REGULAR MEETING OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SANTA BARBARA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

January 27, 1966, 4:00 P.M., Board Room

1. GENERAL FUNCTIONS

1.1 Call to Order

A regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Santa Barbara
Junior College District was called to order by President Garvin on
Thursday, January 27, 1966, at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room at Santa
Barbara City College.

1.2 Roll Call

Members present: Mrs. Kathryn O. Alexander
Mr. Wilbur L. Fillippini
Mr. Sidney R. Frank
Mr. James R. Garvin
Mrs. Winifred H. Lancaster
Mrs. Dorothy N. Meigs
Mr. Benjamin P. J. Wells

Members absent: None

Others present for all or a portion of the meeting included:

Dr. Robert C. Rockwell, Superintendent-President and
Secretary-Clerk to the Board
Mr. Lorenzo Dall'Armi, Administrative Dean, Business
Services
Mr. M. L. Huglin, Administrative Dean, Instruction
Mrs. Marie Lantagne, Administrative Dean, Student
Personnel
Mr. Selmer O. Wake, Director-Administrative Dean,
Adult Education
Mr. Spencer Blickenstaff, Assistant Dean, Adult
Education
Mr. Lisle C. Bresslin, Assistant Dean, Admissions
and Records
Dr. John Forsyth, President, Academic Senate
Dr. Robert Casier, Chairman, Social Science Division;
and division members: Mr. Henry Bagish, Dr. Timothy
Fetler, Mr. George Frakes, Mr. John Kay, Mr. Stanley
Sofas
Mrs. Louise H. Thornton, Executive Secretary
A few other Santa Barbara City College staff members
Mr. Bruce Dunsmore, architect, Daniel, Mann, Johnson,
and Mendenhall
Dr. Elwood P. Lehman, Bureau of School Planning, State Department of Education
Mrs. Laverne Marcy, observer, League of Women Voters
Mrs. Marian Barnes, observer, American Association of University Women
Mrs. Katherine McCloskey, Santa Barbara News-Press reporter

The President declared that a quorum was present and ordered that the Board proceed with the regular order of business.

1.3 Welcome to Guests

Mr. Carvin welcomed the guests and staff members present.

1.4 Minutes

It was moved by Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Alexander, and unanimously carried, to approve the minutes as submitted for the regular meeting of January 13, 1966.

1.5 Hearing of Citizens and Petitions

None.

1.6 Communication - National School Boards Association

Dr. Rockwell asked the Board members to notify his office if they wished to attend the NSBA convention on April 23-26, 1966, in Minneapolis.

(Mr. Frank entered the meeting at 4:08 p.m.)

(For the convenience of the consultants, item 8.2 was discussed at this point in the meeting. Please see page 7 of these minutes.)

2. PERSONNEL

2.1 Certificated Personnel Assignments

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini, seconded by Mr. Wells, and unanimously carried, that certificated personnel assignments recommended in Attachment 2.1 and in the addenda be approved.

2.2 Classified Personnel Assignments

It was moved by Mrs. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Frank, and unanimously
carried, that classified personnel assignments recommended in Attachment 2.2 and in the addenda be approved.

3. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

3.1 Report on Social Sciences

In accordance with the Board's expressed desire to hear, from time to time, presentations by each of the College's divisions, Mr. Garvin called on Dr. Robert Casier, chairman of the Social Science Division. Listing the courses taught, Dr. Casier explained that they comprise a part of the College program leading to the A.A. degree. Nineteen percent of the daytime students are Social Science majors.

Dr. Casier named the State and College requirements and said that the Division's members feel that the College's offerings are extensive for a two-year college but that in the future it is hoped to add more courses for the transfer student. After introducing those members of the Division who were present (see section 1.2 of these minutes), Dr. Casier added that each member of the Division has at least a Master's degree in his subject area.

3.2 Registered Nursing Program Advisory Committee

Referring to Attachment 3.2, a list of persons who have accepted membership on this committee, Dr. Rockwell commented that two or three more names will be submitted at a later date. Mr. Wells submitted the name of Dr. R. John Rutten, Chief of Staff at Goleta Valley Community Hospital, for inclusion on the list.

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini, seconded by Mrs. Meigs, and unanimously carried, to approve the list as submitted, plus the name of Dr. Rutten.

4. COLLEGE PLANTS AND PROPERTY

No report.
5. BUSINESS AND FINANCE

5.1 Purchase Order Reports

It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Fillippini, and unanimously carried, that the purchase of supplies, equipment, and services on purchase order numbers 9986 through 10054, as listed in Attachments 5.1-a through 5.1-c, be approved.

Mr. Dall'Armi reported that the folding partition for the Board Room would be installed in two or three weeks.

