all the local Senates meet to discuss and vote on issues and resolutions (up-coming in mid-Nov.)
- The ASCCC is divided into 4 Geographic Areas (A, B, C, D) – 2 in the north (A, B) and 2 in the South (C, D) ECC falls into Area C.

The Area C meeting had looked at resolutions that would be up for consideration at the next Plenary session, and had also looked at a policy template. These templates are created by the Community College League of California and are available for all to use. There was also discussion on a Resolution on Student Success.
CG reported that no representatives from the **Compton Educational Center** were able to be present today as they were all attending a meeting on Accreditation. CG noted that she had included [in the packet pg 20] a letter/email from Saul Panski of the CEC expressing appreciation to ECC on our role played in the partnership with and reaccreditation process of the Compton College.
CG said there would be **three campus-wide forums** to discuss the calendar issue, the possible cancellation of the Winter session, and possibly establishing two back-to-back Summer sessions. The forums are scheduled for
- Thursday , November 11, 2010. 1-2:00 pm in the Distance Education Room – Library 166
- Tuesday , November 30, 2010. 1-2:00 pm in the Distance Education Room – Library 166
- Thursday , December 2, 2010. 1-2:00 pm at the Compton Educational Center – Student Lounge

Another objective of the Forums is to try to gather information about what the goals for an academic calendar should be and how to achieve those goals. CG will try and attend all the forums. CG noted that it is important to attend the forums and make the faculty voice heard, but there was no guarantee that the faculty opinion would carry the day. The forums have been arranged by Dr. Nishime.

CG also introduced students from her History 102 class who were in attendance, these students are linked with a Hum Dev. 10 class and they are currently learning about wise choices. Processes, group decisions, and participating in service learning, and CG felt an AS meeting might be a good place to observe some of these concepts in action.

VP Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

   No report.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

   No report.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

   CJ noted that she had no report, but she had some items for discussion later in the agenda.

VP Faculty Development – Cristina Pajo (CP) (Co- VP) **and Briita Halonen** (BH) (Co-VP)

   BH said that the Committee is working on a workshop for adjunct faculty on getting a job.

VP Finance and Special Projects – Lance Widman (LW)

   [see pp. 21- 22 of packet]

LW reported on the PBC Minutes of 16th September 2010 where they wrapped up the final budget approval. The evaluation of the PDB will be included in the next minutes. The next meeting will be devoted to planning issues.

VP Legal – Chris Wells (CW)

   [see pg.23-29 of packet]

CW included in the packet a list of Bills recently signed by the Governor, and also the slides from a webinar he participated in on SB1440. CW emphasized the points made that "the CSU shall not require students transferring…to repeat courses that are similar to those taken at the CC that counted toward the associate degree for transfer", noting that the term similar might generate an important discussion. Also the mention of "No additional local graduation requirements may be required" may also be problematic in that different colleges may have different standards. Based on further comments on the slides CW felt that articulation would become increasingly important, and that "double counting" would be used often. CW noted the slide headed "What You Can Do" which includes a web URL www.c-id.net/ where one can look at disciplines and see model curricula. To address concerns and ask further questions go to info@asccc.org and you get a response to questions and are able to voice concerns.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES
Report on Deans' Council – Moon Ichinaga (MI)

   [see handout distributed at meeting] for a summary of the minutes of the October 29th meeting. MI reported that this had been a lengthy meeting and she would just be noting some highlights. MI noted that Dr. Arce had raised the question of whether ECC should change the current limit on units that may be taken during Winter and Summer sessions, and recommended that a committee, including Mr. B. Mulrooney, be established to define reasonable unit limits, and ensure the academic integrity of short-term classes. Ms. C. Lee will research the policies at other schools and report on this. Dr. Nishime talked about registration priorities and said that a recommendation fro a Community Advancement Manager's meeting was to allow new in-district high school graduates to register during the

first day of the new student registration period. Dr. Smith, Dean of counseling had agreed with the recommendation but had raised concerns about the potential amount of work in assessing students pre-registration, and the possible need to increase outreach staff. In the handout was also an article from the LA Times Online which had been shared by Dr. Arce at the meeting, titled "Community Colleges must Commit to Change" and the issues raised by the article had been discussed, especially the issue of how to improve poor student performance. In answer to a query Dr. Nishime said that ECC ranks 21/50 in California Community Colleges in terms of Hispanic enrollment, and 45/50 in terms of Hispanic graduation, adding that the aim of the Title V grant is to increase graduation rates from 15 to 30%. Mr. Kjeseth said there were other factors to take into account, like transfer rates etc., and Mr. Wells agreed that other metrics were also important. Mr. Marston agreed saying that in his experience many Hispanic students were not focused on transfer, but rather their prime motivation was to get a job.

MI continued her report, saying that there had been extended discussion on the topic of proof of in-state residence requirements and the effect on community colleges. The UC system says it has proof via transcripts, but community colleges only have a self declaration from students that they have been resident in the state for two years. Ms. Jeffries asked if the requirement was not one year and one day, an d Dr, Nishime said that was the physical requirement with intent to stay another year.

Ms. Taylor had a question about the handout point V. B. "given that one unit represents a commitment to 18 hours of work…" and it was clarified to read 18 hours of in-class work.

Assessment of Learning Committee Report – Core Competency Summit – Jenny Simon (JS)

[see pp.30- 40 of packet]

JS reported that the assessment of the first core competency – Communication and Comprehension - has been completed, and she shared a report compiled by Institutional Research.JS reported that the process of assessment had used a short survey. Students had completed the self-survey using a 5 point scale, [see pg.32 of packet] for the ratings and list of skills. They were also asked to list 1-3 experiences that had contributed to their skills in communication and comprehension [see pg. 35 of packet]

In addition to the student survey which targeted certain classes, selected faculty were also asked to give a holistic rating of these students [see pg. 32 of packet] JS said that this may be altered next time as it was difficult to reconcile the two sets of rankings. This discrepancy between the ranking systems was also discussed at the summit, and was one of the lessons learned from the process.

Another set of data was to show the average grade of all the communication and comprehension classes taken at the ECC and CEC campuses [see pp. 33 – 34 of packet] The overall GPA was shown to be 3.20 at ECC and 2.83 at the CEC. The success and retention rates can also be seen here. Faculty speakers from the two campuses were also invited to speak at the summit, on their assessment processes. Speakers were from diverse disciplines, including Fine Arts, Administration of Justice, Counseling, History, Science, and ESL. As a result of the assessment and summit it was noted that we need to be cleared in defining our standards, we need to get more faculty involved. Mr. Kjeseth asked if it was only courses that had ranked communication highly that took part in the random sampling. JS answered in the affirmative. Mr. Kjeseth asked if the same basic plan would be followed when assessing the remaining core competencies. JS noted that the same basic plan would be followed, but the next core competency is Critical Thinking, which more courses rated highly, so there would be a wider range of classes from which to draw a random sample. For the other competencies the Committee might include classes that had rated the competency a 3 to get good representation.

JS said that the student self-assessment data had also been broken down by ethnic group [see pg. 36 of packet] and it was interesting to note that Asian had ranked themselves low, and African Americans had rated themselves high on certain criteria. JS said that this might point to supporting training for faculty on teaching culturally diverse students, and on cultural norms and practices. JS noted that the data had opened up many interesting questions and avenues to explore. JS will be writing the ACL summary of the assessment and data; Mr. Kjeseth said that the IR summary [on pg. 34 of packet] did not give ideas on next steps. JS said she would note the patterns shown in the data and note the questions the data raised.

ECC Federation of Techers Report – Elizabeth Shadish (ES)

ES gave some background on the move from an 18 to 16 week calendar cycle. As the classes moved to this format lectures inadvertently picked up some extra minutes for which the college was awarded extra FTES and certain part time faculty received compensation. ECC thus had to reduce the class time by a few minutes, and certain part time faculty had their pay reduced. The Federation is talking to the district about this matter of pay. Mr. Wells asked how much the pay was reduced. ES said she was not sure, but it was said to be $50 per pay packet in one case, which worked out to approximately $250 per semester. Mr. Ahmadapour asked about student pay, noting that many student workers had been getting minimum wage for years. He asked if there was a body to approach for help and advice on this issue. Ms. Taylor thought there was no representative body to help with this issue.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
Officer Nominations – Chris Gold (CG)
CG noted that she wanted to get people thinking about positions up for nomination next year, and in so doing she was fulfilling her constitutional obligation. This item will be brought bak at the next meeting. The offices up for nomination are:
VP, Educational Policies
VP, Faculty Development
VP, Finance and Special Projects
VP, Legislative Action
BP/AP 4055 – Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities – Chris Jeffries (CJ)
[see pp 41-46 of packet
Action item: second reading. CJ noted that the senators might see some grammatical corrections that had been made, but otherwise this was the same as the original document. CJ made a motion to approve the item, which was seconded by Mr. Wells.
Dr. Nishime noted that re: the issue of whether Level 1 accommodations could be handled at the CEC, the answer was that they could, but as their services were not as well publicized, and as they did not document the disabilities as well, the services were currently not as high a standard as here at ECC. CJ asked whether the services would be improving. Dr. Nishime said yes, as currently they were in violation. CG called for a vote and the BP/AP passed unanimously.
Academic calendar Resolutions – Chris Gold (CG)
[see handout distributed at meeting]
CG noted that the handout comprised a Winter Resolution, an Academic Calendar Procedure Resolution, BP/AP 4010 Academic Calendar, and some contract language from an Agreement between the El Camino College District and El Camino College Federation of Teachers July 2007 – June 2010.
CG asked the senators to look these over briefly before opening the floor to discussion. Mr. Widman asked whether Ms. Shadish had incorporated her Federation suggestions into these resolutions. CG said no, but this could be discussed further and could yet be included. CG felt that, as this is a heated issue, it would be best not to set an aggressive or "reactionary" tone. We are hoping for progress, and it seems the faculty see the elimination of the Winter session as counter to progress, so the impetus for these resolutions is to consider the calendar issue carefully.
CG noted that "Progress" meant development, usually of a gradual kind, toward achieving a goal or reaching a higher standard, whereas Reactionary means "opposed to progress" – "opposed to progressive social or political change." A reactionary person is an opponent of progress.
Mr. Marcoux felt it was beneficial to say that the faculty have demonstrated support, and broaden the language. Ms. Jeffries agreed, noting that the counselors are in full support. Mr. Ahmadapour noted that the resolutions do not note the reaction of the students, and their sentiments should be included. Mr. Firestone noted that at an earlier meeting someone had given a history of the Winter session and had noted that it had been started to compete with other schools, and if this was still a valid point tit should be noted.
Mr. D. Brown, the Chief negotiator for the Federation said that he had been invited to give input, [see handout distributed at meeting] and said he was glad to see the contract language included. He said that it

