



PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE

October 29, 2015

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 Strategic Plan. The PBC makes recommendations to the President on all planning and budgeting issues and reports committee activities to campus constituencies.

SI – C – Collaboration

Advance an effective process of collaboration and collegial consultation conducted with integrity and respect to inform and strengthen decision-making.

Members

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant – ECCE | <input type="checkbox"/> William Garcia - Student & Community Adv. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Connie Fitzsimons - Academic Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Cheryl Shenefield - Administrative Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jackie Sims- Management/Supervisors | <input type="checkbox"/> Dean Starkey – Campus Police |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ken Key - ECCFT | <input type="checkbox"/> Nicole Mardesich – ASO, Student Rep. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rory K. Natividad - Chair (non-voting) | <input type="checkbox"/> Lance Widman - Academic Senate |

Alternate Members / Support

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Linda Beam – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Chris Jeffries – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Claudia Striepe - Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Janice Ely – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Jeanie Nishime – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Trevis – Alt. Adm. Serv. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amy Grant - Alt., Ac. Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Emily Rader – Alt. Ac. Sen. | <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Turner - ECCE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Andrea Sala – Alt. SCA | <input type="checkbox"/> Jean Shankweiler – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant – Alt. ECCFT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Irene Graff – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant –Alt.Mgmt./Sup. | <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant – Alt. ASO |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jo Ann Higdon – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Ericka Solarzano - Alt. Police | |

AGENDA

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Draft Minutes Approval – October 1, 2015 | R. Natividad | 1:00 P.M. |
| 2. College Planning Process – Employee Feedback Survey 2011 / 2015 | | |
| | J. Nishime | 1:10 P.M. |
| 3. Strategic Initiative C – Collaboration | J. Nishime | 1:25 P.M. |
| 4. PBC Evaluation | R. Natividad | 1:35 P.M. |
| 5. Bond Sales | J. Higdon | 1:45 P.M. |
| 6. Annual Planning Update | I. Graff | 2:00 P.M. |
| 7. Faculty Hiring | J. Shankweiler/Natividad | 2:15 P.M. |

Next meeting – November 5, 2015

Committee Funds and Financial Terms Glossary

General Unrestricted	Fund 11
General Restricted	Fund 12
Compton Center Related Activities	Fund 14
Special Programs Compton Center Partnership	Fund 15
Student Financial Aid	Fund 74
Workers Comp.	Fund 61
Capital Outlay Projects	Fund 41
General Obligation Bond	Fund 42
Property & Liability Self-Insurance	Fund 62
Dental Self-Insurance	Fund 63
Post-Employment Benefits Irrevocable Trust	Fund 69
Bookstore	Fund 51

- WSCH = Weekly Student Contact Hours
- BOGFW = Board of Governors Fee Waiver
- FTES = Full Time Equivalent Students
- FTEF = Full Time Equivalent Faculty
- COLA = Cost of Living Adjustment
- OPEB = Other Post-Employment Benefits
- FON = Faculty Obligation Number

* A complete list is available in the annual final budget book.

**Planning and Budgeting Committee
2015 Goals**

1. Conduct a college wide evaluation of the planning and budgeting process. [last conducted in Spring 2011]
 - a. Measure: Evaluation, discussion and action plan completed.
2. Review and endorse the Comprehensive Master Plan and sub plans to ensure that they are:
 - a. Supportive of the Mission and Strategic Plan,
 - b. Integrated with other college planning and budgeting,
 - c. Implementable, and
 - d. Achievable.
3. Evaluate progress on the Strategic Plan including Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes and Strategic Initiative Objectives.
4. Develop an informational packet to orient new members
5. Work to develop a common template for various constituent groups use on the website.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: October 1, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant - ECCE | <input type="checkbox"/> William Garcia– Student & Comm Adv. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Connie Fitzsimons – Academic Affairs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cheryl Shenefield–Administrative Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jackie Sims -Management/Supervisors | <input type="checkbox"/> Dean Starkey – Campus Police |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Key - ECCFT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nicole Mardesich – ASO, Student Rep. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rory K. Natividad – Chair (non-voting) | <input type="checkbox"/> Lance Widman - Academic Senate |

Other Attendees: Members: E. Rader, **Support:** I. Graff, J. Nishime, J. Shankweiler

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

A quorum was not present at the beginning of the meeting. Another member showed up and the minutes were approved at the end of the meeting.

PBC Evaluation– R. Natividad (Handout)

1. The committee reviewed a copy of the 2015 PBC evaluation. The committee asked if there were any changes they wanted to make. There was discussion about future changes and ways to address any areas of lacking information
2. A concern was expressed that since the committee does everything well; weakness may not show up as easily, specifically from the written comments section where issues are usually accentuated. It was suggested when feedback is received from the comment section of the survey on specific topics or areas of emphasis, the committee can discuss these items and devise a plan on how to address these matters. It was noted question 14 on the survey would be a good place to collect this information as it specifically deals with comments. It was noted this process would be a great way to acquire some goals and see what tasks are important to the various groups.
3. It was mentioned the evaluation used by PBC was noted as one of the best evaluations of all the collegial consultation committees and has been used as a model for these committees to utilize. A suggestion was made to add goals to the survey in order to see if we have accomplished stated goals at the end of the year.
4. A correction was noted on the PBC evaluation under A. Planning, (1). The term Accreditation Self-Study was changed to Accreditation Self-Evaluation. It was also agreed that the three areas on question 1 (Accreditation Self-Evaluation, Comprehensive Master Plan and annual plans) be broken out to receive individual feedback on each one.
5. A concern was expressed that we may not receive enough survey results from a good cross section of all the committee members on PBC. It was noted next time it will be stressed that all committee members take part in the survey as it is valuable information. The hope is to obtain over 20 results including those who represent members and support.
6. A committee member expressed the desire to make sure the chair and the committee facilitates presentations from the various constituencies and campus committees; such as, enrollment management, the Master Plan, etc. The committee member opened a discussion with regards to the

role of a committee chair and what are the chair's duties. It was mentioned if there was a particular item the committee wanted a follow-up on, the members have a duty and obligation to request that of the chair. The chair in turn needs to determine if the request meets the purview of the committee or the purpose statement. Various members provided dialogue in response to the goals and responsibilities of a chair. It was mentioned when it comes to evaluating the chairperson, there are areas on the survey which address specifics on what the chair does, but it is felt there could be other areas targeted which would be beneficial to evaluate. It was noted the chair communicates on a regular basis with the vice presidents on upcoming issues or items the committee should be notified of or involved in. He also reaches out to other areas on campus for further agenda topics. It was also expressed that the collaborative effort of making the activity calendar has been a positive step in keeping the committee informed of areas of interest which are up and coming.

