



**Academic Senate  
SBVC**

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<p><b>New Business (cont)</b></p>	<p>J Marquis commits 20% of her time to IS. The incoming population is from a myriad of countries; RCC has a large contingent from China. Santa Monica College has 3,500 IS, with \$20M budgeted. It's considered imprudent to be too revenue-dependent on one country's student base. Majors are very diversified.</p> <p>Financially, SBVC's IS funds are approximately \$161K, which went back into general funds. (CHC: 38K). G Kuck warned that an institution should not depend on IS revenue for ongoing funding. It's worthwhile for short-term or one-time expenditures.</p> <p>Past IS perceptions were that attending a CC was for disadvantaged or academically challenged students, i.e. a fallback plan if failing to get into a four-year college. Beginning at a CC is now being seen as a viable pathway and a means of increasing chances of later IS success/acceptance at a four-year (smaller classes, early cultural immersion, relaxed time constraints due to lower cost). Estimated annual costs are: SBVC \$18K, CSU \$28K, UC \$50K.</p> <p>G Kuck stressed there is presently no MOU; we are still seeking options. Sample allocation models (e.g. Butte Community College): 50% to College General Fund (not District), 20% to IS program (travel, marketing, activities), 5% staff/faculty, 5% service augmentation (e.g. tutors), 20% purchasing of sections (which increases, rather than limits, seat capacity). It takes about 100-150 students for a program to be sustainable.</p> <p>Ideal programs, according to recruiters, include: pathway from HS to CC to university with provisional guaranteed acceptance letters at each phase; intensive ESL the prior summer with provisional acceptance pending TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) score; require \$3K deposit (helps with I-20 visa application) at time of acceptance. It's advisable to be certified by an agency like American International Recruitment Council, which gives assurance to parents and recruiters. Other pluses: accepting minors, providing airport pick-ups, available scholarships, offering one-year general-ed experiences.</p>	

**Academic Senate  
SBVC**

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<p><b>New Business (cont)</b></p>	<p>Currently transfer agreements are with CSUSB, U of R, UCR; pending are Loma Linda University and California Baptist University. Local Christian high schools want incoming students there by Grade 10 in order to instill chosen values. Of 40+ recruiting agencies, 19 seem a good fit. An advisory committee will meet when MOUs are in place. Internal marketing plans and an orientation program will be needed, required by Homeland Security in compliance with SEVIS (Student and Exchange Visitor Information System).</p> <p>Challenges going forward: no IS offices on either campus; dedicated/trained counselors; inconsistent documented processes; no marketing; no consistent student tracking (Datatel or SEVIS); no tracking of funding; nine possible English assessment placements; no planning for marketing/recruiting/program.</p> <p>Recommendations: have advisory committee overseen by both colleges with centralized services. Once the program reaches 150 students, phase over to the college. SBVC should contract with California Education and Training Export Consortium and partner with recruiting agencies and have MOUs with service providers.</p> <p><b>15-16 Budget and Proposed Resource Allocation Model:</b> S Stark said that despite an unhappy budget year, the college is heading into better times. The new proposal “helps CHC without hurting Valley College.” The state’s annual disbursement is divided into a couple large appropriations. Base revenue (SBVC \$3.9M, CHC \$3.4M) is allocated on our mere presence as a mid-sized college. The benchmark is again approaching 10K FTES. There is also a main appropriation to District, based on FTES; last year was 13,597 FTES and funding of \$53M. By 70-30: \$44.1M to SBVC, \$18.9 to CHC. \$9.1M allocated for central services was also assessed 70-30, i.e. \$6.3M SBVC, \$2.8M CHC. Any excesses (or deficits) go into/draw from the fund balance June 30.</p> <p>Under current funding, CHC cannot pull out of its financial troubles, needing 5500-5900 FTES (currently 4K). “The District Plan, letting CHC capture as many FTES as possible, didn’t work for Valley.” The shift adjusted to 68.76 v 31.24, costing SBVC \$900K. The new mid-year resource allocation model: 14,689 FTES with 10,100 fully funded for SBVC. CHC will have actual 4,589: funded 3,769, unfunded 820. Valley has been funding FTES overages through District coffers and by using adjunct faculty, trying to demonstrate local needs to State, with District covering \$1,160 per unfunded FTES.</p>	

