September 1, 2011

Board of Trustees
El Camino Community College District

Dear Members of the Board:

You will recall that our next Board meeting is scheduled to be held on Thursday, September 8, 2011, at 4 p.m. in the Board room.

The meeting will open with a presentation regarding Financial Aid followed by a public hearing and adoption of the 2011-2012 El Camino Community College District budget. Vice President Higdon’s budget letter is included in this packet as Attachment 1 and the budget is posted on the web site.

A. The Academic Affairs section includes the second reading of Policy 3750, Use of Copyrighted Materials and Policy 6160, Computer and Network Use Policy. Both policies have gone through the collegial consultation process.

B. The Student and Community Advancement section presents the Accreditation Midterm Report which includes responses to all nine recommendations, two Commission Concerns and 59 self-identified issues from the 2008 Self-Study. Additional edits will take place during September with a final document mailed to the Accrediting Commission by October 10, 2011. The Accreditation Midterm report is on the website at http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/vpaa/accreditation/accreditation.asp

C. Administrative Services includes the Quarterly Fiscal Status Report and various contracts and purchase orders necessary for the start of school.

D. Administrative Services – Measure E Bond fund, Item E, includes a change order for the Taisei Construction Corporation – Math Business Allied Health Building project. Additional information is included as Attachment 2.
E. The Superintendent President's section presents the Redistricting Action Plan and Agenda and Minutes for the August 17, 2011, meeting of the Boundary Review Committee. You will also note recommendation to amend the Board’s Goals for 2010-2011 to add Ethics and Sexual Harassment training requirements.

Following items are included for your perusal:

1. Letter from Francisco Arce, August 17, 2011, regarding Board Policy 4231, Grade Change, which was pulled from the Board agenda;

2. Letter from Francisco Arce, August 17, 2011, regarding articulation agreements;


4. Background Information: Chancellor's Office and Historically Black Colleges and Universities Transfer Numbers, July 18, 2011.

President Fallo will be in his office at 3 p.m. on Thursday, September 8, 2011, for those who wish to arrive early. In the meantime please contact me or Kathy Oswald if you have any questions, comments or concerns.

Sincerely,

Jeanie Nishime
Vice President,
Student and Community Advancement

Cc: Vice Presidents, Director, Community Relations
September 1, 2011

TO: President Thomas Fallo

RE: Budget 2011-12

The State's fiscal environment continues to be the driving force which dictates caution in all California community college budgets. El Camino College is fortunate to have initiated fiscal prudence early in this economic downturn. You will recall that the Board began taking restrictive budget actions relating to this economic downturn in December of 2008. We continued our cost cutting for the FY 10-11 budget and now must maintain this cautious mode.

While the State Budget process began with a call for compromise, along with a possible vote on taxes, it ended with a simple majority vote. That budget identified a $26.6 billion gap—with borrowing, transfers, expenditure reductions and "realignments" reducing that gap. The State's budget is now some $5.5 billion lower than in the 2010-11 fiscal year. Fears of low revenues lead to a budget for 2011-12 with automatic "trigger cuts" defined as follows:

Tier 0 = No midyear cuts if at least $3 to $4 billion of the higher revenues of $6.6 billion materialize.

Tier 1 = If $2 to $3 billion materialize, some $30 million additional cuts are to be made to California Community Colleges (may be offset by increased fees).

Tier 2 = If less than $2 billion of the revenues materialize, over $1.8 billion in cuts could be taken from K-14 budgets ($72 million to California Community Colleges).

The automatic triggers referenced above will avoid the Legislature having to vote to set Prop. 98 aside—it will be automatically be set aside.

Midyear triggers will be determined before or on December 15. There are additional warnings of potential fee shortages and property tax shortfalls. Add to those warnings very serious cash flow shortages and slow downs of payments at
the State level. Since our College receives apportionment payments from the State, these intentional slowdowns of receipts will negatively impact our cash flow position.

Additional challenging issues are the reduction in course offerings as well as the continued low funding of categorical, student-services programs. The forced reduction of our State funded FTES to no more than 18,200 FTES (an estimated reduction of 266 course sections) is devastating to our core mission of providing needed classes to our students. Should the Tier cuts described above occur, our funded FTES will drop further and corresponding reductions in sections will follow. Enrollment management becomes more and more challenging as these forced reductions in funded FTES occur.

Our categorical programs are currently being back filled with over a $1 million of Fund 15 revenues that are received by the College from the State for its partnership with Compton.

