PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE
June 4, 2015
1:00 - 2:30 P.M.
Library 202

Facilitator: Rory K. Natividad   Notes: Linda M. Olsen

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Planning and Budgeting Committee serves as the consultation committee for campus-wide planning and budgeting. The PBC assures that the planning and budgeting are interlinked and that the process is driven by the mission and strategic initiatives set forth in the Strategic Plan. The PBC makes recommendations to the President on all planning and budgeting issues and reports all committee activities to the campus community.

Members

- ☐ 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

Alternate Members / Support

- ☐ Linda Beam – Support
- ☐ Janice Ely – Support
- ☐ Vacant - Alt., Ac. Affairs
- ☐ William Garcia – Alt. SCA
- ☐ Irene Graff – Support
- ☐ Jo Ann Higdon – Support

- ☐ Chris Jeffries – Support
- ☐ Jeanie Nishime – Support
- ☐ Emily Rader – Alt. Ac. Sen.
- ☐ Jean Shankweiler – Support
- ☐ Jackie Sims –Alt.Mgmt./Sup.
- ☐ Ericka Solarzano - Alt. Police

- ☐ Claudia Striepe - Support
- ☐ Michael Trevis – Alt. Adm. Serv.
- ☐ Gary Turner - ECCE
- ☐ Vacant – Alt. ECCFT
- ☐ Vacant – Alt. ASO

AGENDA

1.	Draft Minutes Approval – April 2, 2015	R. Natividad	1:00 P.M.
2.	Tentative Budget	J. Higdon/J. Ely	1:10 P.M.
3.	Full Time Hiring Obligation	L. Widman	1:30 P.M.
4.	Student Access and Student Fee Drops	L. Widman	1:45 P.M.
5.	Institutional Effectiveness Portal Goals	I. Graff	2:00 P.M.
6.	Adjournment		

Next meeting – June 18, 2015

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: May 7, 2015

_____
MEMBERS PRESENT

⊠ David Brown - ECCE   ☐ Dawn Reid – Student & Community Adv.
⊠ Connie Fitzsimons – Academic Affairs   ⊠ Cheryl Shenefield–Administrative Services
⊠ Alice Grigsby -Management/Supervisors   ☐ Dean Starkey – Campus Police
⊠ Ken Key - ECCFT   ☐ Jessica Siripat – ASO, Student Rep.
⊠ Rory K. Natividad – Chair (non-voting)   ⊠ Lance Widman - Academic Senate

Other Attendees: Members: Emily Rader, Ericka Solarzano **Support:** Janice Ely, Irene Graff, Jean Shankweiler

_____
The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

Welcome and Committee Membership – R. Natividad
A welcome was extended to Jean Shankweiler, the new vice president of Academic Affairs.

Approval of the April 7, 2015 Minutes
1. Page 1, Making Decisions Document, 2, last sentence **delete:** seven, **change to:** six.
2. Page 2, Making Decisions Document, 10, clarification is needed for the statement "this area". R. Natividad will check with J. Nishime to clarify the reference.
3. The minutes will be amended and posted on the website.

Development Process Budget Book – J. Higdon / R. Natividad (handouts)
1. The PBC roles and responsibilities which were decided on March 5, 2015 will now be updated and reflected in the budget book (page 32). A handout was distributed showing the track changes for the new statement of purpose and the new committee responsibilities.
2. The top portion of the budget development process will be brought back and be reviewed at another time.

