



PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE

**May 3, 2018
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 planning and budgeting are integrated and evaluated while 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.
10/5/17

Strategic Initiative – 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"/> Jose Anaya – Community Advancement | <input type="checkbox"/> Rory K. Natividad - Chair (non-voting) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amy Grant - Academic Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Alex Ostrega – ASO, Student Rep. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Hinshaw - Administrative Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Jackie Sims - Management/Supervisors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ken Key - ECCFT | <input type="checkbox"/> Greg Toya – Student Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ruben Lopez – Campus Police | <input type="checkbox"/> Josh Troesh - Academic Senate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> David Mussaw – ECCE | |

Alternate Members / Support

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Babs Atane – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Sidney Porter – Alt. Ac. Senate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kristie Daniel-DiGregorio – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Robertson - Alt. Police |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Brian Fahnestock – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Jean Shankweiler – Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Irene Graff – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Luukia Smith – Alt. ECCE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Gutierrez - Alt. ASO | <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Trevis – Alt. Adm. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kelsey Iino– Alt. Student Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Steve Waterhouse-Alt. Mgmt/Sup |
| <input type="checkbox"/> William Kerwin - Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Carolee Jessop-Vakil – Alt. ECCFT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Art Leible – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Van Buren, Star – Alt. Comm Adv. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jane Miyashiro – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant - Alt., Ac. Affairs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ross Miyashiro – Support | |

AGENDA

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 1. Approval Minutes – March 15, 2018 | R. Natividad | 1:00 P.M. |
| 2. Approval Minutes – April 19, 2018 | R. Natividad | 1:10 P.M. |
| 3. Budget Assumptions | B. Fahnestock | 1:20 P.M. |
| 4. ASO Presentation | G. Toya/A. Ostrega | 1:40 P.M. |

Next meeting – May 17, 2018

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
STRS/PERS	Fund 16
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 2017-18 Goals

1. Develop an action plan utilizing the college wide evaluation of planning and budgeting process. The evaluation was conducted last year.
2. Chair to provide brief summary of PBC meeting via email to improve communication efforts.
3. Review and approve the Comprehensive Master Plan 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.
4. Provide orientation and information to new members and alternates
5. Seek evidence of constituent group PBC communications in an effort to improve the understanding of committee efforts throughout the campus.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: March 15, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amy Grant – Academic Affairs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Hinshaw–Administrative Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ken Key - ECCFT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jackie Sims -Management/Supervisors |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Mussaw - ECCE | <input type="checkbox"/> Ruben Lopez – Campus Police |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rory K. Natividad – Chair (non-voting) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greg Toya – Student Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alex Ostrega – ASO Student Rep. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Josh Troesh – Academic Senate |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jose Anaya – Community Advancement | |

Alternate Members: J. Gutierrez, K. Iino, C. Jessop-Vakil, G. Robertson, S. Waterhouse

Support: B. Atane, B. Fahnestock, I. Graff, A. Leible, J. Miyashiro, R. Miyashiro

Other Attendees: R. Dreizler, A. O’Brien, T. Silerio

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

Approval of the March 1, 2018 Minutes

1. The minutes of March 1 were presented to the committee for approval.
2. The minutes were approved and will be posted on line.

Funding Formula– D. Maloney / B. Fahnestock

1. A brief overview was given on the budget development process. In January the governor presents a budget proposal for funding higher education. The budget proposal usually has some serious policy implications. It is not just about the money, it usually reflects some policy implications; things the governor would want from our system. In the budget trailer language which follows, there are usually details of those policy implications. The assembly and the senate then begin to have budget hearings to reveal the details. The legislative analyst will then release an analysis of what their perception is on the implications. The Department of Finance continues to review and finalize all revenue projections. In May the governor will then release a revise of his original proposal. Once the May revise is released, it gives more direction and urgency to things. The two houses of the state legislature meet and ultimately produce a final budget that is agreed to by all parties (the governor and the legislature). El Camino presents our tentative budget to the Board of Trustees in June. It is expected we will have a timely budget out of the legislature this year.
2. The various proposals in the governor’s budget were reviewed. The budget listed a proposed 2.15% COLA as well as a \$175 million augmentation which is related to the change in the funding formula. This money is to keep districts whole next year. The Department of Finance did simulations on the proposal and it was noted the number does not seem right. The governor proposed the establishment of the 115th fully on-line college. This proposal came from a number of directions as well as a work group titled FLOW (flexible on-line workability). There was \$46 million in the proposal to fund the College Promise. We are not sure this is enough money to fund all of the first-time, full-time students in all the community colleges up and down the state. A proposal for deferred maintenance and instructional equipment is slated to receive \$275 million. Proposition 51 – Capital Construction Projects is projected to receive \$44 to \$45 million which will assist in funding 20 projects across the state.