7. In an effort to guide the presentations throughout the year and maintain a consistent approach that the committee has developed the Annual Activities Calendar. This document will provide all members and the campus community a blueprint of items that PBC regularly addresses.
8. A number 15 question will be added to the survey to ask for any additional information or comments.

PBC Statement of Purpose 2nd Review – R. Natividad

1. The purpose statement was reviewed and suggested changes were made to the last sentence. Changes were suggested so it would read as follows: The PBC makes recommendations to the President on all planning and budgeting issues and reports committee activities to campus constituencies. This change will be reflected on the next agenda.

PBC Yearly Goals – R. Natividad

1. Some goals were sent to the chair for consideration. One of the goals was to continue to review the areas of facilitation and assure we have the correct experts in the specific areas to address the committee.
2. One goal is to conduct an evaluation of the planning and budgeting process. This will be a goal of the committee for this year. Another one is to review and endorse the Comprehensive Master Plan and sub plans to assure they are supportive, integrative, implementable, and achievable.
3. New members to the PBC will now receive a welcome packet with pertinent information.
4. In terms of the self-evaluation for the committee, it was recommended we conduct a campus-wide survey which would be disseminated to the campus community. It was noted before the survey would be distributed, it will be presented to the PBC first for their feedback. It was noted this survey should be done in the fall as it would be too much work to do in the spring. Concern was expressed about administering the survey in October because there will be no PBC meeting on October 15 and a review of the survey was needed. It was noted the accreditation team will be visiting the college on October 29 and they would like to visit the PBC. It was decided the October 15 meeting will be moved to October 29 and the evaluation survey can be discussed at this meeting.
5. It was announced that all the collegial consultation committees have agreed to have a web page. There needs to be a template so every committees look is consistent. A goal for the PBC is to revise our web page so it is consistent with the other areas.

Approval of the September 3, 2015 Minutes

1. A clarification was noted under PBC Evaluation Overview, #3. **Delete:** out lining, **change to:** other.
2. The minutes were approved with noted changes and will be posted to the website.

Adjournment – R. Natividad

1. The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled as a special session meeting for **October 29, 2015, at 1:00 p.m.,** in Library 202.

**El Camino College
College Planning Process
Employee Feedback Survey**

Please provide feedback on the planning process at El Camino College by completing the following anonymous survey. Your responses will help us improve the planning process in the future.

Participation is voluntary and you can exit the survey at any time; your responses will be submitted only after you click the SUBMIT button at the end of this survey.

We appreciate your input!

If you are unclear about any aspect of the planning process, you may click on the associated links for more information.

[The Planning Process](#) [Will link to the Planning Model]
<http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/ir/docs/planning/PlanningModel2015Final.pdf>

Definitions

[Types of Plans](#) [This will be a pop-up]

Program Plan: Content in program plans is created by faculty, staff, and managers. A program plan can be academic (i.e., Career Technical Ed. i.e. Construction, ESL, Math, or Psychology); administrative (i.e., Maintenance, Parking Services, or Purchasing); or student services (i.e., Counseling, CalWORKs, Community Education, or Outreach).

Unit Plan: Primarily derived from prioritized content provided by programs that report to the division manager (i.e., Counseling, Facilities, or Humanities). Units can also consist of smaller but highly specialized functions of the college such as the Foundation, Institutional Research, or Public Relations) that do not have programs reporting to the manager.

Area Plan: Primarily derived from prioritized content provided by units that report to the area Vice President (i.e., Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, Human Resources, and Student and Community) or the Compton Center [CEOProvost](#).

El Camino College [Annual](#) Planning Process

The following questions relate to the [Plan-Builder](#) [Program Review & Planning \(PRP\)](#) online planning [module in the College's TracDat software system](#). *Please exclude your experiences in [TracDat associated with the SLO/SAO/PLO module](#).*

1. How often have you logged in to [Plan-Builder](#) [TracDat](#) in the past ~~year~~ [12 months](#)?
~~Two or more times per month~~
Monthly [or more often](#)

A few times [in the year](#)
Once or twice
Never

2. How involved were you in creating the current ([2015-16](#)) plan?
Very involved
Somewhat involved
Rarely involved
Not involved

3. If not involved, would you be interested in participating in the process in the future?
Definitely
Probably
Maybe
Not likely
No interest at all

4. Did you participate with updating [and evaluating the](#) goals and objectives [status](#) in the [current previous year's \(2014-15\)](#) plan [in Plan Builder](#)?
Yes
Not yet
[Was not aware that this step was necessary](#)
Not applicable

5. What was your main role in the planning process?
I was a plan leader ([created and prioritized list of Recommendations](#)).
I was a plan [reviewer-editor \(reviewed someone else's list of Recommendations\)](#).
I participated in [the Program Review process or developing recommendations plan development for the Program Review report](#).
[I was consulted for ideas or feedback on our Annual Plan.](#)
[I entered Recommendations in TracDat at the request of someone else.](#)
I am not sure of my role in the planning process.
Other (please specify)
Not involved [in any way](#)

For items 6 – 23, please indicate your level of agreement with each statement about the planning process at El Camino College.

Scale:

Completely Agree
Somewhat Agree
Neutral/Not Sure
Somewhat Disagree
Completely Disagree
Not applicable

Role of the Planning Process

6. My role and responsibilities in this process were clearly communicated to me.
7. I understand how the planning process relates to the College's [mission and](#) strategic initiatives.
8. The planning process prioritizes resource allocations.
9. The planning process has helped me to focus on improving my program/unit/area.
10. I see a link between the planning process and the students we serve.
11. This planning process has been good for El Camino College.
12. I am clear on the kinds of things that are appropriate to be included in our annual plan.
13. ~~I know that My~~ my program/unit/area plan [could](#) include [Recommendations objectives that we plan to implement](#) even [though-when](#) they ~~may~~ have no additional cost (i.e., outside resources are not needed or already exist to support them).
14. I am beginning to understand the relationship between Program Review, [Plan-Builder](#), and Student Learning Outcomes [\(or Service Area Outcomes\)](#), and [Annual Planning](#).
15. [I am aware of what recommendations are ultimately funded at the College or Center level.](#)
16. On-going or additional training is needed for faculty and staff.

