
EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: February 16, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DeSanto, Michael – Campus Police | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shenefield, Cheryl – Administrative Svcs. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natividad, Rory – Mgmt/Supervisors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spor, Arvid – Chair (non-voting) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patel, Dipte – Academic Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Tomoda, Kenji – ASO |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quinones-Perez, Margaret – ECCFT | <input type="checkbox"/> Turner, Gary – ECCE |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reid, Dawn – Student & Community Adv. | <input type="checkbox"/> Widman, Lance – Academic Senate |

OTHERS ATTENDING: Francisco Arce, Janice Ely, Katie Gleason, Jo Ann Higdon, Kelsey Iino, Ken Key, Jeanie Nishime, Juliet Ortiz, Emily Rader, Natalie Sripongkosol, John Wagstaff

Handouts: Current Budget Update from Regional CBO Meeting (2/10/12); 2/1/12 Letter from ACCJC; Planning Grid

Approval of February 2, 2012 Minutes

Corrections/additions:

1. Page 2, #3i, first sentence – change *ECC* to *ITS*. Reporting was correct the first year; coding changes occurred in the second year. Fifth sentence correction: “ECC had been counting these students as *out-of-state*, not as *in-state* students.”
2. Page 3, #8 – add, “*The entire audit including these documents can be found on-line (link listed on prior page under item #1)*”.

Budget Update (J. Higdon)

1. Nine districts were represented at the Regional CBO meeting on 2/10/12 with Dan Troy (Vice Chancellor of College Finance) on the phone.
2. Deficit factor now appears to be between 3.3 and 3.4 percent (this number will change constantly) and will apply to the total computational revenue.
3. P1 is the first principle apportionment estimate based on state revenues. Preliminary P1 may be out on February 20th. Apportionment numbers will change again in May, June, July and through December 2012.
4. At present, no workload reduction (reduction in amount the state will pay based on FTES) is associated with this deficit factor.
5. This deficit factor is in addition to the Trigger 1 and 2 cuts.
6. Estimated Statewide deficit factor at \$146 million comprised of two main items: \$40 million property tax shortfall (includes \$10 million Orange County lawsuit) and \$106 million additional/additional student fee shortage (includes fee shortages above what was estimated in Trigger 2).
7. Dan Troy stated it is very unlikely that funding formula 361 would be eliminated in the near future but will die under its own weight. Many were concerned the student success model was a signal that community colleges would no longer be paid based on services provided – only on student outcomes.
8. One district with severe fiscal problems may increase their faculty workload from 15 to 18 and change all classified and management positions to 10-month.

9. Report on Allan Hancock District's agreement to take on Cuesta Community College District is erroneous. Cuesta has not contacted Allan Hancock administrators and believes all problems have been resolved and accreditation will not be pulled. Some feel Cuesta is in denial about their accreditation status.
10. Most districts at the meeting appeared to have or project serious cash flow problems including those with substantial reserves. Districts can use Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) to finance short term cash flow deficits but one district believed their TRAN would cost them over \$.5 million. TRAN interest rate percentages are reviewed by S&P and Moody.
11. Revenue from property taxes collected in basic aid districts are higher for community colleges in these districts than non-basic aid districts. There are four basic aid districts. Basic aid districts still receive categorical funding.
12. Recommendations were made to the Chancellor's Office to question how counties are reporting property taxes. "Teeter" districts refer to counties that pay property tax revenues to local agencies based on assessment amounts. The county retains all collected amounts--including penalties and interest. L.A. County is not a teeter district. Riverside County is a teeter district.

Midterm Progress Report (J. Nishime/A. Spor)

1. ECC submitted mid-term progress report October 2011 to the Accrediting Commission in response to nine recommendations that were issued from the 2008 visit. The Commission met in January and submitted the February 1st letter requiring ECC to submit a follow-up report by October 15, 2012 responding to five recommendations. Major concern is that both the ECC and CEC must meet accrediting standards.
 - a. Recommendation 1 –ECC and CEC are to be at sustainable level in program review, planning and budgeting.
 - b. Recommendation 2 – ECC already completed the recommendation to define and publish timeline to develop and implement student learning outcomes and assessments. ECC and CEC are making good progress to reach proficiency level by the end of this year.
 - c. Recommendation 4 – Online courses and programs need to be at same level of rigor as on campus programs. ECC has addressed this recommendation by submitting a substantive change proposal. Academic Affairs has worked to ensure rigor is met and success/retention rates increased. ECC is fully meeting this recommendation.
 - d. Recommendation 5 – ECC needs to work on integrating SLO assessment as part of the faculty evaluation process.
 - e. Recommendation 6 – fiscal management plan for all sites. ECC is in good shape and plan was submitted for Compton.
2. The statement reminding ECC that the Compton Center is a satellite of the College is of major concern. If Compton fails to meet all Commission eligibility and accreditation standards (not just the five recommendations), this will have a direct and negative impact on ECC's accreditation. Compton does not and will not meet eligibility requirements for several years. Is there a separate report addressing Compton's deficiencies? The Commission only sends one letter to the institution. The February 1st letter addresses the deficiencies in the five recommendations that need to be corrected by October 2012. Compton has another two years until the next comprehensive evaluation in the fall of 2014. There is a separate Compton accreditation committee working to help them meet their eligibility requirements. A discussion followed about the effects of the Compton partnership on ECC's accreditation status.
3. A discussion took place about the Accrediting Commission's method of responding to the College's follow-up to the Commission's recommendations. The College submitted a thorough report indicating how the online recommendation deficiencies were resolved but the Commission repeated their response verbatim with no explanation why they didn't agree. Most of what was written in the College's follow-up report was geared towards the Torrance campus; maybe the

Commission felt there should be more information involving Compton. The January 31, 2011 letter from the Commission indicated that ECC met all nine recommendations. The February 1, 2012 letter indicates the Commission re-evaluated their assessment and determined five recommendations should include Compton which is not at the expected level. ECC's response to the recommendations must be submitted by October 15, 2012. Will request Compton faculty participation as an accreditation co-chair.

4. For more information on accreditation, go to www.accjc.org. The accreditation standards and guide to evaluating institutions are posted on this website. J. Nishime will forward PBC a letter updating status of colleges in the accreditation process.

Planning Update (A. Spor)

1. Planning Grid – program review recommendations are placed into program plans. Plans should indicate level of recommendations completed or addressed and evaluate the effectiveness of the plan. A. Spor reviewed all program, unit and area plans for ECC and CEC from 2008-09 to 2012-13.
 - a. The number of ECC program plans submitted was stable throughout the years. The 2012-13 program and unit plan numbers dropped due to plan duplications.
 - b. The number of program, unit and area CEC plans fluctuated. Only 10 of 42 program plans that were due on 12/31/11 were submitted. Many challenges in Compton's planning process include missed deadlines and fluctuations, preventing them from reaching a sustainable level.
2. Mandatory planning manager training will be held at Compton in March and at ECC in April. Training will cover the evaluation process and making sure goals and objectives are written appropriately. Program review recommendations need to be clearly stated in plans. Statement was made that it is difficult to get program plans approved by division council during the long break in the winter session. A. Spor will get input from Academic Senate and Council of Deans to develop plan due dates and reminders.

The next meeting is scheduled on March 1, 2012.