3. The biggest policy change behind the governor's proposal has to do with the funding formula which would shift things to performance-based funding (recognizing student success). Currently our funding has been based on FTES. Under the governor's new funding formula, only 50% would come from the generation of FTES, 25% would come from supplemental grant formula funding and 25% would come from student outcomes.
4. The Department of Finance produced two simulations on this proposal to help each college see what their funding would be if this proposal was implemented. The first simulation showed we would lose \$6 million and the second showed we would be ahead \$6 million. Some districts would not survive this formula. The Chancellor called together a group to work on this. A report was produced and is available on the website. The access-based approach we have been using has not been working well because we have 32 districts in stabilization including El Camino. As the population of college age students goes down, we find we are not sustainable in meeting our cap. The model is out of step with where we are at with enrollment as a system.
5. In the governor's proposal there was an immediate implementation proposed. A new formula cannot be implemented that quickly. Time is needed to plan, strategize, evaluate and to acquire a reasonable simulation. The CEO work group felt we should take time with the implementation. The recommendations were as follows:
 - Establishment of a process for an annual review and analysis of the formula.
 - A report back to the legislature and the Board of Governors by March of each year.
 - Make adjustments.
6. The proposal from the work group focuses on access and equitable success. It provides measures for all transfers, employment and economic mobility and captures momentum points.
7. The CEO workgroup recommended the plan should not be implemented in one year but should be phased in over three years. The year 2020 would be the first year the metrics would begin to change. There would be a two-year period where no district would get less money than it did at the start of this change (a two-year hold harmless). This would allow time for preparing and planning. In the third year 95% of our funding would be based on access and 5% based on outcomes. These equitable success metrics would increase by 5% each year until full implementation. At full implementation, over \$2 billion would be dedicated to Equitable Success metrics. By 2024 we will be at a level where we will have 75% of our funding based on the students we serve (through apportionment) and 25% would be based on outcomes.
8. It was questioned whether or not we should take some of the FTES from summer to reach our goal as this would be our funding for the next two years. If we borrow from summer we will enter next year at a deficit. It is important we solidify the revenue we can access this year as it will carry us over into the next year and the following year. This will give us the opportunity to restore our FTES.
9. It was noted there have been other states that have changed to performance-based funding. Their results showed mixed outcomes. This proposal is something important that we want to shape so it works for our students.
10. It was reiterated that the implementation of this plan is much too quick for us to do a good job at figuring everything out.
11. There are numerous questions regarding the fully on-line 115th college. This proposal is based on the premise there are people in the work force who do not have any credential or degree and that they are not accessing their community college. They are referred to as "the stranded worker." The solution to this is the fully on-line 115th college which would be easy to access. This proposal needs further analysis to see if this is the right conclusion for this population. No one has validated that "the stranded worker" would take advantage of this source of education. There are many parts of California that lack broadband access thus presenting an equity problem. The current community colleges already have a robust on-line program already in place. It may be more prudent to invest the allocated funds for this program into the current community college system to strengthen it further.

Informational Items Update – R. Natividad (handout)

1. A listing of the current members was distributed for the committee to critique for any corrections. The committee was asked to review reach out to any constituents if they see their area is in need of an alternate member for the committee.
2. The flow chart for the Annual Planning and Budgeting Process was also distributed. It was noted all of the unit plans should be done to allow the vice-presidents the time that they need to filter their respected area plans.