could not be a lateral decision to eliminate the Winter session but would have to be negotiated as it is included in the contract. If the concern is that faculty do not participate in college business during the Winter session, Mr. Brown suggested ways to address the problem including having committees having a set of alternate members to ensure there are always enough members to ensure a quorum for business, and giving committees more decision making authority. Mr. Brown felt that the advice or suggestions of the committees was not always followed through upon by the administrators making the decisions. If the committees were made stronger and more collegial, harnessing the talent of the faculty instead of ignoring them, faculty members might be incentivized to join the committees. Mr. Brown went on to remark that it was part of his role as chief negotiator to be aware of practices at other colleges, , and some faculty at other institutions get flex credit for committee work, this would need to be codified in the contract. Other colleges incentivize with extra pay.

Ms. Taylor said she had heard other schools have intersession classes used as load. Mr. Brown said this was termed "Load banking" and the ECC Federation has been negotiating this. Other local colleges do indeed have this.

CG thanked Mr. Brown for his input. She noted that there are key areas where the Senate and Union overlap. Mr. Marcoux asked about the plans for the resolutions. CG noted that this was a first reading and would be brought back. Mr. Isaacs noted that there were some grammatical errors to be cleaned up, especially with the use of commas. A motion was called to joint author a resolution with the Federation, but Mr. Marcoux noted that a motion was not needed to do this. CG thought that more discussion on the issues was needed. Ms. Taylor was of the opinion that the resolutions were different and we should first focus on the issues of setting policy on the goals of the Calendar committee. CG noted that the second resolution calls for the development of a procedure for the calendar committee, noting that currently this language only appears in the contract and should be set down in black and white in the procedures. CG also felt that the Senate should take the leadership in making this happen.

Dr. Nishime asked why a resolution was needed when the Education Policies Committee could simply write a procedure. CG said this was a 10+1 issue and the Academic Senate position needed to be asserted. Mr. Wells felt that he too, did not want to co-mingle the resolutions, but that each body could be in support of the others resolution. Ms. Shadish asked Mr. Wells what his concern was with a co-mingled resolution. Mr. Wells said he felt each body should have their own resolution as the aims of each body might not be identical, and a co-mingling might take it out of the realm of a 10+1 issue. Ms. Shadish said she would send the Federation resolutions to CG for consideration, and the members could talk it over. Mr. Marcoux noted, in response to Dr. Nishime's earlier remark, that the Ed. Policies committee is usually told which policies to work on, and rarely take the initiative to work on a policy alone.

Dr. Arce said that he felt some good points had been made re: the Winter session, but he had been surprised and been made uncomfortable by the reactionary tone of some of the emails and the polarization of the faculty and administration. The Forums will be for sharing ideas and having dialogue. Administration does not believe it can make changes without consultation, and Dr. Arce felt he had made a mistake in presenting the Winter proposal without prior consultation of the relevant bodies, and he should have sought more consensus. If all kept to the higher ground, there would be a more constructive dialogue. Cg agreed with this sentiment. Ms. Budri asked whether there would be an open forum for students, and if so when, as the Associated Student body wished to notify the students as many are eager to know what is going on. Dr. Nishime said the forums were open to all; no special announcements or invitations would be forthcoming, just come and express views.

INFORMATION ITEMS – DISCUSSION
International Education Procedure
[see pg. 48 of packet] Early adjournment meant there was no time to address this issue.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS
None

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

ADJOURN
The meeting adjourned at 1:500pm.
Cs/ecc2010

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Office of the President
Minutes of the College Council Meeting October 25, 2010

Present: Janice Ely, Ann Garten, Christina Gold, Jo Ann Higdon, Jessica Lopez, David Mc Patchell, Jeanie Nishime, Susan Pickens, Gary Robertson, Elizabeth Shadish, Luukia Smith, Lynn Solomita, and Arvid Spor.

1. Classified service awards date is Tuesday, October 26, 2010 at 2 p.m.
2. California Community Colleges Board of Governors meeting will be held at ECC on November 8-9, 2010. College Council members are invited to participate in the following activities on November 8th: 1) lunch (1-2 p.m. in Alondra room); 2) walking tour of ECC programs (2-3 p.m.); and catered reception (5:30-7 p.m. in Alondra room). An invitation will be sent out via email. Please note that College Council will not meet on November 8th.
3. Board of Trustees meeting. There was an article in the Daily Breeze, "Independence Sought for Compton College." Susan will send article to College Council members. Saul Panski sent a letter to President Fallo in support for the partnership and the Accreditation process. Susan will also send that out to Council members.
4. It was noted that College Council is a safety valve. Any issues we have at the College can be brought to College Council for discussion.
5. College Council Goal # 2 – Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
    a. Applause cards –Make more meaningful for the individuals receiving them and publicize. Jeanie will bring a report of how many Applause cards are issued.
    b. STAR award – It was suggested that this award be given once a semester. The winner could have their name on the marquee. There was concern about who would be in charge of administering the award. There was also a concern about someone being left out.
6. BP 2350 Speakers – number 4. There was a suggestion to change the second sentence to read "Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of five minutes on non-agenda items." There was a suggestion to change the third sentence to read "Thirty minutes shall be the maximum time allotment for public speakers on any one agenda or non-agenda item regardless of the number of speakers." Susan will distribute the CCLC Sample BP 2350 and will also check codes sited in the policy.
7. BP and AP 5055- Enrollment Priorities. These will be brought back next week. The managers want to include in the procedure registration priority for new in-district high school students.

Agenda for the November 1, 2010 Meeting:
1. Minutes of October 25, 2010
2. Team Reports
3. Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 5055 – Enrollment Priorities
4. Board Policy 2350 – Speakers
5. CCLC Sample Procedure – 4026 - Philosophy and Criteria for International Education

6. College Council minutes
7. Develop objectives for College Council Goals 2010-2011

College Council Goals 2010-2011
1. Continue to improve internal college communications.
2. Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
3. Continue to incorporate evidence-based decision making when evidence is available.
4. Communicate accreditation eligibility issues facing the College throughout the year.
5. Support, review, and discuss results of a Student Campus Climate survey.
6. Define and discuss the issue of employee morale and student satisfaction at both locations. Support initiatives to improve employee morale and student satisfaction as defined by campus discussions.
7. Complete 10 + 1 policies and accompanying procedures.
8. Continue to build a sense of community.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
COURSE REVIEW GUIDELINES & CHECKLIST

This worksheet assists faculty in course review and is not submitted for approval.
Instead this document should be filed in course file in the Division Office.

Division/Department:_____Date:_____
Date Course Submitted to DCC

Course:_____
Subject & Number   Descriptive Title

Originator:_____
Faculty in Charge of Course Review

Course review has four steps. We recommend a read-through of the entire process below before beginning. Systematically undergoing the first two steps will simplify the last two steps considerably.

Step 1: Discuss the course and review course materials
Step 2: Decide on necessary modifications and the review type   } Before using CurricUNET

Step 3: Modify course documents (in CurricUNET)
Step 4: Obtain DCC and CCC approval   } Using CurricUNET

Step 1: Discuss the course and review course materials Course review should be done by an appropriate group of faculty (not alone), in consultation with the dean and division CCC representative. In course review, step back and think about the course holistically. Examine SLO assessment reports, program review documents, the current course outline of record, sample syllabi, examinations, course schedules, and instructional material. There is no particular order to discussion points listed below, and changes may not be necessary. Further information is available for items with superscripted numbers. Questions should be directed to the division CCC representative, the curriculum advisor, or the dean.

A checked box indicates completion.

☐ Examine recent course **offerings** and **delivery methods.** Consider inactivating any course that has not been offered in two or more years. There is a fast track for reactivating a course later. If a *distance education* version exists, it must be *updated*. If a distance education version is appropriate, it should be *developed*.