Tentative Budget – J. Ely (handout)
1. The tentative budget first draft was distributed and reviewed. This draft will be forwarded to the board for review at the May meeting. Projected expenditures and revenues are listed on each page.
2. The projected revenue for the year up about $3 million dollars in state revenue from last year. This is only if we receive the money under footnote (c) potential revenue shortfall ($1,611,441). There is a possibility we may not receive the revenue shortfall. These figures are based on the April apportionment from the state.
3. The funds budgeted for next year is based on the assumption of the FTES being the same as this budget year (19,163). A COLA increase has been factored in at 1.02% which would give us another $985,000 over the year. It was noted we get base funding based on the size of our college. In the past we have always received the maximum base funding of $8.8 million), but this year

since our FTES dropped we are now considered a medium size college. This caused us to lose $1 million in apportionment.
4. The only change in local revenue will be in item J (Compton Police Salaries). The revenue is a little higher this year because of the retroactive pay increases. Next year the projected total will be lower.
5. A new item in the budget is the lease contract for the old Child Development Center. The revenue is listed as $80,000.
6. A correction was made to the bottom of page 4. The notes to revenue should read a-h & i-k.
7. The salaries show an increase because of the retroactive increases. Footnote (o) shows an increase for the tentative budget because of the addition of ten new full-time faculty.
8. The PERS employer contribution has been raised from 11.771 to 11.847 for next year. STRS is at 8.88.
9. It was recognized we are now fully funded in our post-employment benefits account so we will no longer be paying the retiree benefits out of the general fund. Because of this there will be savings in our general fund.
10. Under contracts and other operating expenses it was noted insurance costs are rising resulting in an increased cost of almost $100,000.
11. Election expenses will increase due to forthcoming election for three board members.
12. This will be the first draft reading of the budget to the Board of Trustees for May. It will be resubmitted with further refinements to in June and then in September it will reflect the final budget.

Planning Summit Debrief – I. Graff (handout)
1. The following was discussed at the planning summit. The summary of the ACCJC recommendations were distributed for review and discussion. It was noted there were 11 recommendations for institutional improvement. These recommendations are being addressed. Three have been completed.
2. The new strategic plan was discussed and one of the recommendations for institutional improvements was to have measurable objectives associated with the strategic initiatives. These have been established and are in place.
3. Institutional effectiveness framework was discussed. This is not outcomes that we set for ourselves but the Chancellor's office setting institutional effectiveness outcomes related to student academic performance, fiscal viability, and accreditation status.
4. All objectives must be met by June 30, 2015.
5. The Making Decisions Document was reviewed and discussed. The revisions of this document were finalized and a printout will be available soon.
6. The theme of the Planning Summit was communication, collaboration and decision making. Group discussions were had which were summarized and included verbatim responses. This summary will be available next week and will be sent out to all attendees and consultation committees.
7. For the recommendation involving the decision-making process, a consultation survey a survey was distributed for the present PBC members to fill out and return. The committee was asked to write any comments on the back. This survey is to collect the consultation committee members feedback on the consultation process as it is today.

Annual Planning Calendar – R. Natividad (handout)
1. As a goal the PBC will now try to review the planning and budgeting calendar every six months. The committee was asked to review the planning and budgeting calendar before the next planning cycle (July 1). Any comments or suggestions should be sent to R. Natividad. The goal is to make the planning and budgeting calendar clearer to the constituents.

Enrollment Report – R. Natividad
1. The enrollment report for summer and fall was distributed. This report will be forwarded to the committee. Currently it shows enrollment is a little down. Summer is six percent down from last year and fall is down nine percent from the prior fall. This report will also show what the enrollment target was for spring.

Adjournment – R. Natividad
1. The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m. The next meeting will be scheduled for **May 21, 2015, at 1:00 p.m.,** in Library 202.

RKN/lmo

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

College Indicator Rates - El Camino College

Required Response

N   Has your college developed, adopted, and publicly posted the goals framework pursuant to the requirements of Education Code section 84754.6?

