



PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE

September 4, 2014

1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

Library 202

Facilitator: Rory K. Natividad

Notes: Linda M. Olsen

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Planning and Budgeting Committee serves as the consultation committee for campus-wide planning and budgeting. The PBC assures that the planning and budgeting are interlinked and that the process is driven by the mission and strategic initiatives set forth in the Comprehensive Master Plan. The PBC makes recommendations to the President on all planning and budgeting issues and reports all committee activities to the campus community.

Members

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alice Grigsby - Management/Supervisors | <input type="checkbox"/> Dawn Reid - Student & Community Adv. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Saima Fariz – ASO | <input type="checkbox"/> Cheryl Shenefield - Administrative Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ken Key - ECCFT | <input type="checkbox"/> Dean Starkey – Campus Police |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rory K. Natividad - Chair (non-voting) | <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Turner - ECCE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dipte Patel - Academic Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Lance Widman - Academic Senate |

Attendees

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Francisco Arce – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Irene Graff – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Ericka Solarzano - Alt. Police |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Linda Beam – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Jo Ann Higdon – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Claudia Striepe - Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> David Brown – Alt. ECCE | <input type="checkbox"/> Chris Jeffries – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Trevis – Alt. Adm. Serv. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Janice Ely – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Jeanie Nishime – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant – Alt. ECCFT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Connie Fitzsimons - Alt., Ac. Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Emily Rader – Alt. Ac. Sen. | <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant – Alt. ASO |
| <input type="checkbox"/> William Garcia – Alt. SCA | <input type="checkbox"/> Jackie Sims –Alt.Mgmt./Sup. | |

AGENDA

- | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------|
| 1. Draft Minutes Approval – August 28, 2014 | R. Natividad | 1:00 P.M. |
| 2. Budget Review – Part 2 | J. Higdon | 1:10 P.M. |
| 3. PBC Evaluation | R. Natividad | 1:40 P.M. |
| 4. PBC Goals Review and Discussion | R. Natividad | 1:50 P.M. |
| 5. Adjournment | | |

Next meeting – September 18, 2014

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: August 28, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT

Members

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alice Grigsby - Management/Supervisors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dawn Reid - Student & Community Adv. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Saima Fariz – ASO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cheryl Shenefield - Administrative Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Key - ECCFT | <input type="checkbox"/> Dean Starkey – Campus Police |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rory K. Natividad - Chair (non-voting) | <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Turner - ECCE |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dipte Patel - Academic Affairs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lance Widman - Academic Senate |

Other Attendees: Members: David Brown, William Garcia, Irene Graff, Emily Rader **Support** – Francisco Arce, Babs Atane, Linda Beam, Janice Ely, Tom Fallo, Connie Fitzsimons, Jo Ann Higdon, Chris Jeffries, Jeanie Nishime, Claudia Striepe **Guest:** Stephanie Frith, Kate McLaughlin,

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m.

Approval of August 7, 2014 Minutes

1. Page 1, Budget Update, 1b, after \$300,000 **add:** over last year's amount.
2. Page 2, Institutional Planning AP/BP, **delete last sentence.**

Final Budget Presentation– T. Fallo

1. T. Fallo thanked the PBC for the important work they do. The accreditation visit will be between October 6 to 9, 2014 and as of yet there is no set schedule yet. The accreditation site-visitation team will want to visit with the PBC in order to gain a better understanding of our budget and planning. Some specific meetings with certain individuals may be requested by the accreditation site-visitation team. Recent accreditation decisions have identified many colleges demonstrated a lack of linking planning and budgeting.
2. The Governor and legislature passed the state budget on time – before June 30 this year. COLA this year is listed at 0.85% which is almost half of last year's amount. The new budget which was passed is supporting growth but the exact formula for growth is not known at this point. Some colleges do not want as much restoration growth because many districts are having difficulty making cap let alone growth.
3. This year the goal for El Camino College is to make up the 291 FTES plus make up the cap which is alternately 2.75% - 2.8%. Meeting growth is a huge issue throughout the state.
4. One very important item is the state deferrals. During the recession the state loaned the community colleges money which we are still paying back. This year the goal was to reimburse this loan fully but it was not fully reimbursed and therefore we will have to reimburse more money next year. The important thing is to fund a 0.85% growth which is roughly \$42,000,000 to \$46,000,000 statewide. The amount going into deferrals is approximately \$440,000,000.
5. Student Services and Support Programs (SSSP) was provided additional money this year which will allow us to restore and grow slightly in this area. The main emphasis is now degrees, completions, or whatever measure of student success we can imagine. Continuing quality improvement is critical for accreditation and for discussions on what will be important. The big focus the next decade is on measurable output which is usually degrees or completions and events like counseling session.