Program Review

16. [Most of my annual plan](#) Recommendations [are derived](#) from the last program review ~~are included in the annual program plan.~~
17. Program review recommendations inform the planning process.

Campus Planning Committees

18. I know that the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) reviews, discusses, and makes recommendations to the President regarding College planning and budgeting issues.
19. ~~Information from the PBC is distributed/communicated campus wide.~~ [I receive regular updates of committee activities from my PBC representative.](#)
20. ~~I understand the role of the Enrollment Management Committee in the planning process.~~
21. ~~I am aware that the Enrollment Management Committee oversees a small amount of innovation funding each year to support campus efforts to improve student success and to grow enrollment when needed.~~

Plan Development and Timeline

22. I understand how the planning process works.
23. I know the difference between Program, Unit and Area plans.
24. I understand that sometimes the process requires us to update current plans while creating plans for the next year.
25. ~~I am confused by all the deadlines for the different plans.~~
26. ~~The deadline to submit the annual plan does not work for my Program/ Unit/Area.~~

PopUp:

Planning Submittal Dates

Program Plans are due by ~~December 31st~~ [November 15](#)

Unit Plans are due by February ~~15~~²⁸~~th~~
Area Plans are due by March 31st

~~27. If these submittal dates do not work, then when should annual plans be submitted?~~

28. What changes or additions should be made to improve the current planning process?

29. What suggestions do you have that would help you understand the planning process? Be specific if possible.

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

A. Employee Group

Faculty

Staff

Manager/Administrator/Supervisor

B. Location

Compton ~~Educational~~ Center

~~ECC Main Campus~~ El Camino College (Torrance)

Other

C. Administrative Area

Academic Affairs

Administrative Services or Business Services

President or Provost

Human Resources

Student and Community Advancement or Student Services

D. Years employed at your location

Less than 1 year

1 to 5 years

6-15 years

16 years or more

E. Employment Status

Full Time

Part Time

Thank you for your thoughts!

ECC Planning Feedback

96 Responses

A. Employee Group

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.87
Faculty	39	41.94	<div style="width: 41.94%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Staff	27	29.03	<div style="width: 29.03%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Manager/Administrator/Supervisor	27	29.03	<div style="width: 29.03%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>

B. Location

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.05
Compton Educational Center	1	1.10	<div style="width: 1.10%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
ECC Main Campus Torrance	84	92.31	<div style="width: 92.31%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Other	6	6.59	<div style="width: 6.59%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>

C. Administrative Area

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.28
Academic Affairs	34	45.95	<div style="width: 45.95%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Administrative Services	12	16.22	<div style="width: 16.22%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Presidents Office	1	1.35	<div style="width: 1.35%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Student and Community Advancement	27	36.49	<div style="width: 36.49%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>

D. Years employed at your location

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.10
Less than 1 year	4	4.35	<div style="width: 4.35%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
1 to 5 years	16	17.39	<div style="width: 17.39%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
6-15 years	39	42.39	<div style="width: 42.39%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
16 years or more	33	35.87	<div style="width: 35.87%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>

E. Employment Status

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.08
Full Time	85	92.39	<div style="width: 92.39%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Part Time	7	7.61	<div style="width: 7.61%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>

1. How often have you logged in to Plan Builder in the past year?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.65
Two or more times per month	10	10.64	<div style="width: 10.64%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Monthly	6	6.38	<div style="width: 6.38%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
A few times in the year	23	24.47	<div style="width: 24.47%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Once or twice	23	24.47	<div style="width: 24.47%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Never	32	34.04	<div style="width: 34.04%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>

2. How involved were you in creating the current (2010-11) plan?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.34
Very involved	33	35.11	<div style="width: 35.11%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Somewhat involved	23	24.47	<div style="width: 24.47%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Rarely involved	11	11.70	<div style="width: 11.70%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Not involved	27	28.72	<div style="width: 28.72%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>

3. If not involved, would you be interested in participating in the process in the future?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.55
Definitely	19	31.67	<div style="width: 31.67%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Probably	11	18.33	<div style="width: 18.33%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Maybe	13	21.67	<div style="width: 21.67%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
Not likely	12	20.00	<div style="width: 20.00%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>
No interest at all	5	8.33	<div style="width: 8.33%; background-color: #0000FF; border: 1px solid black;"></div>

4. Did you participate with updating the goal and objectives status in the current (2010-11) plan?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.54
Yes	58	63.04	
Not yet	18	19.57	
Not applicable	16	17.39	

5. What was your main role in the planning process?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.53
I was a plan leader.	23	24.47	
I was a plan editor.	4	4.26	
I participated in plan development.	22	23.40	
I am not sure of my role in the planning process.	13	13.83	
Other please specify	9	9.57	
Not involved	23	24.47	

6. My role and responsibilities in this process were clearly communicated to me.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.94
Completely Agree	35	44.30	
Somewhat Agree	21	26.58	
Neutral/Not Sure	12	15.19	
Somewhat Disagree	5	6.33	
Completely Disagree	6	7.59	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

7. I understand how the planning process relates to the College's strategic initiatives.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.92
Completely Agree	34	38.64	
Somewhat Agree	27	30.68	
Neutral/Not Sure	16	18.18	
Somewhat Disagree	8	9.09	
Completely Disagree	3	3.41	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

8. The planning process prioritizes resource allocations.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.77
Completely Agree	27	31.03	
Somewhat Agree	32	36.78	
Neutral/Not Sure	15	17.24	
Somewhat Disagree	7	8.05	
Completely Disagree	6	6.90	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

9. The planning process has helped me to focus on improving my program/unit/area.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.36
Completely Agree	20	24.69	
Somewhat Agree	20	24.69	
Neutral/Not Sure	20	24.69	
Somewhat Disagree	11	13.58	
Completely Disagree	10	12.35	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

10. I see a link between the planning process and the students we serve.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.67
Completely Agree	28	31.46	
Somewhat Agree	27	30.34	
Neutral/Not Sure	20	22.47	
Somewhat Disagree	5	5.62	
Completely Disagree	9	10.11	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