Adjournment – R. Natividad

1. The meeting adjourned at 1:54p.m. The next meeting will be held on **April 5, 2018** at 1:00 p.m. in Library 202.

RKN/lmo

Approved

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: April 19, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amy Grant – Academic Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Hinshaw–Administrative Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Key - ECCFT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jackie Sims -Management/Supervisors |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Mussaw - ECCE | <input type="checkbox"/> Ruben Lopez – Campus Police |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rory K. Natividad – Chair (non-voting) | <input type="checkbox"/> Greg Toya – Student Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alex Ostrega – ASO Student Rep. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Josh Troesh – Academic Senate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jose Anaya – Community Advancement | |

Alternate Members: K. Iino, Steve Waterhouse

Support: B. Atane, I. Graff, A. Leible, J. Miyashiro, J. Shankweiler

Other Attendees: A. O’Brien, M. Stevens

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

Approval of the March 15 , 2018 Minutes

1. The minutes of March 15 were tabled until the next meeting.

New Member

1. J. Troesh introduced a new committee member, Sidney Porter. S. Porter is a faculty member from the Accounting department in the division of Business. S. Porter will be an alternate representative for the Academic Senate. Introductions were made by the committee members.

Accreditation Update– J. Shankweiler

1. There are four standards for accreditation. R. Natividad is one of the co-chairs for accreditation. Others serving as co-chairs are: C. Striepe, J. Troesh and A. Leible.
2. In February it was learned there will be changes to the ACCJC at the management level. There will be training for our teams to specifically kick off our process according to the ACCJC on Thursday, May 3. Team sites have already been set up for the four standards. The co-chairs for each of the standards have been recruiting team members. The team members have begun meeting and collecting evidence.
3. Special thanks went out to I. Graff who set up a special template to collect and store the evidence. Over the summer this information will be organized and in the fall the writing will begin for our visitation in fall 2020.
4. One positive change to the process this time around is we have our own vice chancellor from ACCJC who is our advocate. Our advocate will come and visit us at some point next year and will check how our process is progressing. The committee members were encouraged to serve on one of the teams if they receive a call from one of the co-chairs.
5. A. Leible noted he invited the Technology Committee to review Standard 3C – Technology. He is also inviting the PBC to take part in Standard 3D – Fiscal Services and would be willing to send out the outline for their thoughts, comments or ideas. R. Natividad suggested for A. Leible to send him a template and he would send it out to the committee when he sends out the PBC binder.

6. One thing new with accreditation teams this time is we do not do planning agenda items. We now have one or two areas we pick as an area we would like to improve. A quality focused essay is done on how the improvement will be done and why it is necessary.
7. Compton is heavily into their transition planning. They have specified curriculum days where they work on separating their curriculum from ours and inputting it into their system. It is estimated that by summer 2019 they should be on their own. It was noted Compton is an accredited college now and does not need to be addressed at all.

Legislative Update – M. Stevens

1. There were legislative meetings in Sacramento in January and in Washington D.C. in February. Regarding the state of California the main topic is the funding formula. The assembly subcommittee will be discussing the topic this week. The issue we are dealing with is the CEOs in the system are basically ok with it. They like the idea in concept but it is being pushed through without much input from the CEOs. A revision is coming due in May and they are not able to have any hand in it. They did have a work group that made suggestions, but it was not known if their suggestions will be heeded or not.
2. On the national front, the big issue is a bill which came through in a house committee for a reauthorization of the Higher Education Act which funds higher education. A chairwoman put together a proposal called the Prosper Act. This would change how higher education would be funded in this country. This proposal is a 180 degree change of how higher education is currently funded. It is a disaster - students and colleges would get short changed. It would turn higher education into a business and make it competitive. The good news is congress has been so immersed with other issues that this bill has not been getting a lot of attention and may die. More than likely, we may just have a reauthorization of the current act as it stands.
3. It was announced on May 11 there will be the MOU signing of the South Bay Promise. Numerous local officials will be joining us for this event. This will be a signing ceremony bringing in seven school districts to participate in the South Bay Promise.
4. It was reported we could get support for the Public Safety Training Center moving along with our officials in Sacramento and Washington D.C. if we could acquire some property. The most viable option would be to find some local surplus property in one of the schools. There are a couple options in Inglewood. The proposal states we need at least 10 acres.

Bridging Study – I. Graff

1. The Bridging Study is a study supported by the Strategic Planning Committee and generated by the President. It is a study which looks at El Camino's perception in the community, looking at our own perception, seeing if there a gap and if there is a gap, how does the college address it. Some branding will also be addressed.