Indicator	Long-term (6 Years) Goal (optional for this reporting year)	Short-term (1 Year) Goal (goal for 2015-2016)	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010

Required Goals

Student Performance and Outcomes

Successful Course Completion (Datamart)

Annual percentage of credit course enrollments where student earned a grade of C or better (Goal should be set as rate)

	73.7%	70.3%	~~68.3~~ 68.6	70.2	68.6	68.1	68.1

Accreditation Status

Accreditation Status

Latest Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) action (See key below)

			Feb 2014	July 2013	Feb 2013	July 2012	Feb 2012	July 2011	Feb 2011	July 2010	Feb 2010	July 2009
	FA-N	FA-N	FA-SR	FA-W	FA-W	FA-N	FA-N	FA-N	FA-N	FA-N	FA-SR/RA	FA-W

Date of Next Visit   Date of next accreditation visit (mm/dd/yyyy) - information item, no target collected

Optional Goals

Student Performance and Outcomes

Completion Rate (Scorecard)   Percentage of degree, certificate, and/or transfer seeking students starting first time tracked for six years who completed a degree, certificate, or transfer related outcome (Goal should be set as rate)

College Prepared   Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was college level

	78.0%	73.5%	71.3	74.4	71.4	73.3	70.2

Unprepared for College   Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was pre-collegiate level

	40.1%	38.4%	37.5	38.2	36.5	39.0	37.3

Overall   Student attempted any level of Math or English in the first three years

	50.6%	47.9%	46.6	48.2	46.1	48.5	46.5

Remedial Rate (Scorecard)   Percentage of credit students tracked for six years who started below transfer level in English, mathematics, and/or ESL and completed a college-level course in the same discipline (Goal should be set as rate)

	Long-term Goal	Short-term Goal	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Math	29.6%	28.5%	28.0	26.9	25.6	23.7	24.5
English	54.3%	51.0%	49.4	49.5	49.5	45.5	48.7
ESL			32.5	31.0	35.0	34.7	29.3

Career Technical Education Rate (Scorecard)   Percentage of students tracked for six years who completed more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education in a single discipline who completed a degree or certificate or transferred (Goal should be set as rate)

	59.5%	56.5%	55.0	56.5	55.2	54.4	51.4

Completion of Degrees (Datamart)   Number of associate degrees awarded (Goal should be set as total)

	2,232	2,066	~~2,000~~ 1,983	2,012	1,659	1,374	1,278

Completion of Certificates (Datamart)   Number of Chancellor's office approved certificates awarded (Goal should be set as total)

	659	526	466 460	592	516	439	429

Fiscal Viability and Programmatic Compliance with State and Federal Guidelines

Full-Time Eqivalent Students

Annual number of full-time equivalent students (Goal should be set as total)

	0	0	19,409	19,123	19,231	20,488	22,136

Accreditation Status Code Description

FA-N	Fully Accredited - No Action
FA-RA	Fully Accredited - Reaffirmed
FA-SR	Fully Accredited - Sanction Removed
FA-SR/RA	Fully Accredited - Sanction Removed and Reaffirmed
FA-W	Fully Accredited - Warning
FA-P	Fully Accredited - Probation
FA-SC	Fully Accredited - Show Cause
FA-PT	Fully Accredited - Pending Termination
T	Accreditation Terminated
FA-RS	Fully Accredited - Restoration
IA	Initial Accreditation

Back to District Rates

SAVE GOAL DETAILS

VIEW RATES REPORT

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

District Indicator Rates - El Camino CCD

Indicator	Long-term (6 Years) Goal (optional for this reporting year)	Short-term (1 Year) Goal (goal for 2015-2016)	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Required Goals							
Fiscal Viability and Programmatic Compliance with State and Federal Guidelines							
Fund Balance Ending unrestricted general fund balance as a pecentage of total expenditures							
	0.0	0.0	16.7	20.0	20.3	21.5	22.0
Audit Findings Unmodified: Unmodified auditor's report without internal control issues Modified: Modified auditor's report and/or internal control issues							
	Modified	Modified	Modified				
Optional Goals							
Fiscal Viability and Programmatic Compliance with State and Federal Guidelines							
Salary and Benefits Salaries and benefits as a percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures, excluding other outgoing expenditures							
	0.0	0.0	88.6	88.3	88.0	88.8	89.4
Annual Operating Excess/(Deficiency) Net increase or decrease in general fund balance							
	0	0	(2,904,432)	(347,924)	(2,307,429)	700,027	3,978,524
Cash Balance Unrestricted and restricted general fund cash balance, excluding investments							
	0	0	17,168,076	29,913,869	17,743,948	17,982,423	19,241,647