12. I am clear on the kinds of things that are appropriate to be included in our annual plan.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.53
Completely Agree	21	24.42	
Somewhat Agree	29	33.72	
Neutral/Not Sure	19	22.09	
Somewhat Disagree	9	10.47	
Completely Disagree	8	9.30	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

14. I am beginning to understand the relationship between Program Review, Plan Builder, and Student Learning Outcomes.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.72
Completely Agree	26	30.59	
Somewhat Agree	27	31.76	
Neutral/Not Sure	20	23.53	
Somewhat Disagree	6	7.06	
Completely Disagree	6	7.06	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

11. This planning process has been good for El Camino College.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.58
Completely Agree	23	26.74	
Somewhat Agree	21	24.42	
Neutral/Not Sure	31	36.05	
Somewhat Disagree	5	5.81	
Completely Disagree	6	6.98	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

13. My program/unit/area plan includes objectives that we plan to implement even though they may have no additional cost (i.e., outside resources are not needed or already exist to support them).

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.84
Completely Agree	30	36.14	
Somewhat Agree	22	26.51	
Neutral/Not Sure	24	28.92	
Somewhat Disagree	2	2.41	
Completely Disagree	5	6.02	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

15. On-going or additional training is needed for faculty and staff.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.30
Completely Agree	46	52.27	
Somewhat Agree	24	27.27	
Neutral/Not Sure	17	19.32	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	1	1.14	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

16. Recommendations from the last program review are included in the annual program plan.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.88
Completely Agree	29	34.52	
Somewhat Agree	20	23.81	
Neutral/Not Sure	32	38.10	
Somewhat Disagree	2	2.38	
Completely Disagree	1	1.19	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

18. I know that the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) reviews, discusses, and makes recommendations to the President regarding College planning and budgeting issues.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.06
Completely Agree	40	44.44	
Somewhat Agree	28	31.11	
Neutral/Not Sure	14	15.56	
Somewhat Disagree	3	3.33	
Completely Disagree	5	5.56	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

20. I understand the role of the Enrollment Management Committee in the planning process.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.04
Completely Agree	14	15.56	
Somewhat Agree	15	16.67	
Neutral/Not Sure	34	37.78	
Somewhat Disagree	15	16.67	
Completely Disagree	12	13.33	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

17. Program review recommendations inform the planning process.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.92
Completely Agree	30	34.88	
Somewhat Agree	27	31.40	
Neutral/Not Sure	25	29.07	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	4	4.65	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

19. Information from the PBC is distributed/communicated campus wide.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.11
Completely Agree	12	13.33	
Somewhat Agree	22	24.44	
Neutral/Not Sure	31	34.44	
Somewhat Disagree	14	15.56	
Completely Disagree	11	12.22	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

21. I am aware that the Enrollment Management Committee oversees a small amount of innovation funding each year to support campus efforts to improve student success and to grow enrollment when needed.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.94
Completely Agree	15	16.67	
Somewhat Agree	15	16.67	
Neutral/Not Sure	28	31.11	
Somewhat Disagree	14	15.56	
Completely Disagree	18	20.00	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

22. I understand how the planning process works.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.61
Completely Agree	18	20.22	
Somewhat Agree	35	39.33	
Neutral/Not Sure	24	26.97	
Somewhat Disagree	7	7.87	
Completely Disagree	5	5.62	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

24. I understand that sometimes the process requires us to update current plans while creating plans for the next year.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.22
Completely Agree	39	43.82	
Somewhat Agree	37	41.57	
Neutral/Not Sure	9	10.11	
Somewhat Disagree	2	2.25	
Completely Disagree	2	2.25	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

26. The deadline to submit the annual plan does not work for my Program/ Unit/Area.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.96
Completely Agree	7	8.64	
Somewhat Agree	10	12.35	
Neutral/Not Sure	46	56.79	
Somewhat Disagree	9	11.11	
Completely Disagree	9	11.11	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

23. I know the difference between Program, Unit and Area plans.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.74
Completely Agree	32	36.78	
Somewhat Agree	22	25.29	
Neutral/Not Sure	18	20.69	
Somewhat Disagree	8	9.20	
Completely Disagree	7	8.05	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

25. I am confused by all the deadlines for the different plans.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.33
Completely Agree	18	21.18	
Somewhat Agree	27	31.76	
Neutral/Not Sure	18	21.18	
Somewhat Disagree	9	10.59	
Completely Disagree	13	15.29	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

PBC Evaluation October 2015

N= 23

Membership Status

Response	Frequency	Percent	
PBC Member/Alternate Support Staff	8	34.78	<div style="width: 34.78%;"></div>
Missing	9	39.13	<div style="width: 39.13%;"></div>

Annual Plans

Response	Frequency	Percent	
Strongly Agree	4	17.39	<div style="width: 17.39%;"></div>
Agree	6	26.09	<div style="width: 26.09%;"></div>
Disagree	2	8.70	<div style="width: 8.70%;"></div>
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>
Missing	11	47.83	<div style="width: 47.83%;"></div>

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

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	11	47.83	<div style="width: 47.83%;"></div>
2. Agree	9	39.13	<div style="width: 39.13%;"></div>
3. Disagree	2	8.70	<div style="width: 8.70%;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	1	4.35	<div style="width: 4.35%;"></div>
Missing	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>

5. Review and discuss College revenues and expenditures.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	12	52.17	<div style="width: 52.17%;"></div>
2. Agree	10	43.48	<div style="width: 43.48%;"></div>
3. Disagree	1	4.35	<div style="width: 4.35%;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>
Missing	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>

Comprehensive Master Plan

Response	Frequency	Percent	
Strongly Agree	2	8.70	<div style="width: 8.70%;"></div>
Agree	8	34.78	<div style="width: 34.78%;"></div>
Disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>
Strongly Disagree	2	8.70	<div style="width: 8.70%;"></div>
Missing	11	47.83	<div style="width: 47.83%;"></div>

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

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	7	30.43	<div style="width: 30.43%;"></div>
2. Agree	14	60.87	<div style="width: 60.87%;"></div>
3. Disagree	1	4.35	<div style="width: 4.35%;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	1	4.35	<div style="width: 4.35%;"></div>
Missing	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>

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

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	18	78.26	<div style="width: 78.26%;"></div>
2. Agree	5	21.74	<div style="width: 21.74%;"></div>
3. Disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>
Missing	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>