6. One major change to the budget is fund 15. In the tentative budget last year there were a number of student success programs listed. UC Berkeley, which provides the approval of all Puente programs, has recommended El Camino College take a planning (step-out) year. Staffing issues and the need for mandatory training prior to the start of the year facilitated this required planning year. El Camino will be looking at all the programs traditionally budgeted on fund 15 in regards to their effectiveness. It should be looked at where we have been with these programs and where we will be going in the future. It was clarified the “planning year” is a year planning for the Puente Program but we are not just focusing on just the Puente Program but on all the student success programs that have learning communities or specific purposes. It was noted that the budget for these programs is still being adjusted and is not specifically broken down yet.
7. It was noted other colleges in surrounding districts are growing. Advertising by neighboring colleges is becoming more aggressive in order to attract more students. We formally had agreements in the past to not enter another district’s service area without their consent. These rules have now become vague, so the recruiting environment will be amplified to help meet the growth need that district are having.
8. The transmittal letter to the Board of Trustees was presented to the committee. The State General Apportionment base FTES is projected at 19,162 FTES for 2014/15. The enrollment goal is listed at 19,500 FTES. The reason for the difference between the two figures is we want to get back the 3% plus we want to pay back the previous year.
9. The retiree health benefits fund will be paid off this year. The \$2,400,000 transfer freed up \$800,000 which went towards the salary increases.
10. Foreign student recruitment was discussed and it was noted we are fairly competitive. It was pointed out other colleges have other resources in assisting them with international recruiting of students. We currently are at a total of 750 to 850 international students. Our goal is 1,000 students.
11. It was noted at the October board meeting we may ask for eligibility for Compton. This process of accreditation could take anywhere from four to eight years for Compton. It is thought once eligibility is acquired, we may possibly be able to call Compton a campus instead of a center. The ACJC has a draft of the plan which was favorably received. The goal for Compton is to be a secure district by itself. Eventually Compton will be a college within the El Camino College District which can be transferred to another district.

Adjournment – R. Natividad

1. The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m. The next meeting will be **September 4, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.**, in Library 202.

RKN/lmo

ECC PBC Evaluation 2013

N =16

Membership Status

Response	Frequency	Percent	
PBC Member/Alternate	11	73.33	<div style="width: 73.33%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
Support Staff	4	26.67	<div style="width: 26.67%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>

1. Review and discuss evaluation outcomes of the Accreditation Self-Study, Comprehensive Master Plan, and annual plans.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	2	12.50	<div style="width: 12.50%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
2. Agree	11	68.75	<div style="width: 68.75%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
3. Disagree	3	18.75	<div style="width: 18.75%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>

2. Review and discuss prioritized Area plan requests for funding.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	5	31.25	<div style="width: 31.25%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
2. Agree	9	56.25	<div style="width: 56.25%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
3. Disagree	2	12.50	<div style="width: 12.50%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>

3. Continue the five-year cycle of master planning.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	6	37.50	<div style="width: 37.50%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
2. Agree	8	50.00	<div style="width: 50.00%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
3. Disagree	1	6.25	<div style="width: 6.25%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	1	6.25	<div style="width: 6.25%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>

4. Review and discuss annual Preliminary, Tentative, and Final Budget proposals and assumptions.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	9	56.25	<div style="width: 56.25%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
2. Agree	7	43.75	<div style="width: 43.75%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
3. Disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>

5. Review and discuss College revenues and expenditures.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	9	56.25	<div style="width: 56.25%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
2. Agree	6	37.50	<div style="width: 37.50%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
3. Disagree	1	6.25	<div style="width: 6.25%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>

6. Review and discuss long-range financial forecasting.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	6	37.50	<div style="width: 37.50%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
2. Agree	7	43.75	<div style="width: 43.75%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
3. Disagree	3	18.75	<div style="width: 18.75%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>

7. Provide recommendations to the President regarding College planning and budgeting activities.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	7	43.75	<div style="width: 43.75%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
2. Agree	9	56.25	<div style="width: 56.25%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
3. Disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%; height: 15px; background-color: blue;"></div>