College Indicator Rates
El Camino College

Contact Information

Name

Phone Number

Email Address

SAVE GOAL DETAILS
CERTIFY GOAL DETAILS

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Framework of Indicators

College/District Indicator	Brief Definition
Student performance and outcomes	
Completion Rate (Scorecard):	Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2008-09 tracked for six years through 2013-14 who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes.
· College-Prepared	Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was college level
· Unprepared for College	Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was pre-collegiate level
· Overall	Student attempted any level of Math or English in the first three years
Remedial rate (Scorecard):	Percentage of credit students tracked for six years through 2013-14 who started first time in 2008-09 below transfer level in English, mathematics, and/or ESL and completed a college-level course in the same discipline
· Math	See above
· English	See above
· ESL	See above
Career Technical Education Rate (Scorecard)	Percentage of students tracked for six years through 2013-14 who started first time in 2008-09 and completed more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education in a single discipline and completed a degree, certificate or transferred
Successful course completion (Datamart)	Percentage of students who earn a grade of "C" or better or "credit" in 2013-14.
Completion of degrees (Datamart)	Number of associate degrees completed in 2013-14
Completion of certificates (Datamart)	Number of Chancellor's Office-approved certificates completed in 2013-14
Number of students who transfer to 4-year institutions (Datamart)	Number of students who transfer to a four-year institution, including CSU, UC, or private university in 2013-14. [1]
Accreditation Status	
Accreditation status	Latest ACCJC action: Fully Accredited, Reaffirmed Fully Accredited, Warning Fully Accredited, Probation Fully Accredited, Show Cause Fully Accredited, Restoration
Date of next visit	Informational item - no target collected.
Fiscal viability and programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines	
Salary and Benefits	Salaries and benefits as a percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures, excluding other outgoing expenditures
Full-Time Equivalent Students	Annual number of full-time equivalent students
Annual Operating Excess/(Deficiency)	Net increase or decrease in unrestricted general fund balance
Fund Balance	Ending unrestricted general fund balance as a percentage of total expenditures
Cash Balance	Unrestricted and restricted general fund cash balance, excluding investments
Audit Findings	Modified opinion, material weaknesses, or significant deficiencies as identified in an annual independent audited financial statement

[1] Metric dependent upon external variables (UC and CSU transfer admission policy) and therefore collected as information. Colleges would NOT be expected to identify a goal.

In year one, three years of baseline trend data would be prepopulated and sent to each college by the Chancellor's Office. Each college would use a collegial consultation process to set goals (short term and long term) for the subsequent year and return a spreadsheet to the Chancellor's Office with the goals in June.