6. Review and discuss long-range financial forecasting.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	11	47.83	<div style="width: 47.83%;"></div>
2. Agree	10	43.48	<div style="width: 43.48%;"></div>
3. Disagree	2	8.70	<div style="width: 8.70%;"></div>
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>
Missing	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0%;"></div>

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

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	7	30.43	
2. Agree	15	65.22	
3. Disagree	0	0.00	
4. Strongly disagree	1	4.35	
Missing	0	0.00	

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

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	6	26.09	
2. Agree	13	56.52	
3. Disagree	3	13.04	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	
Missing	1	4.35	

11. I am comfortable speaking and voicing my opinion during the meetings.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	16	69.57	
2. Agree	7	30.43	
3. Disagree	0	0.00	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	
Missing	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	15	65.22	
2. Agree	8	34.78	
3. Disagree	0	0.00	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	
Missing	0	0.00	

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

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	4	17.39	
2. Agree	13	56.52	
3. Disagree	4	17.39	
4. Strongly disagree	1	4.35	
Missing	1	4.35	

10. Meeting discussions address the responsibilities of the committee.

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	13	56.52	
2. Agree	9	39.13	
3. Disagree	1	4.35	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	
Missing	0	0.00	

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

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	13	56.52	
2. Agree	8	34.78	
3. Disagree	1	4.35	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	
Missing	1	4.35	

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

Response	Frequency	Percent	
1. Strongly agree	14	60.87	
2. Agree	6	26.09	
3. Disagree	2	8.70	
4. Strongly disagree	0	0.00	
Missing	1	4.35	

PBC Evaluation October 2015

Question: Q1: Planning

Response

The annual plans are discussed. I do not recall the Accreditation Self-Study nor the Comprehensive Master Plan being discussed.

While we didn't spend a lot of time on the master plan, we discussed the challenges of a plan that contained few specific actions.

A more thorough discussion at times would be helpful

We do not really assess the Annual Plans only the recommendations arising from the Vice Presidents recommendations for funding.

Comp. Master Plan hasn't been discussed this past year since it's being revised. However, parts of it, such as the Education Plan, have never been discussed. Some parts, such as the IT part, were discussed 2 or 3 years ago, but with no follow-up, despite there being many problems in that area.

Question: Q2 : Review and discuss prioritized Area plan requests for funding

Response

I think we do OK but can do a better job in this area. For example, the SSSP Proposal did not make it to the PBC committee prior to submission and there are probably other omissions also. Hopefully we will have an opportunity to review the Equity Proposal when that is completed prior to submission in December.

I think more explanation on how what is funded is needed.

We as a committee should be careful not to micro manage and question the process followed by divisions, units, etc.

Question: Q3: Continue the five-year cycle of master planning

Response

We reviewed and approved new strategic initiatives

Good strategy

See #1 above.

Question: Q4: Review and discuss annual Preliminary, Tentative and Final Budget proposals and assumptions

Response

I would like to see or have access to line item details

Great discussion had on items however the future meeting on Flex Day should be revisited and we should continue to be careful when discussing items that are better left to HR and the bargaining units.

Question: Q5: Review and discuss College revenues and expenditures.

Response

Good discussions

Question: Q6: Review and discuss long-range financial forecasting

Response

It is difficult to do but we do our best as a committee

we do not conduct a strong approach in this area as it relates to resources to strengthen faculty involvement in student success.

We review and ask questions about long-range fin. forecasting, but I feel that PBC members and attendees need some training in understanding how forecasting works. I feel that the folks from Financial Services end up saying "That's how it's done" and the committee just has to accept that. It would be nice to have an outside person give us some information.

Question: Q7 Provide recommendations to President regarding College planning and budget activities:

Response

I believe more efforts can be made to have a broader range of presentations on district wide planning at each meeting to have input on, and a better understanding of, hiring decisions and reorganization rationale and forecasting.

Perhaps a quarterly newsletter should be printed to help committee members get the information out to their constituency groups?

Question: Q8 Regularly inform the College community of the results of the planning and budge process:

Response

I am unclear if members of the committee are reporting back to their constituents or not as most committee members do not comment during this portion of the agenda. It would be great if there was more sharing of feedback from different interests within the district. This could be valuable if committee members made a commitment to participate.

I appreciate the efforts of the committee to keep students informed.

While the College community does get informed, more information should be provided on how and why items were funded.

Although the PBC has a web presence we could be doing more to get the information out on the discussions and work done by the PBC

This depends on how often and how well the constituents' representatives inform their group.

We've improved in this area, but I still think that a newsletter that goes out to the whole campus would make it easier for people to check out the PBC discussions and recommendations. Our minutes are not adequate for "outsiders" to understand. So, how about a newsletter, once each semester?

Question: Q9 Periodically review and evaluate the effectiveness of PBC communications to the College community:

Response

I agree this needs to be done but is it? Maybe there needs to be further discussion on this regarding how to best communicate PBC activities outside of the minutes, i.e. website or newsletter, etc.?

Should be on-going discussion

This is an area that needs strengthening. Outside of constituent reporting we do not know how the faculty at large understands what happens in PBC.

We should probably do this more often.

Question: Q10 Meeting discussions address the responsibilities of the committee:

Response

We're still working on the planning side of our responsibilities.

Question: Q11 I am comfortable speaking and voicing my opinion during the meetings:

Response

Depends on the topic and those who attend

Question: Q12 The meeting discussions contain an appropriate amount of structure and flexibility:

Response

There needs to be a balance between the two. When the agenda has many items there normally needs to be a time limit established to discuss each item in order to cover the entire agenda without running past the scheduled meeting time. Of course, there may be some items that require a more in-depth discussion by the members of the Committee, to be designated by the Chairperson.

I appreciate the openness of the committee to differing ideas.

Good structure provided by the Chair

Question: Q13 The final version of the PBC minutes accurately reflects the discussions that occurred

Response

The minutes are comprehensive and well done.

PBC minute meetings are well written and accuracy is prioritized by the Chair

Question: Q14 The PBC Chair provides meeting agendas and draft meeting minutes in a timely manner:

Response

Any presentations not previously emailed should be printed for the meeting. E files at the meeting are insufficient

If the minutes and agenda could be sent out a little earlier I would be better prepared.

I think Rory does a great job, and puts in an enormous amount of time.