☐ Estimate the **independent work hours outside of class**[1] and ask if there are sufficient **contact hours**[1] (lecture and laboratory) to ensure that the **course units**[1] *accurately reflect the hours of work the average successful student requires to succeed*. Changes here may affect **faculty load**[1]**.**

☐ Contact the articulation officer for recommendations regarding the **general education** and **transfer status** of the course. Contact the curriculum advisor with questions about the **discipline** or **credit status** of the course (degree-applicable credit, non-degree-applicable credit, or noncredit). *Credit status rarely changes.*

☐ Reconsider the justification for any **conditions of enrollment**[2] the course may have, in order to ensure that these conditions are *justified in accordance with Title 5 regulations.*

In the current course outline of record:

☐ Reconsider the **descriptive title** and **catalog description**, in order to ensure *that the descriptive title is current and appropriate and that the catalog description reflects the content and purpose of the course*. ***In most cases changes are not necessary.***

☐ Reexamine the **course objectives**[3], in order to ensure that *the outcomes and objectives are appropriate and attainable,* and that *a method of evaluation has been identified for each one.*

☐ Revisit the **outline of subject matter**, in order to ensure *that the content is current and appropriate; that each course topic is given sufficient time, and that sufficient detail is provided for each*.

☐ Review the **methods of evaluation**[4]**, typical assignment**[4], **critical thinking assignments**[5], **work outside of class**[6], and **instructional methods**[6]**,** in order to ensure that these are *current and appropriate*.

☐ Update the **materials**[7] for the course, including textbooks, in order to ensure *that all materials are current as possible and appropriate*. For courses that satisfy CSU Breadth GE or IGETC, a textbook with a publication date within 5 years is necessary. However, this does not mean that the textbook listed must be used for the course.

Step 2: Decide on necessary modifications and the review type Create a list of proposed changes. Based on the type and extent of the changes proposed, the review will be classified as either Standard Review or a Full Review, in order to streamline the approval process. The only substantive difference between a standard and a full review is the number of members of the CCC who will examine the proposed changes. Use your expertise and best judgment to check the nature of the changes needed in each area. If any of the changes fall in the Full Review column, the course review will undergo Full Review in the CCC; otherwise it will undergo Standard Review. In each row of the table below, if nothing is checked, then no changes are being proposed.

	Standard Review	Full Review
Inactivation or Reactivation	▷ inactivation	▷ reactivation
Distance Education	▷ update existing DE version	▷ new DE version proposed
Discipline	▷ changes proposed	
General Education		▷ changes proposed
Transfer Status		▷ changes proposed
Credit Status		▷ changes proposed
Lecture, Lab, and Independent Work Hours, Course Units	▷ changes with no change in course units	▷ changes to course units proposed
Faculty Load	▷ no changes or decrease in faculty load	▷ any increase in faculty load (prior administrative approval required)
Grading Method	▷ changes proposed	
Descriptive Title	▷ changes proposed	
Subject		▷ changes proposed
Number	▷ changes needed	
Catalog Description	▷ changes needed	
Course Objectives	▷ changes needed	
Outline of Subject Matter	▷ changes needed	
Required Texts and Materials	▷ updated current representative textbook ▷ other changes to required material	
Primary Method of Evaluation	▷ changes needed	
Assignments	▷ changes needed	
Conditions of Enrollment	▷ only minor editorial changes needed	▷ substantive changes requiring new justifications

Step 3: Modify course documents (in CurricUNET)
One faculty member serves as the Faculty Contact Person or *Originator*, who is responsible for creating the course review proposal in CurricUNET. Contact the Division CCC Representative with any questions.

Step 4: Obtain DCC and CCC approval
After a final review of the material, the *Originator* launches the course review proposal approval process. The *Originator* must be available for consultation throughout the approval process and will make requested changes in CurricUNET, contacting fellow faculty about any requested changes, if appropriate.

Additional Information:

1. Course Units, Contact Hours, Faculty Load, and **Independent Work Hours Outside of Class**

Course units are intended to award students for the hours they spend mastering the knowledge and skills of the target course. At ECC, we define one *course unit* as 54 hours of student work hours, including the *total contact hours* and the *total independent work hours*. *Weekly contact hours* include both weekly lecture and lab hours. *Total contact hours* are based on weekly lecture hours and weekly lab hours and the number of weeks a course has in a regular term. *Independent work hours* are the hours successful students spend learning outside of contact hours. The *total independent work hours* is always an estimate of an unknowable average and should be determined using the best judgment of instructors and any data which may be collected.

In order to calculate the course units, you need the number of weeks the course lasts in a regular semester, the weekly contact hours, and the weekly independent study hours. ECC currently uses a 16-week, compressed calendar, but for curriculum purposes, we pretend that a full term 18 weeks in length. Most transfer-level lecture courses assume that a successful student needs two hours of independent work for every hour of lecture. Consider the example below:

Example:	Math 120	
Regular Semester Course Weeks:	18 weeks	
Course Units:	3 units	x 54 hours = 162 total hours
Weekly Lecture Hours:	3 hours	x 18 weeks = 54 total lecture hours
Weekly Laboratory Hours:	0 hours	x 18 weeks = 0 total lab hours
Weekly Independent Work Hours:	6 hours	x 18 weeks = 108 total independent work hours
Justification: The sum of total lecture and total independent work hours is 162. 162 hours ÷ 54 hours/unit = 3 course units.		

Some believe this 2-to-1 ratio originated with the definition of the "Carnegie unit". However, the Title 5 definition of the course unit is much more flexible. The examples below illustrate this flexibility:

Example:	ATEC 33	
Regular Semester Course Weeks:	18 weeks	
Course Units:	8 units	x 54 hours = 432 total hours
Weekly Lecture Hours:	5 hours	x 18 weeks = 90 total lecture hours
Weekly Laboratory Hours:	10 hours	x 18 weeks = 180 total lab hours
Weekly Independent Work Hours:	9 hours	x 18 weeks = 162 total independent work hours
Justification: With 8 course units assigned to this course, there is an expectation that the student needs an average of 432 total hours in an 18-week semester in order to succeed. The 270 total contact hours leaves 162 total independent work hours. This works out to 9 weekly independent work hours.		

Example:	French 1	
Regular Semester Course Weeks:	18 weeks	
Course Units:	4 units	x 54 hours = 216 total hours
Weekly Lecture Hours:	5 hours	x 18 weeks = 90 total lecture hours
Weekly Laboratory Hours:	0 hours	x 18 weeks = 0 total lab hours
Weekly Independent Work Hours:	7 hours	x 18 weeks = 126 total independent work hours
Justification: The set up for this course suggests that the student needs an average of 126 total independent work hours, or 7 weekly independent work hours, in order to succeed.		

Often, faculty simply decide the weekly lecture hours, the weekly lab hours, and the course units. They then calculate the total and weekly independent work hours and ask if the results are reasonable estimates of the average time a successful student needs to complete the necessary work.

Occasionally, course review reveals a course that is no longer in compliance with Title 5 regulations, as we see in the Physical Education example below. As these are located, they need to be fixed.

Example:	PE 80ab		
Regular Semester Course Weeks:	18 weeks		
Course Units:	2 units	x 54 hours = 108	total hours
Weekly Lecture Hours:	0 hours	x 18 weeks = 0	total lecture hours
Weekly Laboratory Hours:	10 hours	x 18 weeks = 180	total lab hours
Weekly Independent Work Hours:	0 hours	x 18 weeks = 0	total independent work hours

Problem: As described, this course is out of compliance with Title 5 regulations. Dividing the 180 total student work hours by 54 hours/unit suggests the course should be assigned 3.33 course units. Title 5 requires that units be awarded in half-unit increments, but allows local standards to determine rounding rules. This course should be a 3-unit course.

Changes to weekly lecture and lab hours can affect *faculty load,* which is based on total contact hours. In general, any increase in total contact hours increases faculty load. In order to determine faculty load, use the following formula:

$$\text{faculty load} = \frac{\text{lecture hours/week}}{15} + \frac{\text{laboratory hours/week}}{20} + \frac{\text{activity lab hours/week}}{22}$$

For example, a course with 2 lecture hours and 2 laboratory hours per week yields a faculty load of 0.2333, or 23.33% of a full load. A course with 4 lecture hours per week class yields a faculty load of 0.2667 or 26.67% of a full load. If the faculty load is increased, *written* approval from the Vice President of Academic Affairs is required before the course review approval process begins. Faculty and deans should consider the possibly far-reaching effects of making changes to lecture and laboratory hours for a course. Even decreases in faculty load could be inadvisable from a scheduling perspective.

2. Conditions of Enrollment

Establishing and *justifying* conditions of enrollment are two of the most important responsibilities the state has assigned faculty. We are required to review the justifications for conditions of enrollment every six years. There are three classes of enrollment conditions (prerequisites and corequisites, recommended preparations, and enrollment limitations).

- Enrollment limitations are allowed for courses like orchestra or school newspaper, and are not subject to the same justification procedures as other enrollment conditions. More information is available below.
- Prerequisite and corequisite courses, knowledge or skills are those *without which a student is highly unlikely* to succeed in the target course. These are required.
- Recommended preparation courses, knowledge or skills are those, which *greatly enhance* a student's ability to succeed in the target course. These are advisory.

Categories: Type of Requisite or Recommended Preparation:	Sequential	Other Knowledge or Skills	Communication / Computational	Health and Safety	Statute or Regulation	Standard Requisite	Program Requirement
Prerequisite Course	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Corequisite Course	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Non-Course Prerequisite				✓	✓		✓
Non-Course Corequisite					✓		✓
Recommended Preparation Course	✓		✓				
Non-Course Recommended Preparation		✓		✓			

There are multiple types and categories of prerequisites, corequisites, and recommended preparations. The category of the condition determines how it is justified and what documentation is needed. Common categories for each type of requisite or recommended preparation are checked in the table above. If a box is left unchecked, such a combination is rare.

