# EL CAMINO COLLEGE **Planning & Budgeting Committee Minutes**

Date: February 20, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT	
<ul><li>☑ Dean Starkey - Campus Police</li><li>☑ Sean Donnell - ECCFT</li></ul>	<ul><li>□ Dawn Reid - Student &amp; Community Adv.</li><li>□ Cheryl Shenefield - Administrative Services</li></ul>
Dipte Patel - Academic Affairs	Rory K. Natividad - Chair (non-voting)
☐ Alice Grigsby - Management/Supervisors	☐ Gary Turner - ECCE
Liliana Lopez - ASO	□ Lance Widman - Academic Senate
Other Attendees: Members - David Brown, Connie Fitzsimons, William Garcia, Emily Rader, Michael Trevis	
Support – Francisco Arce, Janice Ely, Jo Ann Higdon, Je	anie Nishime, John Wagstaff
The meeting was called to order at 1:04 p m.	

### **Approval of February 6, 2014 Minutes**

The minutes were reviewed and approved as submitted. The minutes will be posted.

### **Budget Updates - Actuarial** – J. Higdon (handout)

- 1. It was noted P1 has still not been posted.
- 2. The draft version of the actuarial study was presented to the committee. This is the study of El Camino district retiree health liabilities as of October of last year. The actuarial accrued liability (AAL) was listed at \$22,214,690. The prior amount was noted as \$22,355,715. The current report will not go on line until it is presented to the board.
- 3. A change in the expected life spans of individuals (PERS) is an item which will affect the next actuarial report (in two years). This will have a negative impact on our next actuarial study. El Camino has established a GASB 43 trust for future OPEB benefits. The actuarial value of plan assets as of September 2013 was \$17,189,426. It is estimated the "pay-as-you-go" cost (cost of benefits for current retirees) of providing retiree health benefits in the year beginning October 1, 2013 to be \$741,306. It was clarified the GASB 43 has to be fully funded as an irrevocable trust before it can be utilized.
- 4. It was noted that the State's recalculation of FY 2012-13 State revenue translated into additional apportionment funds of \$534,473. However, the State will not pay ECC these funds until such time as other districts (who now owe funds to the State) pay those funds. This State recalculation is based upon receipts from income taxes, property taxes, student fees, RDA and EPA funding.
- 5. It was noted the "pay-as-you-go funding" for retiree benefits is showing a trend of more than doubling within a ten-year period. This presents good reasoning to get the GASB fully funded so expenditures could then be paid out of the trust fund.

## **Board of Governors Fee Waiver (BOGFW)** – W. Garcia

1. Students receiving fee waivers will be required to meet minimum academic and progress standards to remain eligible for the financial assistance under new regulations adopted by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. This policy takes effect in fall 2016. This is a key component of the Board of Governors' Student Success Initiative. The Student Success Act of 2012 - Initiative/SB1456 states we will now apply academic standards to BOG eligibility as well as income criteria.

- 2. The office of Intuitional Planning and Research will be helping to come up with a two-year study from 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years to determine the effect if both ECC and the Compton Center had implemented this state mandate in the fall of 2011.
- 3. Under the new regulations, students would lose their BOGFW if they are on probation for not maintaining a 2.0 grade average for two consecutive semesters or not successfully completing half of their units attempted in that period. They can also lose it if they have more than 100 units completed. This excludes basic skills or English as a second language.
- 4. The first report reflects that in fall 2011, 52% of El Camino students were recipients of the BOGFW. If at that time this mandate would have gone into effect, approximately 15% of those students would have lost their eligibility based on the academic standards not the income criteria.
- 5. The trends resulting from this research showed a potential\_disproportional impact on African-American and Latino students at both campuses. Enrollment management will continue to monitor the trend of disproportional impact on any student group.
- 6. It was clarified that a mandated group is a group the BOG has identified that should receive priority registration or may be eligible to be exempt from the state mandate. This information is being provided because some of the mandated groups want to know how their potential students would be impacted.
- 7. In spring 2012, 53% of El Camino students were recipients of the BOGFW with 19% who would have lost their BOG eligibility.
- 8. The research has shown that implementation of this mandate would negatively impact enrollment. It was noted the critical component at this stage is to plan how to raise awareness, intervene, and reduce the number of probationary students. The committee members were strongly encouraged to share this information with their constituents.
- 9. The second report reflects that in fall 2011, 71% of Compton Center students were recipients of the BOGFW with approximately 12% who would have lost their eligibility. In spring 2012, 73% of Compton Center students were recipients of BOGFW with 17% who would have lost their BOGFW eligibility.
- 10. It was noted before this mandate will be implemented; there should be a state-wide database to help the colleges in tracking their BOGFW students.
- 11. It was mentioned that the Counseling department currently intervenes with students who are second semester probation.

#### FTEF/FTES Comparison Clarifications – F. Arce

1. For clarification the funded FTES for this year is 18,470. Next year for 2014-15 the legislature is funding a 3% increase which would bring us to 19,024 FTES. An additional 1% growth will be added to this amount to give us 19,209 FTES. There is a possibility we will capture extra growth if there is FTES around the state that does not hit cap.

## PBC Goals Update- R. Natividad

- 1. The development of a PBC website is in the works. A portal site has already been established.
- 2. The planning calendar was distributed with no changes. This will go forward to the board as an informational item. It was noted the academic calendar has shifted so another look at the calendars might be needed unit plans and schedule development are being developed at the same time. It is suggested we stay with the current planning calendar for now through this cycle until there is more discussion. The committee was encouraged to give feedback on this issue.

#### **Closing Comments** – R. Natividad

1. A campus climate survey link will be sent out as a link for review and input from the committee.

#### **Adjournment** – R. Natividad

1. The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m. The next meeting will be March 6 at 1:00 p.m., in Library 202.