Adjournment – R. Natividad

1. The meeting adjourned at 1:35p.m. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for **May 3, 2018** at 1:00 p.m. in Library 202. R. Natividad will send an email out verifying the next meeting.

The following 2018-19 tentative Budget Assumptions are recommended by the President.

1. Organization

The 2018-19 El Camino Community College District Tentative Budget Assumptions reflect the best information available at this time from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, the Governor's Proposed Budget and from the District's Management Team.

2. Unrestricted General Fund Budget Guidelines

- A. Estimated Beginning Fund Balance: (\$ 23,506,206)
- B. Estimated Revenue including Federal, State and Local Sources: (\$ 127,056,688)
- C. 2.71% COLA Increase to FTES Revenue (\$ 2,868,735)
- D. Interfund Transfer In from Fund 16 to cover 2018-19 increases to PERS and STRS rates (\$ 1,653,393)
- E. Budget the General State Apportionment based on generation of 19,642 FTES.
- F. Offering 5,007 sections for the 2018-19 Academic Year.
- G. Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) increase: 2.71%.
- H. Step and Column Movement:
 - a. Certificated: 1.75% (\$ 914,612)
 - b. Classified: 1.32% (\$ 333,464)
- I. Salary Increase of 2.71% to be applied to all units at Jan 1, 2019: (\$ 1,050,477).
- J. Increase Employee benefits Costs due to items F and G: (\$ 466,296)
- K. Pension Contributions:
 - a. Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) Increases by 2.531% to 18.062% (\$656,497)
 - b. State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) Increases by 1.85% to 16.280% (\$ 996,897)
- L. Budget for projected utility cost increases of 3% over 2017-18 projected costs (\$ 83,900)
- M. Budget to fill the following full-time faculty positions:
 - a. Accounting
 - b. Administration of Justice
 - c. Air Conditioning
 - d. Anatomy and Physiology
 - e. CIS
 - f. Computer Science
 - g. English (3 positions)
 - h. Fire Academy
 - i. Learning Disability Specialist
 - j. Mathematics (2 positions)
 - k. Nursing
 - l. Physics
 - m. Radiological Technology
 - n. Real Estate
 - o. Theater
 - p. Counseling – Math and Science
 - q. Outreach Librarian
 - r. Systems Librarian

- N. Budget to fill following vacant full-time classified positions:
 - a. Accounting Officer
 - b. Accounting Tech II
 - c. Administrative Assistant II (2 positions)
 - d. Buyer
 - e. Clerk Cashier
 - f. Clery Act Compliance Coordinator
 - g. Machine Tool Technician (2 positions)
 - h. Student Services Technician
- O. Budget to fill the following vacant full-time Management position:
 - a. Executive Director – Facilities Planning Operations & Construction
 - b. Asst Director of Facilities Planning Services
 - c. Assoc Dean, Mathematical Sciences
 - d. Dean Humanities
- P. Budget for the following one-time Augmentations / Enhancements:
 - a. One (\$____)
 - b. Two (\$____)
- Q. Budget for Interfund Transfers Out
 - a. \$ 350,000 to Fund 12 (Restricted General Fund)
 - i. Same as 2017-18
 - b. \$ 913,564 to Fund 14 (Compton College-related activities)
 - i. Same as 2017-18
 - c. \$ 3,649,851 to Fund 15 (Special Programs (Compton College Partnership))
 - i. Same as 2017-18
 - d. \$ 988,000 to Fund 61 (Workers Compensation)
 - i. \$38,000 increase from 2017-18 for 4% rate increase contingency
 - e. \$ 1,144,000 to Fund 62 (Property & Liability Insurance)
 - i. \$44,000 increase from 2017-18 for 4% rate increase contingency
 - f. \$ 1,040,000 to Fund 63 (Dental Self-Insurance)
 - i. \$40,000 increase from 2017-18 for 4% rate increase contingency
 - g. \$ 25,000 to Fund 79 (Auxiliary Services Fund)
 - i. Same as 2017-18
- R. Budgeted Total 2018-19 Expenditures: \$ 129,588,331
- S. Projected Ending Fund Balance: \$ 22,849,475
 - a. Part of this balance includes a contingency for unfinished 2017-18 College Plan Items in Fund 11 (\$ 241,995) Projected