CATEGORIES: **Sequential** – Any course in the same department as the target course

Other Knowledge or Skills – Any course not in the department of the target course

Communication / Computational – Any reading, writing, mathematics, or ESL course not in the department of the target course

JUSTIFICATION and DOCUMENTATION: For these categories, *content review* (as defined in Title 5) is the process used to determine whether or not a proposed prerequisite, corequisite, or recommended preparation course is appropriate. Here are the steps to *content review*:

A. Faculty members with appropriate expertise participate in the entire content review process.
B. The course student learning outcomes and course objectives of the target course are established according to accreditation standards, Title 5, and local standards.
C. Course review resources and other data are considered in establishing the body of required or recommended knowledge or skills for student success in the target course.
  - **For a prerequisite or corequisite:** The knowledge or skills required *prior to* enrollment in (or developed *concurrent with* the progress of) the target course are entered in the **entry skills** page of the target course's CurricUNET file as **required skills**. Write a short paragraph explaining why a student would be *highly unlikely to succeed* (minimum grade of "C" or "Pass") without this set of knowledge or skills.
  - **For a recommended preparation:** The knowledge or skills recommended *prior to* enrollment in (or developed *concurrent with* the progress of) the target course have been entered in the **entry skills** page of the target course's CurricUNET file as **recommended skills**. Write a short paragraph explaining why a student's chances of success (minimum grade of "C" or "Pass") would be *greatly enhanced* with this set of knowledge or skills.
D. For a prerequisite, corequisite, or recommended preparation **course**, the knowledge and skills listed in the **entry skills** page of target course's CurricUNET file are matched to the course student learning outcomes and course objectives of the prerequisite, corequisite or recommended **course**. This may be done on the CurricUNET **entry skills** page.
E. CurricUNET will automatically include the matching skills and content review information in the Course Outline of Record.

CATEGORY: **Communication / Computational** – Any reading, writing, mathematics, or ESL course not in the department of the target course
JUSTIFICATION and DOCUMENTATION: Currently, data must be gathered to justify this category of requisite. Complete an **Entrance Requirements Needing Data Collection (Form B)** and place it on file in the division office. This is not available online.

CATEGORY: **Health and Safety**
JUSTIFICATION and DOCUMENTATION: In CurricUNET, justify health or safety requisites by listing the skills which students should have in order to avoid creating hazards to themselves or others. No additional documentation is necessary.

CATEGORIES: **Statute or Regulation**
 Program Requirement
JUSTIFICATION and DOCUMENTATION: In CurricUNET, cite the appropriate statute or regulation, or program requirement. No additional documentation is needed.

CATEGORY: **Standard Requisite**
JUSTIFICATION and DOCUMENTATION: In CurricUNET, list at least three UC or CSU examples of equivalent courses and requisite courses. Copies of the appropriate catalog pages of the UC or CSU examples should be uploaded on the **attached files** page in CurricUNET.

Enrollment Limitations: Title 5 allows enrollment limitations in nine categories: Band/Orchestra, Theatre, Speech, Chorus, Journalism, Dance, Intercollegiate Athletics, Honors Courses, and Blocks of Courses. In CurricUNET, provide details about how the enrollment limitation can be met. For example, an audition may be required, in which a student performs a solo on an instrument at an intermediate difficulty level. Consult the *curriculum advisor* for guidance writing these conditions. In addition, describe any degree or certificate requirements the target course satisfies. If they exist, alternate courses that satisfy the same requirements, but do not have enrollment limitations, should be listed in CurricUNET.

3. **Course Student Learning Outcomes and Course Objectives**

Enter *course student learning outcomes and their assessment methods* in the CurricUNET SLOs & Assessments Module. This information will be incorporated automatically into the Complete Course Outline of Record, the Brief Course Outline of Record, and the Course Syllabus Information Report. *Course student learning outcomes* are NOT subject to CCC approval and can be changed at any time. *Student learning outcomes* should meet minimum standards for quality and must be assessable. All courses submitted for course review **must** have a complete set of *student learning outcomes.*

Enter *course objectives and their assessment methods* in the CurricUNET Curriculum Module. *Course objectives* are subject to CCC approval and can only be changed through the process of course review. *Course objectives* must be behaviorally measurable and some *course objectives* must expect students to conduct critical thinking.

4. **Methods of Evaluation** and the **Typical Assignment**

The *typical assignment* must be evaluated using the *primary method of evaluation* for the course. The *typical assignment* should address students directly and should clearly indicate the product the instructor will evaluate, such as a paper or an oral presentation of a specific length, an art object or performance, or a quiz. The list of *methods of evaluation* should consist of those methods that are **highly likely** to be used by all instructors of the course. Instructors are not **required** to use the methods listed.

5. **Critical Thinking Assignments**

The *critical thinking assignments* must have clear products and must clearly involve critical thinking skills. The *critical thinking assignments* should address students directly and should clearly indicate the product the instructor will evaluate, such as a paper or an oral presentation of a specific length, an art object or performance, or a quiz. *Critical thinking assignments* are now required by Title 5 for **all credit courses, whether degree applicable or not**. Local standards encourage **noncredit courses** to include *critical thinking assignments*.

6. **Work Outside of Class** and **Instructional Methods**

For both of these areas, the lists should include everything that is highly likely to occur in all course offerings. Occasionally, faculty confuse *instructional methods* with *work outside of class*, so double-check these. Finally, only check "Field Trips" under *instructional methods* if these are trips that must receive prior Board of Trustees approval. (For more information about field trips and alternate class sites, contact your dean.)

7. **Textbooks/Materials**

Textbooks/Material should only include items **that students may be asked to purchase**. If there is doubt about a particular item, please contact the curriculum advisor.

Articulation is greatly facilitated when a course has at least one *representative textbook with a recent publication date*. When the appropriate textbook has no recent edition or printing, the faculty can justify the textbook by indicating that it is an "industry standard" or "discipline standard" or the "most recent edition available". Textbooks are inappropriate for some courses. There is no requirement that a course must have a textbook. However, faculty should consult with the articulation officer regarding any articulation issues that may arise as a result of requiring no textbook.

In CurricUNET, textbooks and alternate texts should be entered under **texts** only if the title, edition, author, publisher, and date of publication are available. Otherwise, list other required readings under **supplemental readings** or **materials.** Using these other options allows faculty to list more general items, such as "Six Shakespeare plays, any version", "The Iliad, any translation", or "Students select four plays written in the last five years".

Minutes for Ed Policies meeting 10/12/10

Members Present: C. Jeffries, C. Wells, L. Suekawa, V. Robles, J. Shankweiler, E. Preston

Guests Present: D. Patel, B. Mulrooney

1) Discussion regarding BP and AP 4055 – Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities
   a) An updated version of the policies and procedures from the one we had seen in May was presented after consultation with the Math Division and Leisa Biggers who specifically approved the Level 1 accommodations
   b) There are now only 2 levels of accommodations. Course waivers was folded into course substitutions
   c) Leisa Biggers will serve as the Disabilities Compliance Offfice
   d) Questions were answered regarding the timing of accommodations and the committee wanted to make sure "in a timely manner" was included.
   e) The difference between course waiver and course substitution was discussed.
   f) The appeal process was identified and strengthened by including it is the responsibility of the student to provide extra evidence or documentation that was not originally supplied
   g) Additional wording was tweaked and the policy and procedure was approved by the Ed Policies Committee to go forward to the Academic Senate.

2) Discussion regarding BP and AP 5055 – Priority Registration
   a) B. Mulrooney went over the legally required groups who have priority registration and the current groups who currently have priority registration. Some of these included athletes, international students, TRIO, student government, Project Success, and Puente.
   b) Some wording changes were suggested.
   c) Because time was running out, it was recommended that members email B. Mulrooney with any other changes as this was not something that had to be voted on by Ed Policies, but was more informational.

"Getting the Job"
Faculty Job Application and Interview Workshops

This two-part workshop provides Adjunct Faculty with tips about applying to and interviewing for full-time faculty positions at ECC/CEC and other community colleges.

The Job Application Process
Friday, December 10, 2010
12:00 - 1:30 pm, Library West Basement
(light refreshments will be served)

Panelists include a representative from Human Resources and new full-time ECC faculty members.

The workshop will cover the following topics:
- iGreentree online application software (used at ECC and CEC)
- the dos and don'ts of submitting the online application
- tips for writing a cover letter
- Q & A

Register Now!
for December's Workshop

Part II: The Interview Process Workshop
Tentatively scheduled for early March 2011

A panel of recently hired full-time faculty will discuss and offer advice for conducting a successful interview.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: October 7, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT

☐ Enomoto, Ryuichiro (Rio) – ASO   ☒ Shenefield, Cheryl – Administrative Svcs.
☒ Ott, Jonathan – Campus Police   ☒ Spor, Arvid – Chair (non-voting)
☒ Patel, Dipte – Academic Affairs   ☐ Turner, Gary – ECCE
☐ Quinones-Perez, Margaret – ECCFT   ☐ Tyler, Harold – Management/Supervisors
☐ Reid, Dawn – Student & Community Adv.   ☒ Widman, Lance – Academic Senate

OTHERS ATTENDING: Francisco Arce, Jack Demont, Katie Gleason, Jo Ann Higdon, Luis Mancia, Jeanie Nishime, John Wagstaff

Handouts: Medical Plans Monthly Rates for 10- and 12 Month-Employees; Budget Information from CCLC; ARRA funding memo and distribution list; PBC Evaluation Report

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

Jack Demont was introduced as the alternate student representative for ASO.