Yes, the Chair is very organized

Agendas, OK. Minutes, too late. I would like to see minutes by the Monday before a meeting, at the latest.

Question: Q15 Do you have anything to add to help evaluate the PBC's performance in 2014-15.

Response

I would recommend some kind of orientation and review for new members to the committee. Sometimes we get caught up in all of the acronyms and this makes it sometimes difficult to follow everything.

none

1. I am concerned that some areas have no representation or no alternates or reps who don't always attend. People in those areas need to work harder to find reps and alternates who, together, can ensure attendance for that group. I appreciate the efforts by the chairperson about this. 2. The chairperson does an excellent job of leading meetings and setting the agendas. But he does not get minutes distributed in a timely manner and cannot find time or delegate someone to work on external communications. I would like to point out that both of these are about communication. I strongly feel that he needs to delegate these responsibilities (to other members of the committee, not to his office staff) or otherwise figure out how to accomplish them. These have been ongoing items of concern.

Review of 2011 Planning Process Evaluation

Recommendations for Improvement

In 2011, El Camino College conducted a College-wide review of its Planning Process that included an evaluation of the annual planning process, opportunities for participation, and recommendations for improvement. This brief reviews the recommendations for improvement and provides comments on where we are today, 4 years later. Nearly every recommendation has been addressed either fully or mostly (or is not applicable).

Recommendations for Improvement

The following constructive ideas were generated in response to open-ended questions about improving the current planning process (Q28) and understanding the planning process (Q29). A response or current status update is provided for each.

28. What changes or additions should be made to improve the current planning process?

Q28. Recommendation from 2011	2015 Response or Update
<i>It seems as though the planning process has been used to create obstacles to funding rather than vice versa. When funds are requested for anything, one is asked if it is in Planbuilder. If one did not anticipate the need a year ago, one is told you cannot subvert the planning process.</i>	Yes, most funding requests must go through the annual planning process since most of our needs can be anticipated through Program Review. However, the College recognizes that we also need to be nimble and respond to emerging needs. The new PRP system can handle both planned-for and emerging needs.
<i>Actually showing any correlation between the current planning process and what actually gets done and/or supported on campus. Removing the justification process for items/services that have been entered into Plan Builder when funding has been allocated for those items. Why do I need to justify something in Plan Builder when the only reason why the item was entered into Plan Builder is because I need the item?</i>	Providing a rationale or justification for a funding request is standard practice and especially important at a large institution. It also ensures that requests are based on thorough evaluation and evidence, typically conducted in the program review. It also explains the purpose of a request for someone who is far removed from the plan. The practice of justification is continued in the TracDat-based PRP system.
<i>Relying on your division for information could be problematic - I would rather have campus-wide trainings.</i>	Training on TracDat and the PRP system has been unified for Program Review and Planning, so the linkage is clearer. Training is provided at all levels of planning.

Q28. Recommendation from 2011 (cont.)	2015 Response or Update
<i>I believe most faculty in my department are completely removed from the planning process and Plan Builder. There needs to be greater awareness of how the process works.</i>	We have made efforts to increase awareness and understanding of the planning process. This survey will be repeated in 2015 to gauge any improvement in this area.
<i>I think the only change I would recommend is the process of evaluation since many programs are looking to our (Institutional Research Office) for research to include in their program plans. All of the programs submit research request at the same time and this causes a back log with our research department, thereby delaying or extending the turnaround time for a research request to be completed. The department does an excellent job of accommodating request but when "Program Plans" are due this presents a problem.</i>	Institutional Research & Planning (IRP) has developed a Program Review data tool for faculty to access for their program. In addition, success & retention reports are now customizable. This has meant that routine requests can be handled by users, saving IR time to handle special projects. A bottleneck still exists at certain times during the year, but IRP is endeavoring to remedy this through more automation.
<i>Have only one plan - combine program review with plan builder - it is so confusing - allow for updates to be made during the year</i>	Effective in 2014-15, program review is fully integrated with annual planning. Program Reviews in the new system can remain live and current with new developments.
<i>I believe people need training. Too often we are asked for feedback when the deadline is literally tomorrow. This is frustrating and makes everyone feel helpless.</i>	Training on TracDat and the PRP system has been unified for Program Review and Planning, is timed with program review orientation and annual planning cycles.
<i>Better communication and willingness of administration to consider and implement faculty input.</i>	Through the development of the Making Decisions document along with the publication of criteria for the prioritization of funding and planning recommendations, the planning, budgeting and decision-making process is more clear and inclusive.
<i>Send out deadlines earlier. So many things on this campus are done at the last minute.</i>	Planning cycles and deadlines have been fairly consistent in recent years, timed to afford faculty with the greatest opportunity for feedback and more clarity on information needed.
<i>Include more stakeholders.</i>	The Making Decisions document has clarified representation on collegial consultation committees including the Planning & Budgeting Committee-PBC. Planning Summits have had broad campus representation.

Q28. Recommendation from 2011 (cont.)	2015 Response or Update
<p><i>My manager has not involved our office in the planning process (i.e. program review). Are managers being encouraged to involve staff? Are they being asked to identify who was actually involved in the process?</i></p>	<p>Managers are encouraged to all staff and faculty to an appropriate degree in the annual planning process. Plan Builder recorded the names of all participants; this can be documented in TracDat also.</p>
<p><i>More trainings to understand what the plan is for, what should be included in it, and the format that it should be written.</i></p>	<p>Training on TracDat and the PRP system is timed with program review orientation and annual planning cycles. Trainings and materials are tailored for each level (program, unit, area) and are offered frequently at each campus location.</p>
<p><i>It is a joke that you want faculty input on planning. The administration makes the decisions and they want the facade of faculty input.</i></p>	<p>The annual planning process starts with faculty and other program leaders who build annual program plans. It is likely that not all program-level requests can be feasibly incorporated into a unit plan due to financial restrictions and the College's strategic goals.</p>
<p><i>Make instruction, not administrative convenience, the focus.</i></p>	<p>The enhanced linkage of planning to program review and strategic initiatives (e.g., A-Student Learning) puts the focus on instructional needs for academic departments.</p>
<p><i>Would be nice to have all the plans copied over to a public access page where anyone could see plans for any Dept. I believe that part of the problem with communication of Plan Builder and its purpose is that only password access users can see the plans. Therefore, making the "submitted" plans accessible for viewing without the need for password access would improve communication and sharing of plans an expand awareness of Plan Builder and its purpose.</i></p>	<p>TracDat's PRP system was designed to develop a College Plan following the VP prioritization process. The College Plan level in PRP is currently in development. The 2015-16 Plan will be accessible by all employees by early November 2015. In addition, the College Plan ("VP Priorities") is shared in PBC whose members can freely share it back with their constituencies.</p>
<p><i>The use of Strategic Initiatives as planning goals this year seemed artificial. Some of my goals fit this model and some did not; I would have liked the opportunity to include goals that don't fit current SIs.</i></p>	<p>In the old Plan Builder, there was no easy way to consistently link a college's strategic goals with plans without making them "goals" with associated objectives. With TracDat, users are able to name a recommendation "what it is" and link a strategic initiative to it.</p>