Student Activity Fee Increase

Associated Students Organization



Background

- Student Activity Fee: \$10
- Administrative Procedure 5032:
 - 35% to Associated Students Organization (ASO) and Inter-Club Council (ICC)
 - 60% to Auxiliary Services Board (ASB)
 - Athletics, Fine Arts, Journalism, etc.
 - 5% to ASB Reserves
 - Opt-out
- Auxiliary Services (ASB) budget deficit spending



Research

- 8 Colleges of similar FTEs and proximity to El Camino College
 - LACCD
 - Cerritos
 - Cabrillo
 - Santa Ana
 - Southwestern
 - Santa Monica
 - Orange Coast
 - Long Beach



Comparing Student Fees

- Student Activities Fee
 - \$10
 - 3rd lowest of 9 surveyed community colleges.
 - \$15
 - 5th highest of 9 surveyed community colleges.
 - Lower than Southwestern, Santa Monica, Orange Coast, and Long Beach



Comparing student fees

- Total Fees - Student Rep, Student Center, etc.
 - \$10.50
 - 3rd lowest of 9 surveyed community colleges
 - 3rd lowest of 42 Colleges
 - \$15.50
 - 5th highest of 9 surveyed community colleges
 - Lower than Southwestern, Santa Monica, Orange Coast, and Long Beach
 - \$18-\$22
 - 10th lowest among 42 Colleges



Student Government Budget: ASO & ICC

- Allocations
 - ECC: 35% of Student Activities Fee to ASO/ICC
 - All other colleges: 100% allocation to ASO/ICC
- Operating Budgets
 - ECC - \$121,600
 - Pre-2015 - \$28,000
 - Lowest of 7 Colleges
 - \$15 fee - \$170,000
 - Still lowest of 7 Colleges



What will ASO/ ICC do with more \$?

- Other College Initiatives

- Santa Monica
 - \$800,000 for food pantries + Metro U-Passes for all enrolled students.
- Orange Coast
 - \$120,000 for one-time funding requests by various programs.
- Santa Ana
 - \$47,000 for Leadership Training
 - \$20,000 for Book Loan Program
- Southwestern (SDCCD)
 - \$70,000 Campus Activities
 - \$100,000 on Personnel



What will ASO/ ICC do with more \$?

- Increase student involvement, leadership, spirit, and equity events
- Leaving a legacy for future students
 - ASO
 - Electrical Charging stations
 - Metro U-Passes
 - Leadership Training
 - Food Pantries
 - Equity programs - Dialogue and Cultural Heritage Months
 - ICC
 - Student Club activities
 - Off-campus excursions/trainings
 - Warrior Wednesday and Homecoming
 - Other emerging student needs or involvement opportunities



Auxiliary Services Board

- Disperses 60% of Student Activities Fee:
 - Athletics, Fine Arts, Forensics, and Journalism.
 - Project Success, First-Year Experience (FYE), Honors Transfer Program (HTP) & more
- Deficit Spending
 - Decreased revenue
 - Bookstore
 - Union Ads and Event Ticket sales
 - One-Time Augmentation to Athletics, Fine Arts, Journalism, and Forensics
 - \$15 will eliminate/reduce deficit spending
- ECC only College with an ASB
 - Others - 100% of Student Activity Funds controlled by ASO



Recommendation

- ECC has one of the lowest Student Activity fees, total annual fees, ASO annual operating budget.
- Increase funds to expand student life and leadership
- Eliminate/Decrease budget cuts to ASB Programs
 - Athletics, Journalism, Forensics, Fine Arts
 - FYE, MESA, Project Success, Puente, etc.
- ASO to increase the student activity fee from \$10 to \$15 for fall and spring semesters.