Approval of September 16, 2010 Minutes

Updates:
1. Page 1, Approval of August 26th Minutes, #1 – medical plan monthly rates for 10- and 12-month employees were made available at the request for more information on health insurance rates.
2. Page 1, Approval of August 26th Minutes, #4 – actuarial computation is similar to how pension fund contributions are calculated based on participant age, gender and/or length of service. The amount reflects potential increases to determine the premium. The final value is allocated as an accrual cost using an actuarial cost method – applying an imputed interest rate to calculated cost. Complicated to discuss in theory, but recommend that the actuarial use samples to explain calculations when the next year's study is done. Biggest concern is if imputed interest rate lowers again.
3. Page 1, Approval of September 2nd Minutes, #1 – explanation of the adjustment of $299,056 to the Workers' Compensation Fund in the budget book: the Southern California Community College Districts (SCCCD) calculations for GASB and Worker's Comp funds were done at the same time and the $299,056 GASB interest was posted together with the Workers' Comp funds. This amount was reversed out the Workers' Comp account (shown on page 14 of the budget book) and credited to the interest account. Will let committee know where credit to GASB is located in the budget book.
4. Page 1, Approval of September 2nd Minutes
   a. #3a – Voice/Data fiber optic replacement is on October Board agenda. If approved, work will start in November 2010 and expected to be completed by October 2011.
   b. #3b – Technology plans being discussed and will update committee at a later time.
5. Page 2, Categorical Funding Source request - informed Janice Ely.
6. Page 2, 2010 PBC Evaluation Discussion #2 – used online source, but not Survey Monkey.

1

The minutes were approved with no changes.

Budget Update

1. *Good news*: 2.2% statewide enrollment growth divided among districts. How monies will be divided has not yet been determined; $35 million to backfill categorical cuts in 2010-11 (replaces ARRA backfill); $25 million for Workforce Development; $20 million for Career Tech programs – distribution still not known; no positive or negative cost-of-living adjustment (no impact to ECC).
2. *Bad news*: carryovers/deferrals continue to increase (total deferral of $892 million for this fiscal year) – deferral pattern will probably continue to grow. Revenue earned from FTES through June 30th is already booked, whether we received or not. As payments continue to be delayed, the accounting profession (through the American Institute of CPAs) may not allow districts to count deferrals as revenue if not received. K-12 is considered a continuing rather than annual appropriation and continues to receive their funding. What is the standard cycle of fees we collect, and is there relaxation of what we give back to the State if we're not receiving money? Fees are not physically sent back to the State - the State pays us what is owed minus the fees. What is the percentage of student fees collected compared to overall appropriations? Approximately 6% ($6M) of student fees booked on a $100M overall appropriation. In the past, one TRAN (Tax Revenue Anticipation Note) was issued a year. Offerings of mid-year TRANs the past few years helped accommodate cash flow. Previous TRANs must be paid off before mid-year TRAN can be issued. We normally use the county pool to sell our TRANs to the public. TRANs are similar to bonds but short term. Proceeds go directly to and are controlled by the County.
3. *Ugh*: PERS retirement age for those hired into the system after November 10, 2010 will be restored back to age 60 at 2%. Retirement compensation will be calculated on the final three-year average, rather than single highest year. This does not address the actuarial problem for CalSTRS and CalPERS.
4. Budget will likely be reopened before year end.

ARRA Funding

1. One-time $5 million funding for community colleges to backfill cuts to categorical programs. $35 million backfill for categorical programs will replace ARRA funding if passed with budget. In 2009-10, received $417, 723 from federal stimulus money. This year ECC will receive $68,616 of the $5 million, but not obligated to use for categorical programs. Why did small college Butte receive $288,639? Possibly because it provides system-wide C-Net support.
2. Cabinet is asking PBC to endorse their recommendation to use money to augment CalWORKs work study provided the jobs are on campus. Required to spend funds within three days, so proposal is to pay for work study salary expenses through expenditure transfers.
3. What other possibilities for use of funds were considered? Backfill for general work study was also considered. Wanted students to benefit. Proposal helps pick up more than the 25% paid by CalWORKs.
4. PBC agreed to endorse recommendation to use funds to augment CalWORKs work study students working on campus.
5. The $68,616 will be accounted for in the budget under actuals spent this year.

2010 PBC Evaluation Results:

1. 10 strongly agreed or agreed and 1 disagreed that PBC reviews/discusses evaluation outcomes of Accreditation Self-Study, Comprehensive Master Plan and annual plans. Comments: Chair keeps members up-to-date; would have been beneficial if PBC recommendations would have been

2

accepted – see outcome working in isolation; not much time spent on self-study; do not do enough of these.

2. 10 strongly agreed or agreed and 1 disagreed that PBC reviews and discusses prioritized Area plan requests for funding. Comments: VPs present their area information; concern to see what recommendations are applied to areas for reassessment when PBC not able to provide the recommendations; discussed not only the requests but processes as well; time spent in spring and summer to cover all four VP area prioritized requests. Committee needs to focus on prioritized plans selected through the process, not on challenging why some plans did or did not make it through the process.

3. 10 strongly agreed or /agreed and 1 disagreed that PBC continues the five-year cycle of master planning. Comment: a little behind as it has been six years. Committee looked at long range budget projections last fall.

4. 11 strongly agreed or agreed that PBC reviews and discusses annual preliminary, tentative, and final budget proposals and assumptions. Comments: frequency of meetings increased to accommodate budget process including annual presentation by the President; this is a walk through; historically the committee's strong suit.

5. 11 strongly agreed or agreed that PBC reviews and discusses College revenues and expenditures.

6. 9 strongly agreed or agreed and 2 disagreed that PBC reviews and discusses long-range financial forecasting. Comment: not effectively applied for strategic planning and decision making; what little "long-range" is possible.

7. 7 strongly agreed or agreed and 4 disagreed or strongly disagreed that PBC regularly informs the College community of the results of the planning and budgeting process. Comments: PBC minutes are posted on ECC website and regular presentations are made to Academic Senate and Classified staff; uncertain how 'regularly' this is done, except to specific constituent group meetings, maybe more flex presentations as was done this fall; not planning; improved in this area but more work is needed. Statement was made that L. Widman does great job updating Academic Senate. The Board reviews Academic Senate minutes. Flex presentations were offered to faculty. Open forums on planning process and Plan Builder were announced through faculty/staff list serves. ECC open forums are on 10/13 and 10/14 and CEC open forums are on 10/19 and 10/20. Individual divisions requested separate planning workshops. Statement was made that if there is disagreement to this statement, it is due to failure of some PBC members to inform their own constituent groups, whether constituents are interested in information or not. All members have a responsibility of getting the information out to their constituents.

   a. Ideas to better inform the College community was discussed. Send link to approved PBC minutes in an email to the entire community. Comment was made that this would take away responsibilities from PBC members - ask for suggestions for improvement from those who disagreed with evaluation statement. Groups that meet regularly should include PBC as a regular item on their agendas. L. Widman highlights particular items discussed in PBC in addition to providing minutes to Academic Senate. There are no regular faculty union meetings, but information can be posted in their regular publication, "Proof." Highlight PBC information in *ECC Matters* on a monthly/quarterly basis and twice a month for the Dean's Council. A. Spor offered to support student presentation at ASO meetings. Recommend that the Union newspaper create a community interest page where President's annual meeting with PBC can be publicized – A. Spor will mention to Lori Megdigovich. Create annual report for the campus community summarizing planning and budgeting and strategic initiatives. Post hard copies of all meeting minutes on a central community board – this would cost in time and effort and is already available online. ITS is three months away from providing Datatel Mobile Access (MOX), which will keep students informed about news, events and alerts. Email more ideas or bring them up in future meetings.

3

8. 8 strongly agreed or agreed and 3 disagreed or strongly disagreed that PBC periodically reviews and evaluates the effectiveness of PBC communications to the College community. Comments: other than putting the information on the Portal there is no other mechanism to update the campus community; long absence of these discussions between 'periods'; new category for PBC so efforts are minimal.
9. 10 strongly agreed or agreed and 1 strongly disagreed that meeting discussions address the responsibilities of the committee. Comments: responsibilities were evaluated and discussed at length in the last few months; A. Spor keeps committee on its tasks.
10. 11 strongly agreed or agreed that they are comfortable speaking and voicing their opinion during meetings. Comments: chair and committee members create atmosphere that encourages free exchange of opinions/information.
11. 10 strongly agreed or agreed and 1 disagreed that meeting discussions contain an appropriate amount of structure and flexibility. Comments: some decisions have already been made for the committee; firm but reasonable hand of Chair is helpful.
12. 11 strongly agreed or agreed that final version of PBC minutes accurately reflects discussions that occurred in previous meetings. Comments: minutes are reviewed by committee in a timely manner and thoroughly discussed.
13. 10 strongly agreed and 1 disagreed that the PBC Chair provides meetings agendas and draft meeting minutes in a timely manner. Comments: sometimes; leaving plenty of time to review and prepare. A statement was made that the one who disagreed may not regularly check email.

The next meeting is scheduled on October 21, 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

4

Academic Technology Committee
4 November 2010
12:30-2 pm
Library 162

1) Approve the minutes of the 4 April 2010 meeting of the ATC

2) Software Budget

   - Procedure: How do we get our needs met?