5.2 Payment of Claims

It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Wells, and unanimously carried, that payment of claims listed in Attachments 5.2-a and 5.2-b be approved.

5.3 Statement of Condition of General Fund, Special Reserve Fund and Excess Tax Funds Cash Accounts

Mr. Dall'Armi answered a number of questions regarding this statement, which was presented for the information of the Board. He said that, in the past, at this time of year it has been the local school districts' practice to borrow money from the County. This procedure is now being discouraged and the districts may have to make other arrangements. The Santa Barbara Junior College District is levying the full 356 of its tax at present and there is not enough to set aside in its reserve. The alternate is tax anticipation notes; the $1200 interest being offset by interest income from funds deposited in the County treasury.

Mrs. Alexander asked what reserve the District would need to carry to take care of these expenses. Mr. Dall'Armi replied that it would require approximately $250,000 plus the present reserve of $125,000. By law, he said, some of the District's reserve cannot be used for general purposes--only for capital outlay.
Mrs. Meigs asked about the money set aside for the District's lawsuit and about the status of the lawsuit itself. Dr. Rockwell answered that a hearing will be held in February to determine whether or not the Board will have to arbitrate.

5.4 Statement of Appropriations, Expenditures, Encumbrances, and Balances

This statement was presented for the Board's information.

5.5 District-Paid Health Insurance Plan for Employees

Mr. Dall'Armi called on Mr. Sofas, representing the Negotiating Council, who reported that the number of Southern California school districts having a district-paid health insurance plan for employees has increased from 55 in 1963-64 to 143 in 1965-66. Two-thirds of the junior colleges in Southern California have health and accident, income protection, major medical, and life insurance, in various combinations. The bulk of the districts having insurance plans pay 100 per cent of the employee's cost; some also pay for dependents.

Mr. Sofas stated that a middle-range program for Santa Barbara City College could be accomplished with a District-paid premium of $120, entailing a 6 mill levy; this permissive tax can be levied by the Board without a public vote.

Dr. Casier and Mr. Sofas extended an invitation to the Board to appoint a member to meet with the Negotiating Council sub-committees to discuss insurance and salaries. The Council would be ready to present a full recommendation to the Board in February or early March, Dr. Casier said.

(Mr. Garvin left the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and Mr. Fillippini presided for the balance of the meeting.)

Mr. Fillippini said it appeared to him that if a Board member served with these sub-committees, it might constitute a commitment for the Board.
Mr. Frank expressed the opinion that the Board member so serving would be helping to select the best policy and that this is not the Board's function; he felt that the staff should make the decision as to which policy and then submit a recommendation to the Board.

Mrs. Alexander suggested that more specific information be made available to the Board with the agenda for the next regular meeting. Mr. Fillippini said it seemed that the first step should be for the Board to indicate whether or not it is interested in such a plan; if the Board is favorably inclined at the next meeting, then a committee can be appointed. He said he believed that salaries must be discussed in conjunction with insurance.

Mr. Miller reported that a good selection of bids with exact costs cannot be obtained until the Board indicates its definite approval; Mr. Fillippini concurred in this statement.

Mrs. Lancaster said she did not think that the Board was as yet familiar enough with the problems; it needs specifics on what is available, how this has been handled to date, and what must be done in the future. Mr. Fillippini suggested that any helpful information be on the next agenda. Dr. Casier said that, if desired, the Council could write a number of junior colleges and make a survey, although this might be quite time-consuming; CTA does not have the information requested by Mrs. Lancaster. Mrs. Alexander asked if abstracts of material published by CTA and other sources could be mailed to the Board.

(Mrs. Alexander left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.)

Mr. Fillippini suggested that after information as to the need factor is furnished at the next regular meeting, then details on the cost factor can be considered. Mr. Wells remarked that fringe benefits should be considered part of salaries.
Dr. Rockwell's suggestion that the salary sub-committee work through the Superintendent and then make a presentation to the Board met with the Board's approval; this item will appear on the agenda of the February 10, 1966, meeting, if possible.

5.6 Transfer of Funds from Special Reserve Fund No. 2 to Bond Building Fund

It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and unanimously carried, that $223,688.00 now in Special Reserve Fund No. 2 be transferred to the Bond Building Fund of the Santa Barbara Junior College District, as reimbursement for the revenue expended to pay for the Administration Building rehabilitation.

6. STUDENT PERSONNEL

6.1 Statistics on Student Characteristics

Because of the late hour, it was agreed to postpone this presentation until the next regular meeting, February 10, 1966.

7. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

No report.

8. GENERAL INFORMATION

8.1 Adoption of Calendar for 1966-67

Mr. Bresslin explained that the calendar was developed in cooperation with the Academic Senate. It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Wells, and unanimously carried, to adopt the 1966-67 calendar as submitted.