California Community Colleges

Fall 2014
Full-time Faculty Obligation
Compliance by District

DISTRICT	Full-Time Faculty Obligation	Full-Time Faculty Actual	Difference		Full-Time Faculty Actual	Part-Time Faculty Actual	Total Faculty Actual	Full-Time Faculty Percentage
Allan Hancock	126.40	139.99	13.59		139.99	143.89	283.88	49.31%
Antelope Valley	139.60	158.00	18.40		158.00	227.73	385.73	40.96%
Barstow	27.50	43.30	15.80		43.30	49.00	92.30	46.91%
Butte	161.40	162.69	1.29		162.69	174.72	337.41	48.22%
Cabrillo	176.60	184.80	8.20		184.80	126.80	311.60	59.31%
Cerritos	258.20	263.00	4.80		263.00	179.26	442.26	59.47%
Chabot-Las Positas	270.00	273.37	3.37		273.37	228.89	502.26	54.43%
Chaffey	191.80	202.16	10.36		202.16	274.93	477.09	42.37%
Citrus	157.00	157.03	0.03		157.03	122.99	280.02	56.08%
Coast	360.40	414.00	53.60		414.00	330.60	744.60	55.60%
Compton	24.40	96.00	71.60		96.00	65.10	161.10	59.59%
Contra Costa	315.70	424.21	108.51		424.21	449.33	873.54	48.56%
Copper Mt.	10.60	40.00	29.40		40.00	90.00	130.00	30.77%
Desert	95.20	101.90	6.70		101.90	118.80	220.70	46.17%
El Camino	306.20	342.66	36.46		342.66	215.66	558.32	61.37%
Feather River	18.10	34.39	16.29		34.39	22.08	56.47	60.90%
Foothill-DeAnza	404.00	452.40	48.40		452.40	437.90	890.30	50.81%
Gavilan	68.10	73.00	4.90		73.00	95.01	168.01	43.45%
Glendale	212.00	212.03	0.03		212.03	187.39	399.42	53.08%
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	263.70	281.55	17.85		281.55	309.82	591.37	47.61%
Hartnell	93.90	102.60	8.70		102.60	108.16	210.76	48.68%
Imperial	89.30	124.07	34.77		124.07	60.68	184.75	67.16%
Kern	353.80	360.60	6.80		360.60	187.86	548.46	65.75%
Lake Tahoe	15.20	36.33	21.13		36.33	55.84	92.17	39.42%
Lassen	19.90	33.99	14.09		33.99	22.30	56.29	60.38%
Long Beach	324.60	319.93	-4.67	*	319.93	233.34	553.27	57.83%
Los Angeles	1421.10	1436.85	15.75		1436.85	1012.13	2448.98	58.67%
Los Rios	873.20	954.80	81.60		954.80	478.50	1433.30	66.62%
Marin	74.90	105.26	30.36		105.26	63.57	168.83	62.35%
Mendocino-Lake	35.00	47.00	12.00		47.00	81.11	128.11	36.69%
Merced	167.60	168.80	1.20		168.80	112.31	281.11	60.05%
Mira Costa	149.10	178.67	29.57		178.67	205.48	384.15	46.51%
Monterey Peninsula	110.90	111.00	0.10		111.00	114.58	225.58	49.21%
Mt. San Antonio	371.90	385.00	13.10		385.00	399.29	784.29	49.09%
Mt. San Jacinto	115.80	142.00	26.20		142.00	251.14	204.91	69.30%
Napa Valley	93.70	94.00	0.30		94.00	76.01	170.01	55.29%
North Orange County	491.80	494.00	2.20		494.00	394.23	888.23	55.62%
Ohlone	107.20	115.00	7.80		115.00	127.50	242.50	47.42%
Palo Verde	17.00	37.00	20.00		37.00	11.07	48.07	76.97%
Palomar	260.80	269.65	8.85		269.65	319.32	588.97	45.78%
Pasadena Area	358.20	372.60	14.40		372.60	428.28	800.88	46.52%
Peralta	304.20	310.19	5.99		310.19	163.41	473.60	65.50%
Rancho Santiago	334.80	334.00	-0.80		334.00	217.90	551.90	60.52%
Redwoods	63.10	75.72	12.62		75.72	77.40	153.12	49.45%

California Community Colleges
Fall 2014
Full-time Faculty Obligation
Compliance by District

