EL CAMINO COLLEGE

Planning & Budgeting Committee Minutes Date: June 4, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT	
 ☑ David Brown - ECCE ☑ Connie Fitzsimons – Academic Affairs ☑ Alice Grigsby -Management/Supervisors ☑ Ken Key - ECCFT ☒ Rory K. Natividad – Chair (non-voting) 	 ☑ Dawn Reid – Student & Community Adv. ☑ Cheryl Shenefield–Administrative Services ☑ Dean Starkey – Campus Police ☑ Jessica Siripat – ASO, Student Rep. ☑ Lance Widman - Academic Senate
Other Attendees: Members: William Garcia, Emi Ely, Irene Graff, Jo Ann Higdon, Jeanie Nishime, Jea	ily Rader, Jackie Sims, Gary Turner Support: Janice an Shankweiler
The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m.	

<u>**Tentative Budget**</u> – J. Higdon (handout)

- 1. Changes to the tentative budget were reviewed as part of the second reading. The first change to the tentative budget was to STRS. The STRS employer contribution rates increased to 10.73%. The second change was to increase the transfer to the Police Department (\$600,000).
- 2. A correction was noted to the bottom of page 6. Under the footnote the letter s needs to be corrected to the letter t.
- 3. It was noted that classified salaries are showing a higher sum in this budget year as compared to next year because this year's numbers include the figures for the retroactive increases for 2014/15.
- 4. The figures for the retiree benefits will need to be adjusted. The figures for 2013/14 showed \$741,306 but for the tentative budget for 2015/16 showed \$309,690. End of the year close-outs and transfers will be done to correct this. The transfer should bring the total up to around \$750,000.
- 5. Clarification was given to the items on page 14 (Special Programs). Student Services had other programs which were back-filled that are not reflected on this list. Some of the categorical programs have been restored and those will no longer be funded out of fund 15. The prioritization process for allocating funding under other programs category has not yet been completed.
- 6. A motion to approve the tentative budget was made by C. Shenefield, seconded by L. Widman and unanimously approved by the committee

Approval of the April 2, 2015 Minutes

- 1. Page 2, Planning Summer Debrief, #2, after the first sentence add: These are now in place.
- 2. The minutes will be amended for clarification and posted on the website.

Full-Time Hiring Obligation – L. Widman

1. An informational item was presented regarding the amount of hiring full-time faculty. The college is over by almost 12% with our Faculty Obligation Number (FON), currently at 306.20 for the college. The Chancellor's Office document identified that we are currently at 342.66. It was noted it appears more hiring is being done with full-time faculty positions than needed as we are

well over our obligation number. Money being used to hire more faculty than needed could otherwise be used for other purposes. There was additional discussion about the districts history of the FON as well as discussion about the 50% rule that requires that 50% of the districts budget be allocated for direct student instruction. Information will be sent out to the committee on this topic for them to review and stimulate some discussions.

- 2. There will be a page in the final budget book (page 55) showing the history of our faculty hiring for the last 25 years.
- 3. It was recommended that Administrative Services provide the PBC a listing of the age distribution of full-time faculty to gain a better understanding of the importance of hiring new full-time faculty in anticipation of the baby boom generation retiring. It was suggested we be more judicious in our hiring process and possibly could make a recommendation to the president regarding this issue.

Student Access and Student Fee Drops – L. Widman

- 1. The student drop policy for non-payment of fees was discussed by the committee. It was asked if it was possible to have a program where students who do not have the funds available to pay their fees could be able to take their classes on the assumption the campus covers their fees, and they have a certain amount of time to pay them back to the college. It would help our FTES if we could carry these students through the first census before they are dropped.
- 2. It was stated that once the semester begins, the state does not allow a student to be dropped for non-payment. It makes it difficult to know where our enrollment stands because students will wait until the first day of school to add a class.
- 3. Right now if a student owes fees, they cannot obtain their transcripts or enroll in other courses until they have paid their fees. This procedure is in-house in that if they leave and go to another campus, their debts will not be carried over to that particular college.
- 4. It was recognized there are problems with the wait list. If room becomes available in a class and the waitlisted student is then moved into the active enrollment, they are not always aware this is done and do not know they need to go and pay for the class they were just moved into. Consequently the student is then dropped from all of their classes for non-payment.
- 5. Delays in receiving financial aid are also problematic. The financial aid process over the last couple of years has become more efficient for the students. The turnaround time has drastically improved from 14 weeks to 4 to 6 weeks. An incentive has also been added for students. If they submit all their paperwork correctly by June 1, they will be assured a disbursement by the first week of the fall semester.
- 6. The FTES which is lost for non-payment was reviewed. It was noted this amount did not appear to be significant. Students do tend to reenroll in other classes.
- 7. A suggestion was made to possibly offer students the option of a payment plan. This has been done with a small group and it did not work.
- 8. Another issue which has arisen is when students return home from an out-of-state college to take summer classes they are flagged as non-resident students. It was noted that Bill Mulrooney could speak to this issue at a future meeting.
- 9. More discussions will be scheduled on this issue.

Institutional Effectiveness Portal Goals – I. Graff (handout)

- 1. A handout was distributed regarding the requirement and process for adopting a system-wide set of indicators called the institutional effectiveness goals and framework. These goals are intended to encourage improvement in institutional effectiveness at the California Community College level.
- 2. There are a set of college indicators related to student achievement. There is also district indicators related to accreditation and fiscal stability.
- 3. Under the college indicators, there is one required goal for student success and course completion. There are also a series of optional goals for our accreditation status. Each institution has to set

- one-year and six-year goals to improve on these rates. There is one required goal for successful course completion which needs to be completed and submitted by June 15.
- 4. It was clarified that the handout for the college indicator rates are for El Camino Torrance only. The Compton Center has their own separate set of rates and goals.
- 5. The PBC was asked for their endorsement of these previously consulted rates as the college's one-year and six-year goals for its institutional effectiveness framework. As it stands now, there is no penalty for not achieving a goal.
- 6. This topic will be brought back to the PBC each year for the consultation process.
- 7. District indicator rates need to have established goals for our fund balance and audit findings. A goal needs to be established by June 15. A correction was noted under audit findings: all thee listings saying modified should be change to unmodified.
- 8. It was noted the fund balance goal would come from the College Cabinet.
- 9. The PBC members gave their endorsement for the college and indicator rates as presented.

Adjournment – R. Natividad

1. The meeting adjourned at 2:17 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for **June 18, 2015, at 1:00** p.m., in Library 202.

RKN/lmo