8.2 Report on Physical Needs of the Next Twenty Years

Dr. Rockwell reviewed the background of the report which was compiled by him and the Planning Committee composed of Mr. Dall'Armi, Mr. Huglin, Mr. Wake, Mr. Bagish, Dr. Forsyth, Mr. Mouck, and Mr. Vernon, and said that the report reflects the best thinking of these persons. Throughout his remarks, he stressed that the estimates and projections will be under constant revision and will be constantly updated.
The basic problems are (1) what the physical needs would be for the SBJCD, looking toward 1985, and (2) how these needs can be met. Dr. Rockwell emphasized that enrollment figures in the report are conservative, being based on full-time equivalent enrollments, not the number of actual bodies. He repeated Mr. Dunsmore's estimates on costs for enrollments of 3,000, 4,000, and 5,000 FTE, with and without multi-level parking structures. With respect to the garages, it is now believed that additional parking can be found without building them.

He summed up the immediate pressing needs for the Mesa Campus, which is already behind in the matter of classrooms and special areas (gym, music-drama, art, and vocational facilities); these would require 12-13 million dollars. Costs for developing the downtown Adult Education Center are not included in this report; they hinge on the feasibility study currently being prepared by Arendt, Mosher, and Grant.

Dr. Rockwell said that it is important to consider a second site—perhaps in the Goleta area—of 100-150 acres. Construction on the second campus would have to begin about 1973.

As soon as the Board gives the architects a maximum figure for enrollment, the architectural firm can go ahead with preliminary plans and the Board can decide how best to finance a building program.

Dr. Rockwell then introduced Mr. Dunsmore, project architect with Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall, and Dr. Lehman, Bureau of School Planning, State Department of Education.

Dr. Lehman said that as part of his consultant's work he had visited the Adult Education program and considered it unequalled. He hopes to make a documentary to assist other areas who want to do something similar.

Remarking that the Board's decision at this meeting would affect the
community for many decades ahead, he urged that additional sites be secured before they escape or become prohibitively priced; he predicted the need for four sites in the foreseeable future. He added that he had seen a choice of outstanding sites and that his recommendation for a campus in Goleta was for not less than 4,000 students and a minimum of 150 usable acres.

Mr. Dunsmore expressed pleasure that the architects were being given sufficient time for depth planning. He believes that the Mesa Campus can handle a 4,000 enrollment and that multi-level parking is not now essential to the building program.

Mr. Fillippini stated that the time has arrived when the Board cannot delay any longer; also, before planning can be started, the Board must give direction to the administration, architects, and consultants. He complimented Dr. Rockwell and his committee on the excellent report, and said that he would like to see the Board adopt as a policy the conclusions recommended on pages 18 and 19 of the report. He suggested that these conclusions be read with time allowed for questioning the consultants present.

Mr. Garvin then read each item, and discussion ensued as follows:

A. All estimates, including enrollment and costs, must be verified periodically to determine accuracy of figures.

Mr. Frank underlined Dr. Rockwell's emphasis on the tentativeness of the figures as being a serious and vital point. Mrs. Lancaster added that past planning had been too conservative and that the Board should not be overly cautious in acquiring land at this time.

B. It would appear wise to develop colleges within the District which are comprehensive in nature.

Mrs. Lancaster remarked that to avoid duplication, each campus should specialize in different areas. Replying to Mrs. Meigs' query, Dr.
Rockwell said that flexibility would be maintained in setting up attendance areas; if a student living in Goleta wished to specialize in a subject on the Mesa campus, this would be permitted. Dr. Lehman concurred, referring to the Education Code, Section 2010. Mrs. Lancaster asked if anything had yet been worked out concerning what each of the two campuses would specialize in, for this would affect the immediate planning for buildings. Dr. Rockwell and Mr. Fillippini both said that these conclusions are only for the broad aspects of the program; as planning becomes more firm, details will follow.

C. The Adult Education facilities should be brought up to standard, either through rehabilitation of the present plant or by replacement by new buildings.

D. In all future construction within the District, care should be exercised in avoiding costly duplication of facilities.

E. Construction of multi-level garages to accommodate parking needs appears to be too expensive and probably should not be considered in the future planning of the Mesa Campus.

To the Board's query, Mr. Dunsmore replied that it is estimated that 120 cars may be parked per acre. Mr. Garvin thought that the conclusion might be stating it too strongly for the present time; in a few years it may be a different story.

F. In considering total costs of the future needs of the District, every effort must be made to achieve a quality building program as economically as possible.

G. The Mesa Campus should be limited to a full-time enrollment not to exceed 4,000 students. (The phrase "providing this can be done without constructing a multi-level garage" omitted as explained below.)

