

**EL CAMINO COLLEGE**  
**Planning & Budgeting Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**Date: November 21, 2013**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jan Caldwell - Campus Police                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Dawn Reid - Student & Community Adv.              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sean Donnell - ECCFT                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Cheryl Shenefield - Administrative Services       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dipte Patel - Academic Affairs         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rory K. Natividad - Chair (non-voting) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alice Grigsby - Management/Supervisors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gary Turner - ECCE                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Liliana Lopez - ASO                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lance Widman - Academic Senate         |

**Other Attendees: Members** – William Garcia, Irene Graff, Ken Key, Emily Rader, Michael Trevis **Support** - Jo Ann Higdon, Jeanie Nishime, Will Warren

---

The meeting was called to order at 1:06 p.m.

**Approval of November 7, 2013 Minutes**

The minutes were reviewed and approved with the following corrections:

1. Under Child Development Center: fourth sentence, after Discussion, **delete:** ensured, **replace with:** ensued. The fifth sentence, after agreed, **delete:** on. The sixth sentence, after development, **delete:** faculty, **replace with:** facility.

The minutes will be posted as presented with the three corrections as noted.

**Making Decisions** – J. Nishime

1. A booklet on making decisions at El Camino College was distributed to the committee. The booklet was reviewed by the committee beginning with the explanation of the philosophy of collegial consultation. It was noted the goal of this document is to be transparent in showing how decisions are made. It was emphasized that collegial consultation gives all the constituencies a chance to participate and give input representing their constituents' point of view and not their own specific view point.
2. Clarification was specifically reviewed on the subject of the committee's recommendation when reaching consensus or majority opinion of a subject. It was relayed that the Board of Trustees' decision is final unless there are compelling fiscal, educational, or operational reasons to revisit the decision. It was noted that strengthening communication throughout the campus committees is an ongoing process.
3. Committees were identified in the document to clarify which are consultation, advisory, or operational committees.
4. The members were asked to share the information from this booklet with their constituent groups so they have a better understanding of the flow of the process.
5. It was made clear when the Board of Trustees votes and makes a decision, they do not have to give a written explanation of their vote.

**Program Plans 2014-2015** – I. Graff

1. Things are moving along with the program plan submittals. There are currently 29% of programs plans submitted from El Camino, 5% submitted from the Compton Center and 65% from El Camino are in progress. Concern was expressed that 65% from the Compton Center had no plans. A hard deadline

will be set for after Thanksgiving to ensure we obtain a quality review with hopefully a lot of participation.

2. TracDat is a new system which is currently being evaluated in hopes of utilizing this system in place of Plan Builder. It was noted that TracDat should provide better integration and utilization. The working teams will be co-chaired by Irene Graff and Bob Klier with Donna Manno, Dr. Jeanie Nishime, Janice Ely, John Wagstaff, and Linda Beam. Program review will be represented by Bob Klier, Janet Young, William Garcia, Chris Gold, Rory Natividad, Trich Bonacic, and Robin Dreizler. Plan Builder may eventually become ineffective once TracDat is proven as a viable system. Plan Builder will be in place for the 2014/2015 planning process.
3. Discussion ensued as to faculty having greater awareness of how the Plan Builder program works and how they can have a more meaningful part of the process.

#### **PBC Evaluation Results Discussion** – R. Natividad

1. The committee reviewed the evaluation results and compared them with the results of the last three years. The information provided is to assist the committee in seeing where trends are going and how we address and look for positive avenues for improvement.
2. The various responses were reviewed and discussed.
3. It was stated that there was a feeling that the PBC minutes did accurately reflect what is discussed during the meetings.

#### **Proposed PBC Goals for 2013-2014** – R. Natividad

1. A suggestion was made during a future Professional Development for a presentation to explain the budget process and how the PBC goes about their review.
2. It was suggested that guidelines be developed to assist members in how to communicate with their constituents. It was pointed out that annually the chairs of the consultation committees perform an orientation for new members. This would be invaluable for new members assisting with better communication with their constituents and the community.
3. The creation of a PBC website to assist with better communication was reviewed. It was noted many other colleges have this kind of website which provides for a good way for communicating. Saddleback College has a website which could be a good model for us to follow since it is clear and easy to follow.
4. The chair advised that committee recommendations in the future be processed over a two meetings, when time allows, providing constituent representatives the opportunity to have discussions with their group prior to making their recommending vote.
5. It was suggested outcomes be devised for our comprehensive master plan which meets our standards.
6. Positive comments were made as to the current operation of the running of the PBC.

#### **PBC CDC Response** – R. Natividad

1. The president's response to the committee's motion to review the decision of closing the Child Development Center was disseminated to the committee. No further discussion or comments were made regarding this response.

#### **Matriculation Funding** – Ken Key

1. It was asked if there was any funding provided for the student success task force. It was noted that funding has remained the same and there are no new funds. Funding for Student Success and Support Programs replaces the matriculation program. Funding was restored to 2007-08.

### Closing Comments

1. It was asked when the committee might discuss the new educational master plan. The new strategic planning process is estimated to be about a year and a half. The current plan will be functioning until 2016. Further information will be forthcoming.
2. Suggestion was made that PBC be involved in discussions about the educational master plan. It was also suggested that we provide feedback as information is developed.

### Adjournment – R. Natividad

1. The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m. The next meeting will be **December 5 at 1:00 p.m.**, in Library 202.

RKN/lmo

Draft