We continue to be faced with many unknowns in our FY 11-12 budget. Regardless of these challenges, the College will maintain our planning and budgeting cycle at the program, unit, area and college levels. As State budget changes occur throughout the year, we will keep our Board informed on impacts to our College budget.

Jo Ann Higdon, M.P.A.
Vice President, Administrative Services
**CHANGE ORDER – TAISEI CONSTRUCTION – MBA**

Comment on all change orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change building door hardware including, door hinges from 3 knuckle hinges to 5 knuckle hinges, door closers, door stops, and door seals at fire rated doors. This change is requested by the District to provide door hardware complying with revised campus standards.</td>
<td>$14,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify fire lane and concrete pathway widths and associated irrigation and landscaping. District Request</td>
<td>-$3,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an additional level of refinement to the exposed sandblasted concrete form joints. This change is requested by the District to provide an improved uniform appearance to interior concrete walls.</td>
<td>24,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Air Handling Unit # 5 to increase capacity per mechanical engineer’s revision to original drawings and specifications. This change is required to provide adequate cooling and heating in building spaces supplied by this unit. The original plans did not provide adequate capacity due to mechanical engineer’s error.</td>
<td>24,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a panic hardware on 3 automatic store front door sliders and connect to the fire life safety system in the building. District Request</td>
<td>7,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install four additional combination fire smoke dampers (CFSDs) for the supply and return air ducts on the 1st and 4th floors. The original plans did not show required CFSDs at these locations due to mechanical engineer’s error.</td>
<td>5,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install concrete wedge anchors for the fastening of brick veneer, throughout the West and East elevations of the building, in lieu of that shown on the project's specifications. The Division of the State Architect approved the anchors shown on the project’s specifications but now is requiring wedge anchors. Code Compliance</td>
<td>32,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade 13 voice data floor boxes from 4 ports to 7 ports. Install 4 additional floor boxes. This change is requested by the District to provide hardware complying with revised campus standards and increase room use flexibility.</td>
<td>25,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Item 4., Cabinet understood that the air handler was needed to increase per specs and codes, but President questioned why we should pay if “engineer’s error”. These are additional costs the contractor incurred and is entitled to under its contract with ECC’s. ECC will claim against the architect/engineer for the cost difference between what would have been paid at bid time versus change order pricing.

Bob Gann, Director, Facilities Planning & Services
August 17, 2011

President Thomas Fallo  
Office of the President  
El Camino College  
Torrance, CA 90506

RE: First Reading of Board Policy 4231 (Grade Change)

Dear Tom:

I scheduled a follow-up meeting with Chris Gold, Bill Mulrooney, Don Goldberg, Merriel Winfree and Claudia Lee to review the proposed policy. We will either incorporate Trustee Beverly’s recommendations for language changes or consider developing a separate policy to give the District authority to initiate a grade change in the event of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency. The current BP 4231 is primarily intended to give students the right to appeal a grade as opposed to giving the District the authority to change a grade. The latter may require a separate policy for clarity. The revisions should be completed in time for the October 2011 Board of Trustees meeting.

Regards,

Francisco Arce
August 17, 2011

President Thomas Fallo
Office of the President
El Camino College
Torrance, CA 90506

RE: Follow-up on Articulation Agreements

Dear Tom:

During the Board meeting, Trustee Brown asked for information about articulation agreements and how these are developed at the College. After the closed session, I briefly spoke with Trustee Brown and informed him that articulation agreements are handled by the College articulation officer, Lori Suekawa. I also told him I will follow-up with any specific questions he may have about forming an articulation agreement with colleges and universities. We agreed that in the future, he would refer his contacts at HBCUs to contact my office or Lori Suekawa to discuss their questions.

Regards,

Francisco Arce
August 19, 2011

TO: Superintendents and Presidents
    Governing Board Members
    Los Angeles County School and Community College Districts

FROM: Matthew F. Spies, Secretary
       Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization
       and
       Interim Assistant Director
       Regionalized Business Services
       Division of Business Advisory Services

SUBJECT: Nominations for Membership on the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization

The Los Angeles County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) is an 11 member body charged by the legislature with responsibilities in the area of school district organization, unification, formation, boundary changes, the manner in which governing board members are elected, and the establishment and abolition of trustee areas. The County Committee is comprised of two members representing each of the five Supervisorial districts, plus one member elected at-large.

VACANCIES ON THE COUNTY COMMITTEE

On October 20, 2011, the following four-year terms of office on the County Committee will be filled by election, and the candidates will serve through October 2015:

• Vacant (Third Supervisorial District);

• Ms. Suzan T. Solomon (Fifth Supervisorial District); and,

• Mr. Lloyd de Lamas (At-Large Representative).

