<div align="center">

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: August 6, 2009

</div>

MEMBERS PRESENT:

☐	Fornes, Jonathan – ASO	☒	Shenefield, Cheryl – Administrative Svcs.
☒	Jackson, Tom – Academic Affairs	☒	Spor, Arvid – Chair
☐	Ott, Jonathan – Campus Police	☒	Turner, Gary – ECCE
☒	Quinones-Perez, Margaret – ECCFT	☐	Tyler, Harold – Management/Supervisors
☐	Reid, Dawn – Student & Community Adv.	☒	Widman, Lance – Academic Senate

OTHERS ATTENDING: Francisco Arce, Julie Bourlier, Bob Gann, Jo Ann Higdon, Claudia Lee, Jeanette Magee, Luis Mancia, Jeanie Nishime, Emily Rader, John Wagstaff

Handouts: Academic Affairs Recommendations from Plan Builder Goals – Priority Rankings
SCA Funding Priorities Survey Results
Administrative Services Objectives for 2009-10

The meeting was called to order at 1:04 p.m.

2009 Area Plan Prioritization Process:

1. The prioritization process is still not widely understood throughout campus. The process started with each manager discussing and jointly prioritizing their department plans to create a division plan. Deans then brought their prioritized division plans to group meetings with other area deans and the area VP to discuss and prioritize the area plan. The VPs came together with the prioritized area plans to create a prioritized list of campus plans.

Academic Affairs:
1. Developed prioritizations in four general areas: staffing, facilities, technology and instructional equipment, and other. Deans and their departments were advised to use their program review recommendations. 8 deans and 1 director voted on and grouped priorities (column on the left).
    a. Staffing: senior clerical positions in BSS, BUS and H.S.A, and a Library position were approved for replacement, which aligned with the ranking process.
    b. Technology: - most priority-1 items have been purchased. Can give committee copy of list of instructional equipment that was funded by plan number. Requests and recommendations were made for ongoing software and licensing funding. Did not receive a block grant for instructional equipment this year, but the deans will recommend equipment to be purchased through bond funds.
2. Faculty worked within each division level to prioritize their recommendations. Statement was made that faculty level of involvement is not apparent in the process. Examples of faculty involvement were subsequently mentioned.
3. Committee Chair was asked to request documentation showing how involvement in process varies in each department/division. Chair has asked for plan, goal and objective numbers for program review recommendations done within the last few years that were placed in Plan Builder. Some higher-ranked department plans may not make the cut at the division, area VP, or collective VP level due to competing priorities. Most departments have extensive faculty involvement in program review development.
4. Planning rubric mentions on-going institutional dialog. Ideally, all faculty, classified staff and management should be involved; this is a process that will improve. From faculty perception, this process is not happening.

<div align="center">

1

</div>

5. Feedback from Clarus Corporation – advertising for low cap, low enrollment classes. Should these classes still be funded after showing years of low enrollment? Statement was made that David Vakil wants to explore program discontinuation, important to consider when cutting sections.

SCA:
1. Grants and Foundation do not have general fund allocations, but they did participate in the voting process. Community Advancement receives very little general fund allocation.
2. Each manager was asked to prioritize one-time and ongoing funding requests.
3. One-time requests: Financial Aid request for software to increase on-line services (ranked #1) was reduced from $25,000 to $5,000 after discussion with ITS and the VP- AS.
4. Managers shared their unit's recommendations for requests they brought forward. These lists were discussed at the VP's manager meeting. IR created an online survey which the managers used for the prioritization process.
5. The VP-SCA brought forward the prioritized list to the other area VPs. All four VPs prioritized SCA plans with their highest ranked area plans.
6. How were acting positions funded? These positions did not go through this process. Statement was made that two years ago, some positions, particularly management positions, were not brought forward to PBC. It was suggested that staffing positions be listed the same as positions on the Academic Affairs list, clearly and in plain view. Some positions were funded through the Compton partnership, Fund 14.
7. Page 2 Survey Support for campus climate, CCSSE, is a student satisfaction survey. Also would like to do a campus climate survey.
8. A comment was made that there were no requests from Student Development. There were requests for staffing that ended in the lower part of the ranking order.
9. The list of classified and management vacancies and what was funded went to College Council.
10. Accreditation Recommendation #1 – 1) need to close planning cycle through evaluation, and 2) verify that program review recommendations were put into plans and that they were addressed.
11. PBC needs to identify short- and long-term goals and evaluate them. Calendared PBC annual evaluation in September.
12. Some of the plans were funded from the general fund and some were not. Using the information presented, how were these chosen to be funded? Through the prioritization process. The highest ranked plans at the end of the process were considered for funding.

Administrative Services:
1. All of the items on the list are found on unit plans, did not involve requests for additional funding, and are tied to a college strategic initiative and accreditation standard. Items were also included in program reviews, if applicable. Many items were listed as no cost knowing funding would not be available.
2. Each manager presented and defended their top #1 and #2 priorities. Voting based on consensus. Received unanimous vote on every priority with the exception of one.
3. Priority #9 (page 2) – delete $80,000 staff (not required).
4. Priority #15 – custodial positions were requests for additional staff.
5. Priority #2 – Director of Accounting position is a replacement position.
6. Priority #7 – did not have all costs identified for radio system and records management.
7. Did not see facilities replacement staff funded. Items that dealt with facilities staff were ranked #15 (custodial staff) and #28 (grounds staff). In general, the classified staff replacements were temporarily frozen due to state budget cuts. Eleven campus-wide positions are being released to be filled.
8. Looking at full-time faculty obligations. Budget target is 18,941 FTES.

Alternative Budget Reduction Discussion:
1. Suggestion was made to table this discussion for the next meeting.
2. Page 17, tentative budget, #8885 – Capital Outlay Fee – Non-Residents: can these be moved to general fund to offset cuts? By code it must go into capital outlay. M. Quinones-Perez stated this was moved last year into the general fund. At the next meeting, she will show how it was moved in previous years.
3. Page 18, #5100 – $10,500 for Consulting Services – used for architects, engineers, etc. for projects from fund 41.
4. J. Higdon asked for a copy of M. Quinones-Perez's list to research and prepare for next meeting's discussion. M. Quinones-Perez wants to think about it – wants to ensure full disclosure to all committee members.

The committee agreed to cancel the August 13th meeting. The next meeting is scheduled on August 20, 2009.

The meeting ended at 2:30 p.m.