3) Procedures for Purchasing Technology – Reducing Waste

   - purchasing software that has already been licensed

   - buying computers and other technology without a commitment in the annual budget
     for support technicians and parts

   - buying media equipment with "more" features and capabilities than we need
     or can be utilized

Academic Technology Committee Meeting Minutes
8 April 2010
Communications 306
12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

> The Academic Technology Committee is a sub-committee of the College Technology Committee and the Academic Senate that focuses on the academic technology needs of the college.

Jim Noyes √	Dick Barton √	Stephanie Rodriguez
Virginia Rapp √	Steve Cocca	John Ruggirello √
John Wagstaff	Tom Jackson √	Margret Steinberg √
Donald Treat √	Alice Grigsby √	Howard Story
Donna Post √	Dwayne Hayden √	Ralph Taylor √
Pete Marcoux √	Noreth Men √	Francine Vasilomanolakis √
	Dave Murphy √	Michael Wynne √

(A √ indicates that the committee member was present.)

In the past, the Academic Technology Committee (ATC) was a forum in which faculty prioritized academic technology and directed the use of funds towards these priorities. Now, the ATC plays a purely advisory role, and merely tries to get attention for issues like:

- There is no regular budget item to purchase and maintain academic software (the software needed to teach courses: no software, no course).

- El Camino College (ECC) does not have enough staff to maintain the technology that we have.

- Faculty laptops are out-of-warranty and there are no replacement parts to repair them, yet faculty are required to do more and more work on their computers (e.g., active enrollment, grades, committee communication).

Software:

Currently Information and Technology Services (ITS) is using money allocated for hardware to pay for the software necessary to teach courses at El Camino College (ECC). Divisions should report their software needs to ITS, and ITS will attempt to find the funds needed to buy the software or maintain the license. It was noted that the lack of a software budget is effectively degrading hardware on campus.

ITS tries to consolidate all software requests so that it can search for the best price for each piece of software (e.g., purchase vs. annual renewal), and estimate how much money needs to be budgeted for software each year. Divisions often buy software using their own money, and there are times when ITS could have found a better deal (e.g., through the foundation or by combining their purchase with software purchased for another division). In addition, grants can often be used to purchase software, but cannot be used to maintain an annual license. So, divisions may buy software, but later need money from ITS to maintain it. By buying the software, they effectively increase the amount ITS needs to request for and spend on software, but typically ITS is not informed until after the software has been purchased.

It would greatly help ITS if all renewals of annual licenses could be done at one time each year. Because there are so many different due dates, the staff of ITS worry that they will miss a due date, making it impossible for instructors to teach a course and/or resulting in higher costs for ECC.

Currently, ITS is analyzing software needs at ECC. ATC members requested that ITS send their list of software to the deans and committee members so that they could review and comment on the list to make sure that it is complete and that no unnecessary software is purchased.

Purchasing Procedures:

In general, lots of technology is bought by ECC, but we do not maintain it, which is inefficient and wasteful. Part of the problem is that funding for innovative teaching technology is available and ECC takes advantage of this funding, but ECC does not add maintenance and replacement costs to the technology budget when the new technology is purchased.

For example, more and more "smart" classrooms are being built on campus. These classrooms contain LCD projectors, computers, DVD players, control consoles, and more. Since they have been purchased, the LCD projectors have not received any maintenance, which presumably reduces the lifespan of this expensive classroom technology and makes it more likely that they will break down, disrupting instruction. Worse yet, since many were purchased at the same time, there could be a flood of broken projectors requiring a large amount of money to fix or replace them in a short period of time. Essentially, we are saving money now, but sooner or later there will be a huge bill to pay – or our "smart" classrooms will become "dumb" classrooms once more.

Until we can afford to maintain and regularly replace the technology that we already have on campus, we should be cautious about bringing new technology to ECC. We must either increase staffing to maintain the technology we have or purchase maintenance contracts with outside vendors. So that the TRUE cost of technology will begin to be brought into the budgeting and planning process:

*The ATC recommends that a maintenance contract of <u>4 or more years</u> **be required** for the purchase of ALL instructional technology (e.g., projectors, consoles, DVD players, and so on).*

Faculty Computer Needs:

In the past, ITS has had a few faculty "test drive" laptops before purchasing them for all faculty. Members of the ATC would like to formalize the process. *The ATC requests that when testing laptops or other faculty computers, ITS asks the ATC to provide faculty volunteers to "test drive" the computers.* The ATC would like to receive reports from the faculty volunteers and use them to make recommendations to ITS.

Members of the ATC were open to a variety of ideas for improving computer resources available to faculty and to reducing the costs of these resources. For example, some instructors (e.g., computer science, math) need far more powerful computers and software to teach their courses

than other instructors who use their computers mainly to access the internet and for word processing. The ATC favors the idea that 2 kinds of new faculty computers be purchased: computers for "power users" and computers for "regular" users. This would be far more efficient and less expensive than providing uniform laptops to all instructors, in which case the "power users" would struggle to do their jobs (if they could at all) and the other instructors would not use their machines to their full potential (money spent on a more powerful laptop for them would be wasted).

The members of the ATC were open to the idea of providing desktops – or better yet, the virtual desktops discussed by ITS. Most classrooms now have computers in the classroom, and most faculty use flash drives and the classroom computer instead of carrying their heavy – and valuable – laptop to their classes and then setting their laptop up and taking them apart multiple times each day . Desktop machines are, of course, cheaper than laptops, and also last longer: the faculty laptops brought to classes get a lot of wear-and-tear as they are opened and closed again and again each day and as cables are plugged in and removed again and again. Of course, the cost of providing ergonomically-appropriate desks would add to the costs of providing desktop computers or virtual desktops instead of laptops, but even with these additional costs, desktops are no more expensive (or less expensive) than laptops. Moreover, when the computers need to be replaced in the future, the furniture will not need to replaced, making the next round of computer purchases far cheaper.

Submitted by Jim Noyes

Winter Session Resolution

Whereas, the El Camino College mission statement asserts that "El Camino College offers quality, comprehensive education programs and services to ensure the educational success of students from our diverse community," and the ECC Statement of Values similarly asserts that "Our highest value is placed on our students and their education goals;" and

Whereas, student success and retention rates are routinely higher in winter than in either fall, spring or summer sessions; and

Whereas, winter session provides additional opportunities for students who are transferring in the upcoming fall semester to complete required coursework, and summer courses cannot be used for same year fall transfer; and

Whereas, optimal teaching and learning conditions appear to be supported by the continuation of the winter session; and

Whereas, on October 24, 2010, the Compton Educational Center Faculty Council voted to recommend maintaining winter session indefinitely; and

Whereas, the conditions that led to the creation of a winter session in the first place still hold today (namely, that we not lose motivated students to neighboring community colleges):

It is Resolved that the El Camino College Academic Senate, the El Camino College Federation of Teachers, and the Associated Students Organization support the ECC mission and value statements by joining the Compton Educational Center Faculty Council in strongly recommending that winter session be preserved for the benefit of ECC students, until such time that indisputable evidence of the academic effects of a calendar change warrants reconsideration.

AP 4026 Philosophy and Criteria for International Education

Reference:
Education Code 66015.7

Note: This procedure is optional: AB 1342 amended Education Code to encourage districts to engage in international education as resources permit. Local practice may be inserted.

International education should encourage programs that support learning about other cultures, global issues, and the exchange of Californians and international students and scholars, such as:

- Develop courses of study in as many fields as possible to increase students' understanding of global issues and cultural differences.

- Offer courses in languages other than English to train students to communicate effectively in other cultures and to enhance their understanding of other nations' values.

- Provide opportunities for students in all majors to participate in study abroad programs to enrich their academic training, perspectives, and personal development.

- Provide opportunities for domestic and international students to interact effectively and routinely share their views, perceptions, and experiences in educational settings.

- Develop innovative public educational forums and venues to explore global issues and showcase world cultures.

For international students and scholars,

- Encourage the presence of qualified students from other countries with sufficient geographic diversity to inspire an appreciation for differences among cultures and a deeper understanding of the values and perspectives of other people.

- Facilitate faculty exchange and collaborative partnership programs with institutions in other countries.

- Initiate collaborative research undertakings to address issues of global significance.

- Recruit and retain the world's best and brightest faculty to educate California's students as globally competent citizens.

New 02/03

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
1102 Q STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811-6549
(916) 445-8752
http://www.cccco.edu

October 29, 2010   **Fiscal Services Memo 10-09**
                                                        Via E-mail Only

TO: Chief Executive Officers
               Chief Human Resources Officers
               Chief Business Officers
               Chief Instructional Officers

FROM: Frederick E. Harris, Assistant Vice Chancellor
               College Finance and Facilities Planning

SUBJECT: Fall 2010 Full-Time Faculty Obligation Compliance

Please find enclosed information to assist your district to comply with the full-time faculty obligation requirements contained in California Code of Regulations (CCR) title 5 section 51025. This regulation requires districts to increase the number of full-time faculty over the prior year in proportion to the amount of growth in funded credit FTES.

The attached table "**Full-Time Faculty Obligation**" shows by district the final full-time faculty obligation (FON) for Fall 2008, Fall 2009 and Fall 2010; and the Fall 2011 Projected FON based on the recent Advance Apportionment. Also attached are copies of the form "**Full-Time Faculty Obligation Compliance for Fall 2010"** for each district to report how it complied with its Fall 2010 FON, the CCR title 5 regulation on FON, an explanation of the FON basic principles contained in the table, and each district's FON calculation worksheet.