Mrs. Alexander said she would like to consider the area between 3,000 and 4,000 at greater length and would like to see a further report not so equivocal. Dr. Rockwell said that the Board will be informed of the number the architect recommends. Mr. Fillippini and Mr. Frank both expressed the thought that these are flexible conclusions; the
land must be utilized to the greatest extent and this includes parking. Mr. Frank recommended amending "C", eliminating the final phrase. Mrs. Lancaster said that the District is really aiming and should interpret the figure 4,000 rather strictly toward 4,000/ Mrs. Alexander commented that the District is only establishing this as a ceiling. Mrs. Lancaster further remarked that expense per student and accessibility for the student must be taken into consideration; the Mesa campus must be saturated as much as possible before going elsewhere.

Mr. Miller asked what other junior colleges in the State had decided as to the best FTE figure. Dr. Rockwell replied that 3,000 is the breaking point at which the college begins to save money.

Mrs. Lancaster said that at the CSBA convention she asked these some what number they set as a limit per campus, and was told 4,000 persons representing multi-campuses if any had 7,000-8,000 students; 10,000 with 7,000-8,000 the most common figure; she and said she would like to obtain figures from all such campuses. Dr. Lehman interjeeted that such campuses usually have 4,000-6,000 day enrollment; a combined day and evening enrollment might run to 8,000.

Mrs. Meigs remarked that only when things begin to stabilize between the two campuses do you have a definite ceiling. During the building phase, the Mesa Campus might have 5,000 and when the new campus opens the latter may have only 1,000. Mr. Wells said that he felt this is not the time to finalize or be restrictive; these conclusions are to be used only as guidelines.

Mrs. Meigs inquired if perhaps a source other than bonding could be found to finance multi-level garages; if so, there would then be no objection to including these structures in the building program. Mr. Dunsmore commented that garages could be added at any time after construction of other buildings.
H. A site for a second campus, in the Goleta area, must be purchased as soon as possible, in anticipation of the estimated growth in enrollment as well as to save money for the District.

I. (Original version before amending) The Goleta Campus should be designed for an enrollment of 4,000 to 5,000 FTE students, with a campus of 100 to 150 acres.

Mrs. Lancaster felt that the District should not set a limit of 5,000 enrollment or 150 acres; the new campus should be capable of expansion. Commenting that establishing a junior college in the proximity of a university would mean an interrelationship, Mr. Frank asked what problems have been noted in other areas where this situation exists. Dr. Lehman answered that there is no correlation in the kinds of problems in this situation; more mutual problems exist in the proximity of a junior college to a high school. It was moved by Mrs. Alexander, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and unanimously carried, to amend "I" to read:

The Goleta Campus should be designed for an enrollment of at least 4,000 FTE students, with a campus of about 150 usable acres.

J. The acquisition of more acreage adjacent to the Mesa Campus would appear to be financially unsound in view of the development of a second campus.

K. It would appear that the District will have the financial potential to support a building program to meet its needs. (This statement was amended by substituting the word "potential" for "resources.")

L. After careful analysis of the advantages and disadvantages between a tax override program and a bonding program, it would appear that a bonding program is to be preferred.

M. In view of the urgent need for facilities at the Mesa Campus, the Board should act swiftly to provide these facilities. (This statement was amended by eliminating the words "it would appear that" following "Mesa Campus.")

N. As soon as possible, the Board should ask the people of the District to vote bonds sufficient to meet the needs of the District through the next ten years, including the purchase of a site for a second campus.
Q. Priorities for future building should be established, not only for determining the amount of money to be required but also for determining an equitable assignment to all divisions of the College according to need.

Mrs. Meigs commented that this item has not been discussed to any extent; it was agreed to go into this soon.

P. All available sources of revenue from Federal and State governments, as well as private funds, should be used to help offset costs to the people of the District.

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini, seconded by Mr. Wells, and unanimously carried, to adopt as a policy the "Conclusions" identified as Part III of the report, as amended, with the understanding that this is a minimum, flexible policy not restricted to those items identified with the policy.

The Board thanked Dr. Lehman and Mr. Dunsmore for their services and advice.

8.3 Report on Future Planning for Business Services

The Board will meet as a Committee of the Whole on February 2, 1966, at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room, to hear Dr. Lloyd Nelson and Dr. Schuyler Joyner, consultants, report on future planning for business services.

9. ADJOURNMENT

No further business being presented, it was moved by Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Meigs, and unanimously carried, that the meeting be adjourned at 6:25 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held on Thursday, February 10, 1966 at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room at Santa Barbara City College.

Attest:  
Mr. James R. Garvin  
President, Board of Trustees  
Santa Barbara Junior College District

Dr. Robert C. Rockwell, Superintendent-President and Secretary-Clerk to the Board of Trustees  
Santa Barbara Junior College District

Approved by Board of Trustees on February 10, 1966 as corrected