Per Education Code (EC) provisions, these seats will be filled by an election. Therefore, the County Committee is requesting that the governing board of each school and community college district submit nominations for membership on the County Committee to fill these three seats.
Please follow the guidelines under “Nominee Requirements” and “Nomination Process” as outlined below for the above vacancies.

**NOMINEE REQUIREMENTS**

- Any nominee must be available to serve the term of office, which will begin on the date of election on October 20, 2011, and expire on the date of election in October 2015.

- All nominees for the seats in the Third and Fifth Supervisorial Districts must reside in those districts. Nominees for the At-Large seat may reside anywhere in Los Angeles County. Attached are maps of the Third and Fifth Supervisorial Districts.

- All nominees must be registered voters.

- Employees of school and community college districts, and county offices of education, are excluded from membership on the County Committee.

- A member of a school or community college district governing board, who is otherwise eligible, may simultaneously serve as a member of the County Committee.

- To ensure representation that is balanced and diverse, the County Committee encourages school and community college districts to additionally consider nominating non-school district community leaders/individuals to serve on the County Committee.

- The County Committee members whose terms are expiring this year are eligible to be nominated to serve another term of office, as there is no limit on the number of terms a County Committee member may serve.

**NOMINATION PROCESS**

- A governing board may submit more than one nomination.

- A governing board may nominate an individual who resides outside their district.

- A governing board wishing to submit a nomination(s) must send the name(s) of the nominee(s), accompanied by a biographical sketch not to exceed 200 words, to the attention of Ms. Mary Bracamontes by September 16, 2011, at the following address:

  Los Angeles County Office of Education  
  Division of Business Advisory Services  
  9300 Imperial Highway  
  Downey, CA 90242-2890
Nominations may also be made from the floor during the annual meeting where the election of members will take place. Residency requirements and the nominee’s willingness to serve must first be validated before these candidates can be seated.

ELECTION PROCESS

- The election of members to the County Committee will take place at an annual meeting of the voting representatives of the governing boards of school and community college districts called for that purpose.

- The annual meeting will be held in conjunction with the fall meeting of the Los Angeles County School Trustees Association on October 20, 2011. Information concerning the time and location of this meeting will be distributed when available.

- **The election is an at-large election.** The voting representative from each district governing board will cast a vote for each vacant position. It is not necessary for a district to fall within the boundaries of a Supervisory district where a vacancy exists in order to make a nomination or to cast a vote.

- The person from your district entitled to vote at the annual meeting is the person selected by your board pursuant to EC §35023 (K-12 school districts), or EC §72403 (community college districts).

- The voting representative may opt to vote by using an absentee ballot in lieu of casting a vote at the annual meeting. **The use of an absentee ballot is the preferred method.**

- Your district’s voting representative will receive biographical information on the candidates and voting instructions approximately one month prior to the meeting. An “Absence Ballot” form will also be provided at that time to districts desiring to utilize this method of voting in lieu of attending the annual meeting to cast a vote.

This bulletin and its attachments are posted on the Los Angeles County Office of Education’s (LACOE) Web site at the following address:

www.lacoe.edu/bas

Select “Bulletins” on the left side of the screen under the heading “BAS Resources,” and then use the “Find” function to locate a specific bulletin by number or keyword.
If you or a nominee desire additional information relative to the County Committee's functions or activities, please contact me at (562) 922-6336.

Approved:
Melvin lizuka, Director
Division of Business Advisory Services

MFS/AD:mb
Attachments

Info. Bul. No. 39
BAS-18-2011-12
Michael D. Antonovich
Supervisor, Fifth District
Population: 2,092,704*
Square Miles: 2,838
(07/06 COUNTY ESTIMATE)
(213) 974-5555
FifthDistrict@lacbos.org
869 Kenneth Hahn
Hall of Administration
500 W. Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Cities
Alhambra
Arcadia
Bradbury
Burbank
Claremont
Covina
Duarte
Glendale
Glendora
La Canada-Flintridge
La Verne
Lancaster
Los Angeles (portion)
Monrovia
Palmdale
Pasadena
San Dimas
San Gabriel
San Marino
Santa Clarita
Sierra Madre
South Pasadena
Temple City
West Covina

Los Angeles City
Canoga Park (portion)
Chatsworth (portion)
Granada Hills
Mission Hills (portion)
Olive View Hospital
(in Sylmar)
Porter Ranch
Sunland (portion)
Sun Valley (portion)
Tujunga