Approval and Support Process

- Campus Committee and ASO Committee Timeline:
 - April 6th - ASO Finance Approval (Vote)
 - April 9th - ASB Support (Vote)
 - April 16th - ICC General Meeting Support (Vote)
 - April 20th - Student Equity Advisory Council presentation
 - April 26th - ASO Cabinet (Support Vote)
 - Mah 1st - Academic Senate presentation
 - May 3rd - PBC presentation
 - May 7th - ECC Cabinet presentation
 - May 7th - ECC College Council presentation
 - May 10th - ASO Senate Approval - Final Vote
 - May 21st - ECC Board of Trustees - Presentation
 - Fall 2018 - Student Activity Fee = \$15





Questions & Answers

Student Fees per College - Date 7/14/2017

Notes: Fees below do not include summer/inter session terms and assume a full-time load. For annual fee, please copy and paste

COLLEGE	REP	STUDENT BOI	TRANSPORTAT	ID CARDS	TECH	CAMPUS CTR	Sem/C	ANNUAL	Has Camp
Berkeley College	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2.00	3	\$ 114.00	Yes
Cuesta College	\$ 1.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ 10.00	2	\$ 42.00	Yes
Foothill College	\$ 1.00	\$ -	\$ 5.00	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ 20.00	3	\$ 108.00	Yes
Laney College	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 41.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2.00	3	\$ 129.00	Yes
Los Medanos College	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.00	\$ -	3	\$ 30.00	No
Mission College	\$ 1.00	\$ -	\$ 15.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 5.00	2	\$ 62.00	Yes
West Valley College	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4.00	\$ -	\$ 15.00	2	\$ 38.00	Yes
Cabrillo College	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ 15.00	2	\$ 134.00	Yes
City College of San Francisco	\$ 1.00	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3.00	\$ -	3	\$ 27.00	No
Diablo Valley College	\$ 2.00	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.00	2	\$ 34.00	Yes
Evergreen Valley College	\$ 1.00	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 18.00	No
Merced College	\$ 1.00	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 12.00	No
Monterey Peninsula College	\$ 1.00	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.00	2	\$ 32.00	Yes
Napa Valley College	\$ 1.00	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ 5.00	\$ 10.00	\$ -	2	\$ 42.00	Yes
Ohlone College	\$ -	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5.00	\$ -	2	\$ 20.00	No
San Jose City College	\$ -	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 15.00	No
Solano Community College	\$ -	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.00	2	\$ 30.00	No
Gavilan College	\$ 1.00	\$ 6.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5.00	3	\$ 36.00	Yes
College of Marin	\$ 1.00	\$ 8.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.00	\$ 35.00	2	\$ 108.00	Yes
Southwestern College	\$ -	\$ 8.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1.00	2	\$ 18.00	Yes
De Anza College	\$ 1.50	\$ 9.00	\$ 5.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17.50	3	\$ 99.00	Yes
Chabot College	\$ -	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 30.00	No
El Camino College	\$ 0.50	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 21.00	No
Hartnell College	\$ -	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 30.00	No
Las Positas College	\$ 1.00	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 22.00	No
Santa Ana College	\$ 2.00	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 36.00	No
Victor Valley College	\$ 1.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 6.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.00	2	\$ 54.00	Yes
Santiago Canyon College	\$ 1.00	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 22.00	No
Mt. San Antonio College	\$ 0.50	\$ 11.00	\$ 9.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 61.50	Yes
Coastline Community College	\$ -	\$ 12.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 24.00	No

Fullerton College	\$ -	\$ 12.00	\$ -	\$ 3.50	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 31.00	Yes
Cañada College	\$ 1.00	\$ 15.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 48.00	No
College of San Mateo	\$ 1.00	\$ 15.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 48.00	Yes
College of the Canyons	\$ 1.00	\$ 15.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10.00	2	\$ 52.00	Yes
College of the Sequoias	\$ -	\$ 15.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 30.00	No
Santa Rosa Junior College	\$ 1.00	\$ 15.00	\$ -	\$ 3.00	\$ -	\$ 10.00	3	\$ 87.00	No
Skyline College	\$ 1.00	\$ 15.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	3	\$ 48.00	No
Butte College	\$ 2.00	\$ 18.00	\$ 73.00	\$ -	\$ 20.00	\$ -	2		No
Santa Monica College		\$ 19.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	4	\$ 78.00	Yes
Long Beach City College	\$ 2.00	\$ 20.00	-	-	-		2	\$ 44.00	Yes
Orange Coast College	\$ -	\$ 21.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 42.00	Yes
Merritt College	\$ -	\$ 25.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	2	\$ 50.00	No



Background

The Associated Students Organization (ASO) and Student Development Office (SDO), in partnership with the Auxiliary Services Board (ASB), conducted research to examine and propose an increase to the El Camino College (ECC) Student Activity Fee (ASB sticker). The ECC Student Activity Fee has been \$10/semester since at least 1996. Since 1996 the rising cost of inflation has challenged ASB programs to fund their programs. Coupled with the loss of Bookstore revenue to the Auxiliary Services Board (ASB), the ASB budget entered deficit spending.