DISTRICT	Full-Time Faculty Obligation	Full-Time Faculty Actual	Difference		Full-Time Faculty Actual	Part-Time Faculty Actual	Total Faculty Actual	Full-Time Faculty Percentage
Rio Hondo	194.60	194.60	0.00		194.60	89.00	283.60	68.62%
Riverside	327.00	345.60	18.60		345.60	353.69	699.29	49.42%
San Bernardino	194.80	213.33	18.53		213.33	261.55	474.88	44.92%
San Diego	462.80	502.08	39.28		502.08	474.94	977.02	51.39%
San Francisco	362.80	560.19	197.39		560.19	208.63	768.82	72.86%
San Joaquin Delta	203.80	219.37	15.57		219.37	136.74	356.11	61.60%
San Jose-Evergreen	199.00	228.52	29.52		228.52	168.15	396.67	57.61%
San Luis Obispo	128.40	153.69	25.29		153.69	111.40	265.09	57.98%
San Mateo	328.00	337.97	9.97		337.97	107.92	445.89	75.80%
Santa Barbara	223.40	229.00	5.60		229.00	148.79	377.79	60.62%
Santa Clarita	171.80	177.15	5.35		177.15	220.56	397.71	44.54%
Santa Monica	244.40	326.05	81.65		326.05	396.05	722.10	45.15%
Sequoias	165.20	166.04	0.84		166.04	73.64	239.68	69.28%
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	110.10	129.90	19.80		129.90	94.98	224.88	57.76%
Sierra	190.60	218.30	27.70		218.30	234.10	452.40	48.25%
Siskiyou	31.40	33.80	2.40		33.80	43.49	77.29	43.73%
Solano	120.60	150.00	29.40		150.00	106.72	256.72	58.43%
Sonoma County	252.50	275.98	23.48		275.98	205.90	481.88	57.27%
South Orange	353.80	376.00	22.20		376.00	383.10	759.10	49.53%
Southwestern	237.30	250.16	12.86		250.16	318.90	569.06	43.96%
State Center	449.50	483.40	33.90		483.40	382.73	866.13	55.81%
Ventura	369.20	391.00	21.80		391.00	291.00	682.00	57.33%
Victor Valley	113.10	115.00	1.90		115.00	202.74	317.74	36.19%
West Hills	78.45	80.89	2.44		80.89	25.13	106.02	76.30%
West Kern	53.60	58.00	4.40		58.00	34.53	92.53	62.68%
West Valley-Mission	279.10	305.00	25.90		305.00	117.66	422.66	72.16%
Yosemite	274.00	274.00	0.00		274.00	169.84	443.84	61.73%
Yuba	81.40	112.20	30.80		112.20	89.27	201.47	55.69%
Total	16,034.55	17,572.76			17,572.76	14,502.46	31,886.99	56.14%

*

April 2, 2015

TO: Superintendents/Presidents
               Chief Business Officers
               Chief Student Services Officers
               Chief Instructional Officers

FROM: Theresa Tena, Vice Chancellor
               Institutional Effectiveness Division

SUBJECT: Requirement and Process for Adopting Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Goals
               Framework and 2015-16 College IE Goals

This memorandum formally notifies colleges/districts of the requirement that each college develop, adopt and post a goals framework as mandated by recently enacted legislation. In addition, this memorandum provides guidance on the process for approving the goals framework, and for adopting and posting the college's goals. The enacted legislation set ambitious deadlines for implementing this new process, which requires expedited activity at both the local and state levels. In recent weeks, representatives from over 104 colleges attended regional trainings on how to meet these new requirements (materials from these trainings can be found at: (http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/InstitutionalEffectiveness.aspx).

Background: Recently enacted legislation established a new system of indicators and goals that is intended to encourage improvement in institutional effectiveness at California community colleges. Pursuant to Education Code section 84754.6, the Board of Governors (BOG) adopted a goals framework at its March 16, 2015 meeting to measure the ongoing condition of a community college's operational environment (see attached Consultation Digest and BOG Item). This statute also requires that, as a condition of receipt of Student Success and Support Program funds, each college develop, adopt and post a goals framework that addresses, at a minimum, the following four areas: student performance and outcomes, accreditation status, fiscal viability, and programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines. In addition, it requires that the Chancellor post by June 30, 2015, and before each fiscal year thereafter, the annually developed system wide goals adopted by the BOG, and locally developed and adopted college/district goals.