8. Regularly inform the College community of the results of the planning and budgeting process.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	3	18.75	
2. Agree	9	56.25	
3. Disagree	4	25.00	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	

9. Periodically review and evaluate the effectiveness of PBC communications to the College community.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	3	18.75	
2. Agree	10	62.50	
3. Disagree	3	18.75	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	

10. Meeting discussions address the responsibilities of the committee.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	6	37.50	
2. Agree	10	62.50	
3. Disagree	0	0.00	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	

11. You are comfortable speaking and voicing your opinion during the meetings.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	7	43.75	
2. Agree	9	56.25	
3. Disagree	0	0.00	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	

12. The meeting discussions contain an appropriate amount of structure and flexibility.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	6	37.50	
2. Agree	10	62.50	
3. Disagree	0	0.00	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	

13. The final version of the PBC minutes accurately reflects the discussions that occurred in previous meetings.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	9	56.25	
2. Agree	7	43.75	
3. Disagree	0	0.00	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	

14. The PBC Chair provides meeting agendas and draft meeting minutes in a timely manner.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	10	62.50	
2. Agree	6	37.50	
3. Disagree	0	0.00	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	

Written Responses

Question: Q1 Comment:

Response

Could do more in this area.

A long-time shortcoming, still going on, re: Master Plan and annual plans.

Agree for annual plans and to some extent the accreditation self study. The CMP doesn't have outcomes per se.

Question: Q2 Comment:

Response

We don't really discuss this at PBC meetings but should be discussing them prior to final decisions being made.

The Area plan requests are not thoroughly discussed; the PBC should have more complete presentations from each division.

Question: Q3 Comment:

Response

Aside from budget forecasting, I don't think we engage with this.

Question: 4 Comment:

Response

The PBC needs more updates from Administrative Services on all of the above.

More time should be devoted to the Preliminary phase of budget preparation.

seems to be the major focus of PBC

Question: Q6 Comment:

Response

We don't do this as much as we should.

While we do this, we are so limited in our ability to project. This is partly due to the vagaries of the economy and state funding, but also because the College does little long-range planning (aside from construction). If there's little that is substantive to review, there's little to discuss.

Question: Q7 Comment:

Response

We don't often send recommendations to the President.

with budget, planning recommendations are less structured

Question: Q8 Comment:

Response

Very few outside of PBC know what we discuss, what decisions we make, etc.

We can always do a better job at communicating the planning and budget process.

I agree that we do this, but mainly through reports to committees and various decision-making bodies such as Academic Senate and the Board. We're still not effectively communicating to students, staff and faculty.

Really depends on how well the constituent members inform their constituencies.

Some members are lax in sharing/disseminating the information they receive and discussions conducted.

Question: Q9 Comment:

Response

Don't recall evaluating the effectiveness of our communications.

Question: Q10 Comment:

Response

It would be good to remind the committee of its advisory role, opportunities for input, and need for collegial dialogue.

Very much so, except for the Master Plan.

Question: Q11 Comment:

Response

It depends who is in the room or the topic of conversation.

Some members seem to forget their role as a constituent representative and contributor. It's unfortunate that a few comments are blatantly self-serving.

I greatly appreciate the collegial character of the PBC.

The chair is very good at encouraging everyone to give their input.

Question: Q13 Comment:

Response

The minutes are usually pretty accurate.

Because the chairperson always opens the meetings with review of the minutes from the previous meeting, we do an excellent job of changing anything that is not completely clear or accurate. Our minutes are also very detailed, so they faithfully report on our discussions.

Minutes are sufficiently detailed.

Minutes are concise and to the point. Good job.

Question: Q14 Comment:

Response

Getting better. But please keep in mind that faculty (and probably some other committee members) are not at their desks for long periods of time, every day. This means that materials that are sent out 2 days ahead of time are often early enough for review--especially the minutes of previous meetings. I sometimes wonder whether the minutes could be emailed earlier, even if the agenda and other materials are not yet ready.

Very consistent. I like how they are structured.

Rory is doing nicely

Goals 2013-14

- Professional Development Day presentation – Spring 2014
 - Providing information about the PBC year and budget information
- New member orientation involved chair and existing constituent member
- Brief constituent member updates at start of PBC meetings
- Review the process for recommendations and consensus
- Develop PBC website to improve communication amongst members and the college community
- Comprehensive master plan update and comments