In 2014, Administrative Procedure 5032 allocated the student activity fee revenue as follows: 35% to ASO and Inter-Club Council (ICC), 60% to ASB Board for Co-curricular components of academic programs such as Athletics, Fine Arts, and Journalism, and 5% to Reserves. Moreover, AP 5032 adopted an Opt-Out procedure in which students would be charged the \$10 fee per semester (fall and spring) unless they opt-out when paying their fees. AP 5032 generated increased income for ASO. Conversely, the ASB budget entered deficit spending. Thus, ASO and SDO contacted comparable college student governments and inquired about student fees, student government budgets, the existence and function of a body similar to ASB, and student government programs.

Summary of Findings

Information was gathered from 8 California Community Colleges (Orange Coast College, Santa Ana College, Cerritos College, Long Beach Community College, Los Angeles Community College District, Santa Monica College, Southwestern College, and Cabrillo College). Colleges were selected by Student Development Office staff based on similar student Full Time Equivalent (FTE) and proximity to El Camino College.

Total Student Activity Fees

Of the 9 colleges, El Camino ranks 3rd lowest in total fees charged per semester (See Table 1). Raising the student activity fee to \$15, would still mean lower total fees to students than other comparable institutions (Santa Monica, Orange Coast, Southwestern, and Long Beach).

Student Representation Fee *Education Code section 76060.5*- Such revenue can be used to travel to and from conferences sponsored by student organizations where legislative matters will be discussed, to purchase computer equipment needed to conduct legislative

research, and/or to pay for any other expense reasonably necessary to effectuate student representation activities.

Student Center Fee *Education Code section 76375*- Annual building and operating fee, for the purpose of financing, constructing, enlarging, remodeling, refurbishing, and operating a student body center.

Table 1

College	Activity Fee	Student Rep Fee	Student Center Fee	TOTAL Fees
LACCD	\$7.00	\$1.00		\$8.00
Cerritos	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10.00
El Camino	\$10.00	\$0.50	\$0.00	\$10.50
Cabrillo	\$10.00	\$1.00		\$11.00
Santa Ana	\$10.00	\$2.00		\$12.00
Southwestern	\$8.00	\$0.00	\$10.00	\$18.00
Santa Monica	\$19.50			\$19.50
Orange Coast	\$21.00			\$21.00
Long Beach	\$20.00	\$2.00		\$22.00

Moreover, in a system wide survey by the California Community College Student Affairs Association (CCCSAA), of the 42 Colleges reporting, El Camino College was tied for 22nd lowest cost for Student Activities Fees and 5th lowest annual fees charged to the student (See Appendix A). In raising the Student Activity Fee to \$15 per semester, El Camino College would be charging one of the highest amounts but still lower than comparable institutions (Southwestern, Santa Monica, Orange Coast, and Long Beach). At \$15 per semester, El Camino College would still be one of the lowest in total annual fees charged. El Camino College total annual fees would be \$32.00 which would be tied for 10th lowest among the 42 Colleges.

Student Government Budgets: Allocations

Most of the other College’s allocated 100% of the student activity funds to their ASO (Table 2). Compared to the six student governments who provided their budgets, ECC ASO allocates significantly less funds toward ASO events and programs.

Of the six Colleges who provided ASO operating budgets, El Camino College ASO ranks the lowest (Table 2) at \$121,600. The main source of income for ASO is the ASB sticker or the student activity fee, in which ASO receives 35% of the total revenue. The ECC ASO operating budget is about \$100,000 less than Santa Ana College and almost \$1.5 million less than Orange Coast College. The remaining College ASO budgets are significantly higher than ECC ASO.

With an increase to \$15 student activity fee, the ECC operating budget would be approximately \$176,000. Thus, ECC’s ASO budget would still rank the lowest of comparable institutions (Table 2).