In a normal year the FON is the lower of the Advance and Second Principal Apportionment calculations. However at its November 2, 2009 meeting the Board of Governors (BOG) determined there were inadequate funds to implement an increase in the Fall 2010 FON, similar to what was determined for the Fall 2009 FON. As provided in the regulation, in such years   "… the district's base full-time faculty obligation shall be unchanged. However, for the fall term of the succeeding fiscal year the district may choose, in lieu of maintaining its base obligation, to maintain, at a minimum, the full-time faculty percentage attained in the prior fall term."

That means that the final Fall 2009 FON and the final Fall 2010 FON will remain unchanged **unless** the district experienced a sufficient decline in funded credit FTES to cause a reduction in the FON. Districts may experience a decline in their FON due to a variety of factors, including the effects of the workload reduction contained in the 2009 Budget Act. Determination whether the 2010 Budget Act provided adequate funds for a Fall 2011 FON increase will be made by the BOG at its November 8-9, 2010 meeting.

Please return the completed form "**Full-Time Faculty Obligation Compliance for Fall 2010"** to us on or before **Tuesday, November 30, 2010**. If you have any questions, please contact Michael Yarber at 916-327-6818 or myarber@cccco.edu.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
FULL-TIME FACULTY OBLIGATION
10/29/2010

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	Fall 2008		Fall 2009			Fall 2010			Fall 2009	Fall 2011
	Compliance		Calculated	Calculated	Compliance	Calculated	Calculated	Compliance		Projected
District	FINAL	Recal (1/09)	Advance	P-2	FINAL	Advance	P-2	FINAL	or FT Fac %	
Allan Hancock	136.4	141.4	139.4	141.4	136.4	135.4	139.4	135.4 ↓	59.20%	135.4
Antelope Valley	*	158.6	163.6	162.6	153.6	156.6	160.6	153.6	52.69%	153.6
Barstow	27.5	31.5	31.5	31.5	27.5	29.5	31.5	27.5	44.40%	27.5
Butte	164.4	165.4	171.4	182.4	164.4	175.4	197.4	164.4	54.75%	164.4
Cabrillo	205.6	212.6	211.6	212.6	205.6	205.6	206.6	205.6	64.25%	205.6
Cerritos	287.2	296.2	294.2	298.2	287.2	287.2	290.2	287.2	68.49%	287.2
Chabot-Las Positas	299.0	314.0	306.0	302.0	299.0	291.0	286.0	286.0 ↓	56.30%	286.0
Chaffey	200.8	216.8	223.8	221.8	200.8	212.8	219.8	200.8	48.89%	200.8
Citrus	174.3	188.3	185.3	188.3	174.3	181.3	187.3	174.3	69.70%	174.3
Coast	412.4	461.4	462.4	460.4	412.4	443.4	443.4	412.4	61.91%	412.4
Compton	22.4	22.4	23.4	24.4	22.4	23.4	29.4	22.4	55.40%	22.4
Contra Costa	354.7	388.7	387.7	354.7	354.7	342.7	339.7	339.7 ↓	52.80%	339.7
Copper Mountain	14.6	14.6	15.6	15.6	14.6	14.6	15.6	11.3 ↓	75.00%	11.3
Desert	102.2	103.2	107.2	106.2	102.2	102.2	106.2	102.2	48.38%	102.2
El Camino	339.2	352.2	352.2	352.2	339.2	338.2	339.2	338.2 ↓	63.15%	338.2
Feather River	22.1	23.1	24.1	24.1	22.1	22.1	23.1	22.1	50.64%	22.1
Foothill-DeAnza	516.0	527.0	520.0	521.0	516.0	502.0	500.0	500.0 ↓	62.02%	500.0
Gavilan	*	78.1	79.1	78.1	72.1	75.1	75.1	72.1	49.62%	72.1
Glendale	*	251.0	250.0	248.0	230.0	240.0	236.0	230.0	64.99%	230.0
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	280.7	292.7	295.7	295.7	280.7	284.7	290.7	280.7	49.45%	280.7
Hartnell	96.9	104.9	105.9	110.9	96.9	105.9	111.9	96.9	57.10%	96.9
Imperial	*	103.3	108.3	108.3	102.3	104.3	109.3	102.3	65.79%	102.3
Kern	372.8	395.8	412.8	410.8	372.8	394.8	410.8	372.8	67.43%	372.8
Lake Tahoe	22.2	23.2	24.2	24.2	22.2	22.2	25.2	22.2	48.12%	22.2
Lassen	21.9	19.9	24.9	22.9	21.9	20.9	29.9	20.9 ↓	59.68%	20.9
Long Beach	325.6	366.6	366.6	362.6	325.6	349.6	353.6	325.6	62.85%	325.6
Los Angeles	1461.1	1617.1	1609.1	1616.1	1461.1	1558.1	1566.1	1461.1	59.87%	1461.1
Los Rios	*	988.2	999.2	992.2	955.2	957.2	968.2	955.2	69.70%	955.2
Marin	73.9	75.9	77.9	77.9	73.9	77.9	90.9	73.9	56.65%	73.9
Mendocino-Lake	46.0	46.0	48.0	49.0	46.0	46.0	50.0	46.0	42.68%	46.0
Merced	174.6	177.6	184.6	184.6	174.6	177.6	185.6	174.6	72.37%	174.6
Mira Costa	*	116.1	119.1	126.1	108.1	126.1	151.1	108.1	51.80%	108.1
Monterey Peninsula	109.9	116.9	119.9	123.9	109.9	118.9	138.9	109.9	55.06%	109.9
Mt. San Antonio	*	407.9	411.9	418.9	403.9	404.9	424.9	403.9	59.87%	403.9
Mt. San Jacinto	*	133.8	139.8	138.8	132.8	132.8	137.8	132.8	38.63%	132.8
Napa Valley	98.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	98.7	95.7	98.7	95.7 ↓	64.42%	95.7
North Orange	536.8	547.8	550.8	548.8	536.8	529.8	572.8	529.8 ↓	66.53%	529.8
Ohlone	123.2	125.2	124.2	124.2	123.2	119.2	119.2	119.2 ↓	60.33%	119.2

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
FULL-TIME FACULTY OBLIGATION
10/29/2010

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		I	J
	Fall 2008		**Fall 2009**			**Fall 2010**				**Fall 2009**	**Fall 2011**
	Compliance		Calculated	Calculated	Compliance	Calculated	Calculated	Compliance			Projected
District	FINAL	Recal (1/09)	Advance	P-2	FINAL	Advance	P-2	FINAL	or	FT Fac %	
Palo Verde	25.0	25.0	27.0	26.0	25.0	24.0	24.0	24.0	↓	54.10%	24.0
Palomar	285.8	289.8	296.8	297.8	285.8	286.8	294.8	285.8		54.21%	285.8
Pasadena Area	*	412.2	411.2	409.2	408.2	395.2	394.2	394.2	↓	69.40%	394.2
Peralta	*	345.2	351.2	350.2	341.2	336.2	341.2	336.2	↓	55.89%	336.2
Rancho Santiago	332.8	341.8	339.8	342.8	332.8	331.8	353.8	331.8	↓	63.30%	331.8
Redwoods	82.1	86.1	87.1	92.1	82.1	88.1	95.1	82.1		42.74%	82.1
Rio Hondo	209.6	224.6	221.6	225.6	209.6	217.6	216.6	209.6		71.06%	209.6
Riverside	336.0	376.0	378.0	376.0	336.0	362.0	363.0	336.0		50.09%	336.0
San Bernardino	213.8	226.8	217.8	226.8	213.8	217.8	217.8	213.8		54.99%	213.8
San Diego	504.8	509.8	515.8	512.8	504.8	494.8	509.8	494.8	↓	53.49%	494.8
San Francisco	483.8	554.8	555.8	549.8	483.8	530.8	507.8	483.8		69.14%	483.8
San Joaquin Delta	*	228.8	234.8	232.8	228.8	223.8	230.8	223.8	↓	60.44%	223.8
San Jose-Evergreen	237.0	240.0	243.0	243.0	237.0	234.0	237.0	234.0	↓	58.49%	234.0
San Luis Obispo	146.4	151.4	151.4	151.4	146.4	145.4	145.4	145.4	↓	51.90%	145.4
San Mateo	338.8	359.8	376.8	422.8	338.8	406.8	477.8	338.8		61.28%	338.8
Santa Barbara	*	248.4	252.4	249.4	246.4	240.4	245.4	240.4	↓	57.13%	240.4
Santa Clarita	*	186.8	203.8	198.8	182.8	190.8	203.8	182.8		58.89%	182.8
Santa Monica	237.4	240.4	252.4	282.4	237.4	271.4	319.4	237.4		48.08%	237.4
Sequoias	169.2	178.2	177.2	192.2	169.2	184.2	200.2	169.2		63.95%	169.2
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	122.1	129.1	129.1	133.1	122.1	128.1	132.1	122.1		59.94%	122.1
Sierra	209.6	213.6	220.6	220.6	209.6	212.6	217.6	209.6		46.44%	209.6
Siskiyou Joint	40.4	41.4	41.4	43.4	40.4	41.4	44.4	40.4		50.42%	40.4
Solano	166.6	170.6	169.6	174.6	166.6	167.6	171.6	166.6		54.33%	166.6
Sonoma County	302.5	309.5	309.5	314.5	302.5	303.5	310.5	302.5		53.55%	302.5
South Orange County	305.8	342.8	340.8	363.8	305.8	363.8	400.8	305.8		53.27%	305.8
Southwestern	255.3	264.3	266.3	266.3	255.3	256.3	262.3	255.3		52.80%	255.3
State Center	495.5	500.5	514.5	512.5	495.5	493.5	509.5	495.5		57.15%	495.5
Ventura County	*	420.2	423.2	421.2	396.2	405.2	407.2	396.2		55.88%	396.2
Victor Valley	123.1	123.1	131.1	128.1	123.1	123.1	130.1	123.1		41.37%	123.1
West Hills	*	98.5	102.5	99.5	99.5	94.5	97.5	94.5	↓	63.66%	94.5
West Kern	*	56.6	57.6	60.6	52.6	56.6	60.6	52.6		67.50%	52.6
West Valley-Mission	*	315.1	341.1	340.1	323.1	327.1	362.1	323.1		66.87%	323.1
Yosemite	293.0	307.0	299.0	308.0	293.0	296.0	299.0	293.0		65.35%	293.0
Yuba	94.4	105.4	105.4	106.4	94.4	101.4	103.4	94.4		60.30%	94.4
Total	13,033.9	18,328.7	18,516.7	18,635.7	17,470.7	17,957.7	18,548.7	17,355.4		57.75%	17,355.40