Adopting Framework and Goals: Each college should adopt the framework of indicators approved by the BOG and colleges/districts adopt at least one goal for each of the four areas identified above (see attached "Select Framework of Indicators definitions" document). Colleges/districts may choose to adopt more than one goal for each area; however, in this initial year of implementation, we anticipate that most colleges/districts will adopt only four goals in the following areas:
   1) Student performance and outcomes: **Course Completion Rate**
   2) Accreditation status: **Accreditation Status**
   3) Fiscal viability: **Fund Balance**
   4) Compliance with State/Federal guidelines: **Overall Audit Opinion**
The process that a college uses to adopt the framework and college goals should be locally determined, but colleges are encouraged to ensure that all appropriate constituency groups (e.g. academic senate, classified staff, student senate, etc.) are engaged, consistent with their college's collegial consultation process.

Certifying/Posting Framework and Goals: An online monitoring portal has been established for posting each college's/district's goals, and can be accessed at https//:misweb.cccco.edu/ie/. A unique district password for posting college's/district's goals to the portal will be sent to your district's Chief Information Systems Officer on Monday, April 13, 2015, and should be shared as appropriate.

Action Requested: <u>By June 15, 2015</u>, adopt the BOG approved goals framework, adopt at least one goal for each of the four areas, and complete the IE monitoring portal's certification page. The Chancellor's Office will post each college's/district's goals on the institutional effectiveness web site by June 30, 2015.

Contact: If you have any questions regarding this information, please feel free to contact me at ttena@cccco.edu or Jeff Spano, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness at jspano@cccco.edu.
.

Attachments

cc: Chief Information Systems Officer
President, CCC Statewide Academic Senate

Hi Lance,

You asked for my thoughts on the hiring of new FT faculty at El Camino in relation to other expenditures like faculty and staff salaries. I've had a chance to review "Full-time Faculty Obligation Compliance by District," a state report for fall 2014 prepared by Michael Yarber, a Fiscal Policy Specialist at the Chancellor's Office. I'm attaching a copy.

In the fall of 2014 El Camino exceeded its full-time faculty obligation by 36.46 FTE faculty. We had a state-mandated obligation to have 306.20 FT faculty and we had 342.66 FTE. We exceeded our obligation by 11.9% and that margin put us in the upper 36% of districts in the state.

Some districts cut this as close as possible. Citrus, Rio Hondo, Yosemite, and Glendale met their state-mandated obligations precisely, for example, and Monterey Peninsula, Butte, Los Angeles, Chabot-Las Positas, Napa Valley, Merced, College of the Sequoias and North Orange were districts that exceeded the minimum requirement by 1.2% or less. Four other districts exceeded the requirement by margins of between 1.3% and 2%.

So we were virtuous. Hooray!! We moved toward the high proportion of classes that the zeitgeist says should be taught by full-time faculty.

However virtue has a price. Adding the FT faculty to reach this level absorbed money that could be used for other things – like raises for faculty and staff. If we had been content to fill our minimum obligation in the manner that Rio Hondo, Citrus and Glendale did, we would have had additional funds amounting to perhaps $1.82 million, estimated fairly conservatively. (I'm assuming that a new FT faculty member costs the District something like $50,000 more a year than adjunct faculty members do in salary and benefits where the adjuncts are covering the same number of classes.)

If applied to the salaries of full-time faculty, that money would have been enough to give each FT faculty member a $5,300 raise. And of course if the money had been applied to all staff salaries, it still would have represented a nice increase.