The largest budget allocation for ECC is for campus enrichment (\$35,400), Student Representation Fee (SRF) conference travel (\$10,000), SRF advocacy (\$7,500), and AS conference attendance (\$8,500). Despite ranking lower among comparable student government budgets, ECC allocated \$40,000 to the Inter-Club Council (ICC) compared to the \$30,000 Southwestern and Orange Coast College allocated.

Table 2

College	Allocation% to Student Government	Student Government Budget
El Camino College	35%	\$121,600
Santa Ana	100.00%	\$212,725
Cabrillo College	100%	\$250,000
Southwestern	100.00%	\$337,121.00/\$581,437.00
Santa Monica	33%. 66% to student programs	\$1.2 million: \$400,000 (Unrestricted) \$800,000 (To other programs)
Cerritos	100.00%	\$1.3 million
Orange Coast	100.00%	1.6 million (\$78,000 for Programs) \$213,500.00 (Total Operating Budget)

Programs/Initiatives

Equipped with a larger budget, other comparable ASO’s are able to sufficiently fund different events and programs. For example, Southwestern College allocates nearly \$70,000 for campus activities and over \$100,000 on personnel including advisors, clerks, graphic designers, and other student workers. Santa Ana allocates nearly \$47,000 to leadership training, \$34,500 to student activities, and \$20,000 for their Book Loan Program. Orange Coast allocates \$120,000 for campus entities to request one-time funding for other programs and funds student life positions. Santa Monica allocates \$800,000 to address basic human needs such as food pantries and free Metro U-Passes for all students.

An increased budget would allow ASO and ICC to increase their positive impact on the student experience. ASO discussed applying increased funds to legacy projects such as FloWater, electrical charging stations, food pantries, transportation, and meeting other basic student needs. For example, ASO can increase their subsidy and support of offering discounted or free Metro U-Passes to students and increase financial support to establish extended Warrior Pantry hours and staffing and or add additional food pantries to the College. ASO could also fund more effective student leadership programs, contribute to personnel/staffing needs, and

address any emerging student needs. ASO/ICC may increase support to the Student Equity Advisory Council to expand equity programs, such as cultural heritage month events and Student Equity Program initiatives, to assist in closing the educational achievement gap.

A larger budget to ICC will increase the activities and programs that facilitate student involvement, leadership, development, and spirit. ICCs largest fiscal expense is to support clubs with programs and initiatives that enhance the student club experience (e.g. Robotics Competition). Moreover, ICC may encourage more off-campus excursions that facilitate increased co-curricular learning and activity (e.g. Hiking club). ICC may also support the formation of new student clubs which diversifies and addresses the diverse co-curricular interests of our students (e.g. Virtual Reality club). ICC may partner with ASO to develop leadership training opportunities and offer expert presentations for students to enhance their transformational leadership knowledge and skills. ICC may also electrify the College with increased school spirit by collaborating with Athletics to expand Homecoming and partner with multiple College departments to expand Warrior Wednesday activities.

Auxiliary Services Board (ASB) Budget

ASB raises, receives, and disburses funds for co-curricular activity of Athletics, Fine Arts, and Journalism and programs such as Project Success, Puente Project, Transfer Center, First-Year Experience, the Honors Transfer Program, and Math Engineering Science and Achievement (MESA). With increased funds allocated to ASO, elimination of Bookstore revenue, and increased temporary augmented funding for Athletics, Fine Arts, and Journalism, the ASB budget initiated deficit spending in FY 2016-17. Increasing the Student Activities fee will reduce the deficit spending. However, additional programmatic cuts are necessary to eliminate deficit spending.

The research revealed that no other College has a body similar to ASB. In fact, 100% of the student activity fee income is allocated to their ASO and ASO students decide on funding for other departments and divisions through funding request procedures. Santa Monica, with agreement of their ASO, allocates 66% of their budget for programs such as public transportation and food pantries, not curricular-related divisions (Table 2). Athletics, Journalism, Fine Arts, and other curricular-related programs are funded through general and other budgetary resources, not student activity fee money.

Recommendation

Since ECC has one of the lowest Student Activity fee costs and total annual fees charged to students, coupled with the lowest ASO annual operating budget and an ASB budget in deficit spending, this report generated a recommendation for ASO to increase the student activity fee from \$10 to \$15 for fall and spring semester. The report also recommends a further examination of ECC student activity fee money supporting academic related programs.