*   **We made an error in the Final Fall 2008 compliance obligation for these districts, which was corrected in their Final Fall 2009 compliance obligation.**

Full-Time Faculty Obligation
Basic Principles

Lower of the 2. In <u>adequately funded years</u> as determined by the Board of Governors (BOG), the base full-time faculty obligation (FON) for <u>the Fall term of the following fiscal year</u> is "*increased by the lower of the projected fundable credit growth at the time of the budget enactment*" at the <u>Advance Apportionment</u>, **OR** "the *actual percentage change in funded credit FTES*" at the <u>P2 Apportionment</u>.   The FON is then "*adjusted to the actual percentage change in funded credit FTES*" at the time of the <u>Recalculation Apportionment</u>, which then forms the basis for the calculation of the subsequent year's P2 Apportionment FON. *{CCR title 5 section 51025(c) (1)}*

"Frozen" FON. When the BOG determines that <u>inadequate funds</u> were provided in the annual budget for the purpose of increasing the FON, instead of using the "Lower of the 2" to calculate the FON that "*obligation shall be unchanged*" from the prior year. The BOG determined inadequate funding for 2008-09 and 2009-10, which froze the Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 FONs.   In the enclosed table, the "frozen" FON is illustrated when you compare <u>Columns A, E and H</u>. For most districts their Final FON remained the same in each of those 3 years beginning with the Fall 2008 FON, which was calculated from the last adequately funded fiscal year (2007-08). *{CCR title 5 section 51025(c) (7)}*

Reductions to "Frozen" FON.   However, if a district experiences "*a reduction in its base credit FTES*", its FON shall be proportionally reduced. That means that even in a "frozen" FON year, a district's FON could fall below its frozen level if it has sufficient reductions in its credit funded FTES. *{CCR title 5 section 51025(g)}*

Workload Reduction. All districts experienced a <u>workload reduction</u> in 2009-10 which may have impacted their Fall 2010 FON. This workload reduction is one of many possible "negative growth factors". In general the impact of that workload reduction can be seen in the calculations from one year to the next by comparing the drop in a district's calculated FON from <u>Columns C&D</u> to <u>Columns F&G</u>. However as shown in <u>Column H</u>, those few districts with a down arrow (↓) had sufficient "negative growth factors" including the workload reduction in their credit funded FTES to warrant a reduction in their "frozen" FON.

Alternative Compliance.   In an inadequately funded year, if a district is unable to meet its FON it has the choice to instead meet its "*full-time faculty percentage attained in the prior fall term.*" For the purposes of the Fall 2010 FON compliance, a district can choose to comply with either the amounts in <u>Columns H or I</u> in the enclosed table. This Alternative Compliance is <u>only</u> allowed in inadequately funded years. *{CCR title 5 section 51025(c) (7)}*

Effects of Next Adequately Funded Year. Since there is no compliance alternative **AND** no "frozen FON" in adequately funded years, districts need to be aware that their FON could increase in the next adequately funded year after the "frozen" FON year. At this time we can only estimate the extent of that impact by comparing the lower FON in either <u>Column B</u> (the last adequately funded years "actual" FON at Recal) **OR** in <u>Column G</u> (the most recent actual FON at P2) **TO** <u>Column J</u>. That difference in addition to any current year funded growth should approximate the amount of additional full-time faculty your district would be required to employ in order to comply with a Fall 2011 FON **IF** adequate funding is determined by the BOG for 2010-11.

Basic Principles Applied.   The BOG determined 2007-08 as the last <u>adequately</u> funded fiscal year for purposes of the Fall 2008 FON calculation. The fiscal years for the Fall 2009 FON (2008-09) and Fall 2010 FON (2009-10) were determined by the BOG to be <u>inadequately</u> funded years. Therefore the FONs for Fall 2009 and for Fall 2010 were "frozen" at the Fall 2008 FON "last adequately funded year" level. However due to the impacts of workload reductions and other locally experienced "negative growth factors", some districts experienced a reduction to their "frozen" FON as indicated in <u>Column H</u>.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
2008-2009 2009-2010 FULL-TIME FACULTY OBLIGATION

DISTRICT: Compton

	FALL 2009 FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009				FALL 2010 FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010				
	ADVANCE BUDGET WORKSHOP	P1 MAR. 2009	P2 JUN. 2009	RECAL JAN. 2010	ADVANCE BUDGET WORKSHOP	P1 MAR. 2010	P2 JUN. 2010	RECAL JAN. 2011	2011 ADVANCE BUDGET WORKSHOP
Credit Base FTES	4,439.39	4,439.39	4,439.39	4,439.39	4,917.15	4,929.95	4,929.95	0.00	5,533.48
Funded Credit FTES	4,792.15	4,483.78	4,917.15	4,929.95	4,727.61	5,526.67	5,533.48	0.00	5,643.05
Deficit Factor	1.0000	0.9870	0.9852	0.9881	1.0000	1.0000	0.9989	0.0000	1.0000
Adjust Credit Funded FTES	4,792.15	4,425.46	4,844.15	4,871.29	4,727.61	5,526.67	5,527.21	0.00	5,643.05
Growth/Decline in FTES	352.76	-13.93	404.76	431.90	-189.54	596.72	597.26	0.00	109.57
Overcap Adjustment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Growth/Adjustment	352.76	-13.93	404.76	431.90	-189.54	596.72	597.26	0.00	109.57
% Change in FTES	7.9461%	-0.3139%	9.1175%	9.7288%	-3.8547%	12.104%	12.115%	0%	1.9801%
Base FON	22.40	22.40	22.40	24.40	24.40	26.40	26.40	0.00	29.40
Growth Pys	1.78	-0.07	2.04	2.37	-0.94	3.20	3.20	0.00	0.58
Rounded Growth Pys	1.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	-1.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00
FON	23.40	22.40	24.40	26.40	23.40	29.40	29.40	0.00	29.40

November Report	Nov. 2008	Nov. 2009
Full-time Faculty	84.00	79.00
Part-time Faculty	43.12	63.60
Total Faculty	127.12	142.60
Faculty Percent	66.08%	55.4%
75% Total Faculty	95.34	106.95

Report produced on 10/29/2010 at 10:05:33AM

DISTRICT: El Camino

	FALL 2009 FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009				FALL 2010 FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010				
	ADVANCE BUDGET WORKSHOP	P1 MAR. 2009	P2 JUN. 2009	RECAL JAN. 2010	ADVANCE BUDGET WORKSHOP	P1 MAR. 2010	P2 JUN. 2010	RECAL JAN. 2011	2011 ADVANCE BUDGET WORKSHOP
Credit Base FTES	19,299.15	19,305.00	19,305.00	19,305.00	19,645.90	19,624.89	19,624.89	0.00	18,917.29
Funded Credit FTES	19,544.74	19,803.63	19,645.90	19,624.89	18,906.68	18,910.51	18,909.35	0.00	19,341.74
Deficit Factor	1.0000	0.9870	0.9852	0.9881	1.0000	1.0000	0.9989	0.0000	1.0000
Adjust Credit Funded FTES	19,544.74	19,546.03	19,354.24	19,391.38	18,906.68	18,910.51	18,887.94	0.00	19,341.74
Growth/Decline in FTES	245.59	241.03	49.24	86.38	-739.22	-714.38	-736.95	0.00	424.46
Overcap Adjustment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Growth/Adjustment	245.59	241.03	49.24	86.38	-739.22	-714.38	-736.95	0.00	424.46
% Change in FTES	1.2725%	1.2485%	0.2551%	0.4474%	-3.7627%	-3.6402%	-3.7552%	0%	2.2438%
Base FON	348.20	352.20	352.20	352.20	352.20	353.20	353.20	0.00	339.20
Growth Pys	4.43	4.40	0.90	1.58	-13.25	-12.86	-13.26	0.00	7.61
Rounded Growth Pys	4.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	-14.00	-13.00	-14.00	0.00	7.00
FON	352.20	356.20	352.20	353.20	338.20	340.20	339.20	0.00	346.20

November Report	Nov. 2008	Nov. 2009
Full-time Faculty	346.24	342.71
Part-time Faculty	219.05	200.00
Total Faculty	565.29	542.71
Faculty Percent	61.25%	63.15%
75% Total Faculty	423.97	407.03

Report produced on 10/29/2010 at 10:05:33AM