Budget Advisory Committee/College Planning Committee
Minutes
March 24, 2014
Meeting

PRESENT: Eva Bagg, Cindy Baker, Ladera Barbee, Lorraine Blouin, Marilyn Brock, Lou Anne Bynum, Chris Carter, Sem Chao, Casey Crook, Ann-Marie Gabel, Shauna Hagemann, Charlotte Joseph, Karen Kane, Lynne Misajon, José Ramón Núñez, Kristen Payne, Greg Peterson, Carol Sabol, Connie Sears, Sigrid Sexton, Lynn Shaw, Mark Taylor, John Thompson, Dan Van Sinden, Lark Zunich

ABSENT: Rose DelGaudio, John Downey, Thomas Hamilton, Kenna Hillman, Jorge Ochoa, Rodney Rodriguez, Karen Roberts, Meena Singhal

NOTE TAKERS: Janet Falcon and Maria Narvaez

Welcome (Ladera/Marilyn/Dana)
➢ Everyone was welcomed to the meeting. Introductions were made.

Approval of Minutes/Summary Notes
➢ The BAC minutes of the February 24, 2014 meeting were reviewed. The minutes were approved as submitted.
➢ The CPC Summary Notes of the February 20, 2014 meeting were reviewed. The notes were approved as amended to mark José Ramón as present at the meeting.

Institutional Priorities (Ann-Marie, Marilyn/Dana)
(Refer to “Institutional Priority for 2014-15” handout)
➢ Ann-Marie discussed the Institutional Priorities including the following highlights:

- The workgroup met and developed priorities as listed below.
- The wording for the priorities was taken directly from the VP Level Plans and there was an emphasis to stay true to the wording. The VP Level Plan goals can be found listed on the CPC meeting notes from February 20, 2014.
- The Institutional Priorities will be presented to the Board of Trustees in the Tentative Budget.
- Carol asked for clarification on technology (4th bullet). Was the intent to be for hardware and software or to include technological innovations in teaching methods? Marilyn responded that the intent was to include all of those items.
- Ann-Marie stated the second bullet item was meant primarily for staffing and the organizational structure of the college. Making sure the right employees are in the right positions so the college will be able to carry out the priorities it sets. Marilyn wants to be sure that there is no expectation that everyone and every position that had been eliminated will be restored. Others agreed that it will take time for us to get back to where we were a few years ago and that we will not look the same as we did back then.
Eva asked for opinions on how the college identifies a “student success initiative” as referenced in the sub-bullet for the first item. Marilyn replied that it would be initiatives that have the goal in mind to help our students become more successful. Absolute detail for the individual student success initiatives would be found in the Department Plans.

Marilyn recommended the Institutional Priorities be approved as amended to include the sub-bullet for item number two. The sub-bullet marked in red was at the result of a recommendation to expand the “resources” bullet item.

The Institutional Priority was approved. The next step will be for the CPC co-chairs to send this to the Superintendent-President as a recommendation. If he accepts the priority, he usually sends out a college-wide email about it.

The college’s top priority is to improve rates of student success which include, but are not limited to the following: AA/AS, AA/AS –Transfer, transfer, certificates of achievement and workforce readiness.

In order to accomplish this top priority, the College will strive to:

- Maintain fiscal stability to afford opportunities for student needs.
  - Acquire and manage funding to support student success initiatives.
- Further analyze and dedicate resources that build effective organizational structures college-wide.
  - Evaluate need for reinstatements, reorganizations, filling vacancies and /or hiring personnel.
- Further support implementation of the Pacific Coast Campus Educational Master plan.
  - Continue to increase GE course offerings.
- Facilitate, advance, promote, and support effective integration of technology into the learning and work environment.
- Support professional development in alignment with institutional priorities through coordinated efforts in Human Resources and Faculty Professional Development.

**Winter Extension/Intersession Analysis (Marilyn, Ann-Marie)**

(Refer to “LBCC Extension Course Revenue” and other handouts on Course Success Rates and Fill Rates)

- Marilyn and Ann-Marie discussed the Winter Extension/Intersession classes.

- Ann-Marie reviewed the Extension Course Revenue. Total fees received were $75,937; students paid $27,495 while the rest were covered by BOGG discount, Foundation Grants for BOGG and Foundation Scholarships. The BOGG eligible discount and Foundation grants for BOGG eligible students automatically happened when they enrolled.

- There was a $30,036 surplus which will be used to cover any deficits in future offerings of extension classes. The program needs to pay for itself, so this surplus will be held in case it’s needed for the summer extension classes. Ann-Marie recommended keeping the fees the same for the summer even though it was justified to raise the rates. Monies from the Extension Courses are held in the Unrestricted General Fund.
• Charlotte asked about the Foundation grants and scholarships. Ann-Marie replied the monies that were disbursed to students in the form of Foundation Scholarships were new donations acquired by the Foundation.

• There were 113 students who enrolled in the five Winter Extension classes. The handout comparing Extension and Intersession demographics indicates similar distribution in all ethnicities except "Other/Multiple/Unknown". Almost 84% of students enrolled in Extension classes were previously enrolled students (96% for Intersession). There were also fewer DSPS and Veteran students enrolled in Extension classes compared to Intersession classes. Marilyn stated that the Veteran student group was the target population for the Intersession and Extension classes because enrollment in these classes ensured that they would continue to receive benefits during that time. Success and retention rates were compared for Intersession classes and Extension classes. Rates were also compared for classes offered during Winter (both Intersession and Extension), Fall 2013 and Summer 2013 as well. Overall, the data shows the Intersession classes did not advantage or disadvantage students.

• Two Intersession classes and one Extension class were closed due to low enrollment.

• This summer we will have a target of 2,000 FTES including a plan to have five extension classes.

• Lynn suggested info/analysis be sent to faculty. Dana is already working on a Q&A to be sent out to faculty.

Other –

➢ Ann-Marie discussed TBA hours. The Chancellor’s office did not accept our 2012-13 audit due to a finding for three years in a row on how we calculate TBA hours. While the District has tried to address the issue each year, this year 100% of TBA classes were audited. There were 283.7 FTES disallowed because attendance reports were not submitted to Admissions and Records which equaled a $417,000 fee after adjusting our unfunded FTES calculations. Some of our TBA classes should have been coded as positive attendance. Our Internal Auditor is currently auditing TBA classes for Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. Marilyn stated Admissions and Records is currently working to systematize TBA attendance reporting. Faculty will be notified for specific TBA requirements and guidelines. José Ramón sits on the Grade Appeal Committee and commented he consistently sees a lack of attendance records submitted when they complete a grade check. He stressed the importance of submitting attendance records.

➢ The Student Success Committee is asking for a workgroup to be formed to work on the Student Equity Plan. The workgroup would submit recommendations for a work plan by the end of the Spring semester.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Next Meeting – BAC will be April 28th at PCC – EE209 starting at 3:00 pm
CPC will be April 17th at LAC – T1046 starting at 2:30 pm