



## District Budget Committee (DBC)

Members Present: *Jose Torres, Mike Strong, Celia Huston, Jim Holbrook, Denise Allen-Hoyt, Mark McConnell, Scott Stark, Girija Raghavan, Yendis Battle, Rosemarie Hansen, Diana Rodriguez, Shari Blackwell, Jeremy Sims, Larry Strong, Rania Hamdy, Kristina Hannon*

Members Absent: *Richard Galope, Jajuan Dotson, Sheri Lillard, Steve Sutorus, Jason Lee*

Guests: *Scott Thayer, Tenille Alexander*

---

### Meeting Minutes – 4/19/2018, 2 pm, PDC 103

#### 1. Welcome & Introductions

Jose Torres welcomed everyone to the meeting; self-introductions were made for the benefit of Executive Director of Human Resources Kristina Hannon who was attending for the first time.

#### 2. Approval of Minutes

**Shari Blackwell made a motion to approve the minutes of the 2/15/2018 meeting, which Rania Hamdy seconded. The motion to approve passed unanimously.**

#### 3. Current Business

##### A. Review of FY 2017-18 Campus Program Review Requests (Mike & Scott)

Jose apologized for last month's late cancellation due to the Board of Trustee study session lasting much longer than anticipated. Scott Stark and Mike Strong each spoke about the program review process at their campus while committee members reviewed the handouts. Jose pointed out that the second item on CHC's list was not Measure M funded. Mike acknowledged that this was an error and advised that he will look into it.

##### B. Proposed DBC Recommendation 2018-03: Budget Assumptions for 2018-19

Jose reviewed the proposed recommendation and corrected the growth from 1.00% to 1.50%. He pointed out that Physical Plant and Instructional Equipment may be eligible to meet some program review needs that fit the criteria for this funding. **Mike made a motion to approve the recommendation with the change in growth percentage which Scott Stark seconded. There was no further discussion and the proposed recommendation was unanimously approved as amended.**

#### 4. Updates

##### A. FCC Auction Proceeds

Committee members discussed at length the differences between the Proposal for Allotment of \$57 Million in FCC Auction Proceeds presented for first read at the March 22 Board of Trustee study session and the Proposal for Allotment of \$76 Million in FCC Auction Proceeds discussed at the April 12 BOT meeting. Conversation included the following.

- Mark McConnell advised that CHC faculty found that line 10 of the April 12 document allotting \$10,000,000 for "Reserve for 'Promise Program'" appears to be something added

simply to appease one board member. Denise commented that the CHC Academic Senate voted to reaffirm and support the March 22 document (as originally recommended by the DBC).

- Jim Holbrook added that his senate had made three negative comments including 1) the changes in the document were identified as “summer magic”, 2) this is tyranny by the Board, and 3) this action erodes trust that has been developed by the DBC process.
- Celia Huston advised that the SBVC senate had also voted on the allocation. Since SBVC is further along on its College Promise program and has a skeletal plan, they supported line 10 of the April 12 document but not line 5 (\$30,000,000 for the KVCR Endowment) because they did not have enough information on how this would impact SBVC and KVCR.
- Denise commented she had reviewed the Districtwide Support Services Strategic Plan and that nowhere in the document was the media academy mentioned and that she could find the word promise only twice. She commented that these initiatives should be put through the planning process. All good ideas should be entertained but they have to align with district documents.
- Celia mentioned that the Left Lane is a Promise program to which Denise replied that that such a program has a very specific use and cost which need to be analyzed.
- Mike asked to hear about SBVC’s promise plan. Celia advised that it is based on the Valley Bound promise for the first year and they are building on a second year for 2020. Diana Rodriguez commented that the Valley Bound program is already recognized by the state as a Promise program.
- Denise commented that SBCCD has processes. There are many programs that could use an infusion of money; Promise could be a very interesting solution but the District should respect the hours of work already done. She felt that because there was a strong voice behind the dais, money is being directed toward an initiative that has not gone through the process.
- Jim commented that SBCCD has made a lot of progress toward becoming a universal organization. These kinds of surprises harm this process.
- Diana commented that SBVC has been going through its process and views this as a scaling up of one of its own programs.
- Jose voiced his perspective that a College Promise should provide the same services and opportunities to students at both colleges.
- Denise pointed out that the FCC Auction Proceeds Guiding Principle 9 prohibited using principal for ongoing costs.
- **Denise moved that the DBC make a recommendation to support its original FCC auction proceeds proposal which Mark seconded. The motion passed by a majority vote.**
- Celia advised that the SBVC Academic Senate had expressly requested that she vote against the additional KVCR funding and in favor of the College Promise funding.

- › Mike voiced his opinion that the vote of going back to the other recommendation is not a vote against College Promise. He is in support for developing a districtwide College Promise program.
- › Denise commented that the new proposal for auction proceeds pulls money away from the original Board promise to set aside \$80 million.
- › Jose asked for a recommendation about line 10 and the allocation of \$10 million for College Promise. Committee members discussed this issue and felt that there needed to be districtwide conversation about this initiative. Jose voiced his commitment to pursue the processes that the DBC has worked to build.
- › **Jose made a motion that the DBC recommend that the Board restore of the \$80 million set aside and allow the DBC to propose a districtwide College Promise. Mike seconded the motion and it was approved by the committee.**

## 5. Future Business

No future business was discussed.

## 6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for 5/17/2018, 2 pm, in PDC 104.