Unincorporated Areas

Montrose
Neenach
North Claremont
(islands) (portion)
Northeast San Dimas
(islands)
Oat Mountain
Pearblossom
Placerita Canyon
Quartz Hill
Redman
Roosevelt
San Pasqual
Saugus
Soledad
Stevenson Ranch
Sulphur Springs
Sunland/Sylmar/
Tujunga (adjacent)
Sun Village
Three Points
Twin Lakes
Val Verde
Valencia
Valyermo
Vasquez Rocks
West Arcadia (islands)
West Chatsworth
(portion)
West Pomona (islands)
White Fence Farms
Wilsona Gardens
Wrightwood
Background Information: Chancellor’s Office and HBCU Transfer Numbers

Each year, the Chancellor’s Office creates a report that outlines the number of students who transfer to in-state private and out-of-state 4-year universities, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). To generate this report, the Chancellor’s Office partners with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), an organization that verifies student enrollment. Through NSC, the Chancellor’s Office gains access to a robust set of student data that is more detailed than what individual institutions have access to. Consequently, the Office of Institutional Research reports the numbers obtained by the Chancellor’s Office, as outlined below.

Table 1. Transfers to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination Institution</th>
<th>Count of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETHUNE COOKMAN COLLEGE</td>
<td>06-07: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>07-08: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA A &amp; M UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>08-09: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOREHOUSE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>06-07: 1, 07-08: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA UNION UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>08-09: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>2, 2, 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chancellor’s Office follows a stringent methodology to obtain these transfer numbers. First, only first-time students at ECC are counted. In other words, students who previously enrolled in courses at another community college are not reported. Second, students must have completed a minimum of 12 units at ECC and have a social security number. Last, the report reflects only the first 4-year institution students transferred to. If an ECC student transferred to a 4-year institution and subsequently an HBCU, that student is also not counted toward HBCU.

An additional consideration includes students’ right to privacy. According to the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), if a student requests privacy, the institution must honor the student’s request and therefore cannot send his/her data to NSC. Also, NSC matches data using students’ social security numbers. If the Chancellor’s Office has missing or incorrect student identifiers, NSC will not be able to match students and they are consequently excluded from the count. Furthermore, NSC relies on each institution’s reports. Because some institutions are not members of NSC, the system’s student data matching capabilities are limited.

Aside from using data from NSC, the best method of collecting the count of transfer students is by hand. Although not always practical, contacting each institution directly is the most accurate way to obtain transfer numbers since institutions have privileged access to student data, such as transcripts. Table 2 outlines the number of students currently enrolled at Clark Atlanta University and the number of students who accepted their offers to Howard
University. The number of students currently enrolled at Howard University is unclear given the possibility that not all students who accepted their offers enrolled in courses.

Table 2. Count of Currently Enrolled and Accepted Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination Institution</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>Currently Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD UNIVERSITY*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The count of students who are currently enrolled at Howard University is currently unavailable.

Careful review of the list of Clark Atlanta University students revealed that it was not generated using a methodology similar to that of the Chancellor’s Office. The 15 students on the list are currently enrolled students who transferred from El Camino College over multiple years. The exact time during which these students transferred, however, is unknown. Some students are newly enrolled students while others are returning students. The Chancellor’s Office report, however, examines only students who transferred for a specific year. Additionally, without greater details about how the list was generated, it is unclear whether these students transferred directly from ECC or transferred to Clark Atlanta from another 4-year institution. Given the inconsistent methodology, the list of Clark Atlanta students cannot be compared with the specified numbers obtained by NSC.

Dissimilar from Clark Atlanta’s list of currently enrolled ECC transfers, the list from Howard University is comprised of ECC students who were accepted for admittance between 2005 and 2011. Of these 42 students, only 29 students accepted the offer. Dividing these 29 students by the 7-year span, an average of 4-5 students accepted their offer to attend Howard each year. This approximate number is greater than those reported by the Chancellor’s Office for a number of reasons previously mentioned. First, although they accepted the offer, one cannot assume that all of these students enrolled. Second, ECC might not be the first community college that these students attended. Last, Howard may not be the first 4-year institution that students transferred to. As a result, it is likely that the number of transfer students mirror those reported by the Chancellor’s Office when following a similar methodology.

Taking these confounding factors into consideration, the discrepancy in transfer numbers provided by HBCUs and NSC is minimal. Because of the strict methodology, the transfer numbers represent a very specific population—students who enrolled at a community college for the first time at ECC and transferred to their first 4-year university at a HBCU—per year. Therefore, unless comparing trends, NSC data should not be compared with other data sources. Although it has some limitations, since NSC data is reported by institutions, it is the best source aside from hand-checking with each institution.