This is something to think about in a district that's had lower-than-state-average FT faculty salaries for many years. In the fall of 2013 El Camino had an average FT faculty salary $4,665 lower than the state average. We ranked 44th out of 72 California community college districts.*

*In the fall of 2013, the average salary of every other faculty and staff group but one at El Camino ranked higher in the state than the average FT faculty salary did, according to Chancellor's Office data. Educational administrators ranked 21st for example, the average adjunct rate ranked 11th, classified administrators ranked 23rd, and classified support staff ranked 26th. The exception was the average salary of classified professional staff. Like the full-time faculty average, that also ranked 44th in the state.

Basic-aid districts like Mira Costa (the number of FT faculty in fall 2014 was 19.8% above the state obligation) and San Jose-Evergreen (14.8% above the FT obligation) can afford to hire more FT faculty than the state requires of them and still pay much higher salaries than El Camino. They have a lot money. And some districts like Palo Verde (117.6% above the FT obligation) and Copper Mountain probably hire extra FT faculty because they must. There aren't enough potential adjuncts living in or around Blythe and Joshua Tree to make it feasible to teach the needed classes with adjuncts. Not surprisingly Palo Verde FT faculty salaries are among the lowest in the state. Copper Mountain was a bit better in fall 2013, but still pretty low.

Looking at the numbers, I'm reasonably certain that for many districts, cutting the hiring of new FT faculty as close to the state-mandated minimum as possible is a deliberate strategy. This past year there were 16 districts that either met the FT requirement precisely or were over the minimum by 2% or less *(and 2 districts that undershot the requirement). Naturally those districts then have more money to spend on other things - like salaries.

I understand that we're trying to deal with the consequences of a state system whose funding mechanisms have slowly evolved to allow some districts to grow wealthy and pay very high salaries while other districts struggle. But the statewide funding mechanisms aren't going to change quickly if they change at all.** We probably won't see the day again when the average FT faculty salary at El Camino once again ranks third in the state, as it did in 1983-84.

However there are things the College can do to direct more money to salaries. There's no structural reason I know of that explains why Rio Hondo's average faculty salary was nearly $7.000 higher than El Camino's in the fall of 2013. But the evidence suggests that Rio Hondo is pursuing a different policy when it comes to hiring new FT faculty, and that no doubt plays a role in its ability to pay better.

Not everything is an equal priority. It's important that others be involved in weighing one priority against another here. The hiring of new FT faculty is a matter in which the Academic Senate has traditionally taken the lead on the faculty side. I don't think that the problem can be addressed without involving the leadership of the Senate and probably the entire faculty.

On another, though related, matter, I notice that in the fall of 2013 the ECC FT faculty overload rate had fallen in state rank to 43rd. The state average was $67.19 and El Camino was paying $60.18. Could that help to explain why overload FTE dropped from 33.1 in 2000 to 22.9 in

** The kinds of cuts in categorical aid for basic aid districts that the Legislative Analyst's Office was recommending four years ago for K-12 would be a start if applied to the CCs.

2013?*** Probably. To an extent, the overload rate is in competition with what nearby colleges are paying adjunct faculty. Why would a FT ECC faculty member teach an overload here when they could earn $82.68 an hour, on average, in the LACCD or $94.29 an hour at Santa Monica. And of course we both know FT ECC faculty who do teach as adjuncts in exactly those districts.

Why should this matter to El Camino? Well, because it's clearly in the District's interest to offer a high enough rate that an "adequate" number of FT faculty have an incentive to teach overloads. Overload teaching by FT faculty plays a favorable role in the calculations that are made to see whether districts have met their full-time obligation mandated by the state. (Full-time faculty overload is excluded from the 75%/25% calculation.) It's a lot less expensive to pay FT faculty for 10 lecture overload classes than it would be to hire a new FT faculty member to teach the same number of classes. It's surprising that the District hasn't pushed for an increase in the overload rate without ECCFT proposing it.

*** The decrease can't be explained by the FTES decline we experienced during this period, since that decline was only a little over 3%. Clearly, FT faculty have found it less worthwhile to teach overloads.

Joe Georges
Department of Political Science
Charter member of the PBC 1989-1992