**Academic Senate  
SBVC**

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<p><b>New Business (cont)</b></p>	<p>S Stark noted that schools must return funds when not meeting FTES; refunded monies (“fallout”) are redistributed to qualifying colleges. It was planned that 194 FTES in fallout funds would go directly to CHC. Next year’s published growth is 2%; both schools will grow by that amount and CHC will capture any fallout funds to cover their FTES. Anticipated fallout funds are projected to possibly exceed 1.5%. CHC should go to 4,042, SBVC growing to 10,300. SBVC’s excess of \$376K has been spent on additional faculty/classified positions. The new excess is anticipated at \$2.1M, growing the fund balance. “By 2020, CHC should be out of the deficit game – perhaps out of the hole by 2017. It’s looking really promising.” R Pires asked why, if faculty retirements left already-funded positions, why couldn’t they all be replaced? Answer: SBVC went into position control, looking at each classified or faculty position. The expanded Chancellor’s cabinet was entreated for all necessary positions before a final budget was approved September 2014.</p> <p><b>Vote of No Confidence Process and Timeline:</b> J Gilbert met with CHC’s Senate president and J Stankas. The plan was to submit gathered evidence and a resolution to the April 9 board. In order to have first and second readings prior to board, Senate would need meetings both March 25 and April 1. Suggested categories are: 1) leadership/vision (questionable hiring practices and HR issues), 2) training and informing the board, 3) respect for and knowledge of collegial processes, 4) interference with college process and purview, 5) fiscal management. Except for generically reported facts, evidence cannot be submitted anonymously. The email site is <a href="mailto:sbvcevidence@gmail.com">sbvcevidence@gmail.com</a>. Evidence will be drafted by both Senate executive committees; both will submit identical resolutions. A first reading (no debate) would occur March 25. Evidence can still be gathered following first reading. The Brown Act mandates 72 hours of posting; the Senate Drop Box can be used. The concluding “Resolved” statement would direct the board to place this item on its public agenda for the following board meeting (May 14). With classes still in session, faculty and campus personnel would be available for public debate.</p>	

**Academic Senate  
SBVC**

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>New Business (cont)</b>	Three possible outcomes: 1) neutral appreciation for Senate input, 2) Board agreement/action, 3) Board proposing an improvement plan. D Lee asked if CHC was able to meet the same deadlines. They require three readings, but are able to accommodate with extra meetings. M Copeland urged the enhanced schedule to communicate to the Board Senate's serious weighing of said matters. J Lamore suggested encouraging Senators to assign proxies if necessary, in order to make quorum. J Gilbert noted that CHC is requesting that non-tenured faculty not vote.	<b>MOTION</b> by A Alsip to schedule Senate meetings March 25 and possibly April 8 in case quorum is not met March 25 or April 1. <b>2<sup>nd</sup></b> by D Lee. <b>Voice Vote – unanimous save one abstention.</b>
	<b>Old Business</b>	<p><b>Outstanding Professor Policy Revision:</b> C Huston reintroduced wording changes re eligible voters and changing the voting procedure to selecting two top choices (runoffs in case of tie).</p> <p><b>ACCJC Report and Deficiencies:</b> J Gilbert sent Senators the Chancellor's update re how District plans to address deficiencies; it is included in Senate's meeting files. Senators are encouraged to examine it. Share concerns with J Gilbert or the Chancellor. It was proposed to form an ad hoc committee to monitor improvements and revisions/drafts. S Lillard reported that the Board of Trustees is expecting a monthly report from the Chancellor; our Senate president should be able to get copies.</p> <p><b>Ed Policy - Student Services - no report.</b></p>	<p><b>MOTION</b> by A Aguilar-Kitibutr to approve Outstanding Professor language/voting changes. <b>2<sup>nd</sup></b> by A Au. <b>Voice Vote – unanimous.</b></p>
	<b>Committees</b>	<p><b>Personnel Policy: Faculty Vacancy Process:</b> J Gilbert described the proposed flow chart about retirement/resignation replacements within the last two years, to be reviewed in the next two. Steps would be: 1) program review: YES. 2) Is the discipline required for transfer or AA/AS degree? YES. (NO would then consider CTE job favorability data.) 3) Any special regulatory mandates? YES. Program Review would then green-light the hire. A NO on #3 would query: does not replacing result in remaining faculty load falling below 50%. YES also leads to a recommendation to hire. A NO would return to Program Review for Needs Assessment. Senators proposed a number of edits. S Lillard said that state allocation funds are available to convert PT to FT positions. J Gilbert asked Program Review to continue to edit the form; he will then send it to Personnel Policy.</p>	



Academic Senate SBVC		AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30	
Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action