Q28. Recommendation from 2011 (cont.)	2015 Response or Update
<i>More information sent to all faculty and staff to better understand outcomes and why those outcomes are being implemented. More transparency</i>	The College Plan will promote transparency. The Plan shows how each funded item links to strategic initiatives and other college-wide goals by expense category (e.g., staffing, etc). In addition, an annual planning newsletter is in the works to inform the college community about funding directions and some of these funded items, in particular.
<i>More trainings to understand what the plan is for, what should be included in it, and the format that it should be written.</i>	Training on TracDat and the PRP system is timed with program review orientation and annual planning cycles. Trainings and materials are tailored for each level (program, unit, area) and are offered frequently at each campus location.
<i>It is a joke that you want faculty input on planning. The administration makes the decisions and they want the facade of faculty input.</i>	The annual planning process starts with faculty and other program leaders who build annual program plans. It is likely that not all program-level requests can be feasibly incorporated into a unit plan due to financial restrictions and the College's strategic goals.

Question 29. What suggestions do you have that would help you understand the planning process?

Q29. Ideas to Improve Understanding	2015 Response or Update
<i>Availability of an on-line brochure or tutorial.</i>	Academic Affairs developed videos demos of each module (e.g., SLOs, PRP) in TracDat to assist users. Also, step-by-step instructions for PRP, with screen-shots, are in development.
<i>When structuring the plan, make it more simple to understand.</i>	We are striving to keep the PRP system as simple as possible while including the information essential for annual planning and record-keeping. We are somewhat limited by the structure of TracDat, which is outside of our control, but we hope that tutorial materials and trainings will facilitate access and understanding.
<i>I feel that all new supervisors/managers should be provided some brief level of training.</i>	As noted above, trainings and materials will be offered that are specific to the Unit level. These resources will be offered annually and as needed.

Q29. Ideas to Improve Understanding (cont.)	2015 Response or Update
<p><i>The process should be more flexible. Everything needs to be accessible to faculty on and off campus. Faculty should be able to update their plans at any time. The yearly deadline is unworkable and leads to funding of outmoded plans. When funds become available they should apply to the current plan. If it is continually updated it will always reflect the current needs. Administrators should not be able to pick and choose what gets funded. The departments should prioritize and the funding should follow that prioritization.</i></p>	<p>The PRP module is hosted on the TracDat website, so everyone’s access is now as good as a local internet connection, both on and off campus. While there is a deadline to submit annual plans for annual budget development, program review and annual plans now remain “live” and can be edited as needed. Program reviews and associated plans can be kept current by faculty leads. The prioritization process is published and TracDat facilitates greater transparency. However, the number of annual recommendations always far exceeds the budget to cover costs, so funded items must be determined strategically based on College mission and goals.</p>
<p><i>Communicate the process and allowed to be an active participant</i></p>	<p>Since the 2011 evaluation, the planning process has been codified and publicized to a greater extent; the Institutional Planning Administrative Procedure (AP 3250), updated Strategic Plan (BP 1200, Mission & Strategic Initiatives), and an enhanced Planning Model are published on the College website. In addition, the planning calendar is reviewed and updated by PBC annually. All employees should have the opportunity to participate in the annual planning process, by providing input or developing or reviewing the plan.</p>
<p><i>LISTEN! The campus atmosphere should tell you something about how serious input is taken.</i></p>	<p>We heard you! Through the development of the Making Decisions document and the College’s commitment to follow through on its guidelines for consultation, opportunities for participation, comment and review are now more widely known.</p>
<p><i>I would also recommend that managers are fully trained in the context of program plans because I’m not confident that everyone understands how to interpret the program plans in front of them and that causes concerns in the minds of those creating the plans.</i></p>	<p>For the TracDat system, trainings and supporting materials have been created that are specific to each level of planning (Program, Unit, and Area) to ensure that they address the needs of each level.</p>

Q29. Ideas to Improve Understanding (cont.)	2015 Response or Update
<i>More trainings to understand what the plan is for, what should be included in it, and the format that it should be written.</i>	Annual plans are now fully integrated with program review in TracDat's PRP module. Templates and embedded help text clearly describe PRP components and formats. In addition, trainings are more comprehensive, incorporating program review, planning, and the "big picture" into each session.
<i>The frequent reminders about what is due and when have been helpful for those of us who think about plan builder only when submission dates are near. We need more of them.</i>	Reminders continue, timed with the planning cycle and targeted to the group in question (program, unit, or area planners). We are exploring the possibility of embedding reminders into TracDat so that planners can receive notifications when information is due or missing.
<i>Relate to instructional, rather than administrative, goals.</i>	Student Learning (A) and Student Success & Support (B) are the first two strategic initiatives of the Strategic Plan and are associated with the vast majority of funded recommendations.
<i>Just seems like there is a lot of re-iteration and overlap in the plan builder, program, review, and other management reports.</i>	Many reported this duplication and we hope that the new PRP system resolves this. We now have one place in which program review and planning are stored and integrated.
<i>I understand the process fairly well. People in other areas are not as lucky as I am to have a manager that constantly informs me and updates me on the planning issues on campus. My input is always requested and valued. Having open communication encourages me to continue to participate in the planning process.</i>	Glad to hear it! This comment describes the ideal process to ensure understanding and participation. The review and evaluation of our planning process has helped us as a College do a better job at this collectively.
<i>Not directly related to the planning process but division/program/unit directions should consult and/or reflect the items in the plan builder when developing or implementing a process change or structural change.</i>	The greater integration of program review and planning facilitated by PRP should assist program and unit leaders in their efforts to plan for and implement change, as needed.

**EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

16007 Crenshaw Boulevard, Torrance, California 90506-0001

Telephone (310) 532-3670 or 1-866-ELCAMINO

www.elcamino.edu

October 14, 2015

To: President Thomas Fallo

From: Jo Ann Higdon, M.P.A.

Subject: Future Bond and Refunding Sales

The District has general obligation bonds authorized, but unissued, in the amount of \$350,000,000 from the 2012 Measure E. The November Board Agenda will include a proposal to sell between \$80 to a \$100 million of these bonds around December of 2015.

The proposal will also include a refunding of a portion of our previously issued bonds in order to take advantage of lower long-term interest rates. This refunding process will provide substantial cost savings to our taxpayers. By combining both a sale and refunding the issuance cost of the bonds will be significantly reduced as well.

The attached bond credit rating history was prepared by RBC Capital Markets and documents the college's excellent credit rating.

We look forward to working with our team of experts (Roderick Carter, RBC Capital Markets and Khushroo Gheyara, Caldwell Flores Winters, Inc.) in preparation for the upcoming sale. Their experiences in California Community Colleges have been invaluable to both our ratings and our past successful refund and sales of bonds.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jo Ann Higdon".

Jo Ann Higdon, M.P.A.
Vice President Administrative Services

Attachment: Bond Credit Ratings History



El Camino Community College District Credit Rating History

Moody's	S&P	Rating Description	
Long-term	Long-term	Prime	Investment-grade
Aaa	AAA	High Grade	
Aa1	AA+		
Aa2	AA		
Aa3	AA-		
A1	A+	Upper medium grade	
A2	A		
A3	A-		
Baa1	BBB+	Lower medium grade	
Baa2	BBB		
Baa3	BBB-		
Ba1	BB+	Non-investment grade speculative	Non-investment grade (high-yield or junk bonds)
Ba2	BB		
Ba3	BB-		
B1	B+	High speculative	
B2	B		
B3	B-		
Caa1	CCC+	Substantial risks	
Caa2	CCC	Extremely speculative	
Caa3	CCC-	Default imminent with little prospect for recovery	
Ca	CC		
	C		
C	D	In default	
I			

Credit Rating History		
Date	S&P	
	Rating	Action
2003	AA-	Issued
2005	AA-	Affirmed
2006	AA-	Affirmed
2009	AA	Upgraded
2012	AA	Affirmed
2013	AA	Affirmed

Date	Moody's	
	Rating	Action
2003	Aa2	Issued
2005	Aa2	Affirmed
2006	Aa2	Affirmed
2012	Aa1	Upgraded
2013	Aa1	Affirmed

From: [Lam, Karen](#) on behalf of [Shankweiler, Jean](#)
To: [Jeffries, Chris](#); [Striepe, Claudia](#); [Miranda, Gloria](#); [Simon, Angela](#); [Rapp, Virginia](#); [Pham Vi T.](#); [Fitzsimons, Constance](#); [Leach Larry](#); [Natividad Roy](#); [Fernley, Nathan](#); [Lew Thomas](#); [Geraghty, Elise](#); [Andrade Argelia](#); [Rodriguez, Stephanie](#); [Cocca Steven](#); [Ayala John](#); [Daugherty Seth](#); [Sims Jacquelyn](#); [Broderick, Carl](#); [Grant Amy](#); [Palos, Teresa](#); [Patel, Dipte](#); [Pon-Ishikawa Janice](#)
Cc: [Shankweiler, Jean](#); [Lam, Karen](#)
Subject: Faculty Hiring Priorities
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2015 8:08:05 AM

TO: Faculty Position ID Committee

FROM: Jean Shankweiler

SUBJECT: Faculty Hiring Priorities

The faculty prioritization results for the 2015-16 academic year were approved by President Fallo as listed below in alphabetical order:

1. Accounting
2. Biology
3. Computer Information Systems
4. Computer Science
5. Counselor – Generalist Counselor
6. Counselor – Veterans Counselor
7. Electronics and Computer Hardware Technology
8. English
9. Geography
10. History – United States
11. Kinesiology/Coaching
12. Mathematics
13. Music
14. Nursing
15. Sign Language
16. Spanish

Thank you.

Budget Development Process 2015-2020 Strategic Plan

The 2015-16 budget will reflect the goals identified in the El Camino College Strategic Plan 2015-20.

Costs for operational necessities such as utilities, insurance, regular payroll (including step and column and other negotiable items) will be budgeted and funded prior to identifying moneys for priorities developed through the planning process.

Requests are based on needs assessment and/or program review. An augmentation is a one-time addition to the current year budget. An enhancement is an increase to the base budget. Priorities may also be accomplished by redirecting existing funds.

Budget augmentations will be funded using one or more of the following guidelines:

1. Maintain current level of revenue produced for the District, i.e., achieving FTES target, outreach activities, grant development.
2. Directly impacting institutional effectiveness outcomes.
3. Maintain the integrity of a program.
4. Fulfill legal mandate requirements.
5. Recognize District employees as valued professionals.

Planning and Budgeting Committee

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 Strategic Plan. The PBC makes recommendations to the President on all planning and budgeting issues and reports all committee activities to the campus community

Responsibilities

General

1. Discuss, Develop and Review the purpose, goals, responsibilities, and membership of the committee.

Planning

2. Annually review and discuss the current Strategic Plan (BP 1200) and Comprehensive Master Plan, and monitor their implementation.

3. Review and discuss *prioritized* Area plan requests for funding, and other aspects of annual planning, ensuring that requests for funding are linked with program review, master planning, or other planning processes.
4. Participate in the development and review of the five-year cycle of strategic and master planning.
5. Participate, review and make recommendations on the College Strategic Initiatives.

Budgeting

6. Review and discuss annual Preliminary, Tentative, and Final Budget proposals and assumptions, ensuring that they supports the College's mission and strategic initiatives.
7. Review and discuss College revenues and expenditures.
8. Review and discuss long-range financial forecasting.

Communication

9. Provide recommendations to the President regarding College planning and budgeting activities.
10. Regularly inform the College community of the results of the planning and budgeting process.
11. Periodically review and evaluate the effectiveness of PBC communications to the College community.
12. Inform the College community of committee goals and responsibilities.