REGULAR MEETING OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES

SANTA BARBARA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

June 23, 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, June 23, 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  
Mr. Charles F. Rheinschmidt, Assistant Dean, Student Activities  
Mr. Richard R. Weist, President, Instructors Association  
Mr. Ralph E. Vernon, Past President, Instructors Association  
Mrs. Louise H. Thornton, Secretary to Superintendent  
A number of other Santa Barbara City College staff members
Mr. Bruce Dunsmore, architect, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall
Mr. Mike Pahos, City Landscape Architect
Mr. Steve Sullivan, Staff Writer, Santa Barbara News-Press

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. Garvin welcomed the guests and staff members present.

1.4 Minutes

It was moved by Mrs. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Fillippini, and unanimously carried, to approve the minutes as submitted for the regular meeting of June 8, 1966.

1.5 Hearing of Citizens and Petitions

None.

1.6 Communications

None.

2. PERSONNEL

2.1 Certificated Personnel Assignments

It was moved by Mrs. Meigs, 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 Mr. Wells, 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 Receipt of Approval of Vocational Education Project No. 7-0838

For the information of the Board, Dr. Rockwell announced that the
District's request for financial aid under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (PL 88-210) has been approved. This request was filed under Project No. 7-0838 for the amount of $4,760 and was entitled, The Occupational Preparation of a General Office Worker Through a Technical Clerk-Typist, Secretarial, and Stenographic Program.

3.2 Request for Authorization to File an Application for Extension of Adult Education EOA Basic Education Project

To Mrs. Alexander's questions, Mr. Wake replied that this project has been going on three months, since April 11, 1966, and that students may attend either five day sessions or four evening sessions per week. Dr. Rockwell added that the project has been operating concurrently with the MDTA program.

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini, seconded by Mr. Frank, and unanimously carried, to approve the request for filing for an extension of the 100 per cent reimbursable Adult Education EOA Basic Education Project, to carry the program forward into the 1966-67 school year.

(Later in the meeting, following item 5.6, Mr. Garvin asked if the Board should approve the lease for facilities for this project, a copy of said lease being included in Attachment 3.2. Mr. Dall'Armi said he thought it would be premature to enter into a lease agreement before approval of the extension had been obtained.)

4. PLANTS AND PROPERTY

4.1 Report on Status of District-Owned Buildings with Respect to Recent Ruling by the Attorney General's Office on Board Responsibility for Ordering Inspection of Buildings Built Prior to 1933

Mr. Dall'Armi stated that no buildings on the Mesa campus come under this particular opinion of the Attorney General. A complete report will be made on buildings on the Adult Education site and will be presented with recommendations at a future Board meeting.
4.2 Architect's Progress Report on Planning for Completion of Mesa Campus

Mr. Dunsmore displayed a site plan and sketches depicting the consolidation of a number of large group lecture halls into one unit located in the humanities area; this unit, planning of which involved participation by many SBCC staff members, would serve as a "stopping point" for one end of the court area.

Next, Mr. Dunsmore discussed the concept plans for the three-level physical education complex, incorporating the present facilities built under Phase I. He said that although the budget area programmed was 90,960 sq. ft., the area in the concept under discussion had been kept to 79,200 sq. ft. Every area in the Master Plan is now in some stage of planning development, he added.

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini and seconded by Mrs. Alexander to authorize Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall to proceed from the concept stage to preliminary drawings for the physical education complex, under Phase II.

Discussion then ensued. Concerning the retractable seats in the gym, Mr. Fillippini asked for figures to show the comparison of total cost of the gym with retractable seats and total cost with standard seating, so that said costs could be presented to the public in justification of the former. In terms of extra land needed and resultant higher building costs if stationary seats are used, he pointed out that it would seem more economical over-all to order retractable seats even if the seats themselves were more expensive than the stationary type.

Mrs. Alexander and Mr. Frank expressed interest in the possible utilization of the large deck area for some sort of physical education or recreational activity. Mr. Dunsmore said this could be done; however, this would mean higher cost because of stronger footings necessary.
Also, 10-12-foot-high fencing would be required which might not be attractive. Mr. Dunsmore stated that he would run an analysis on possible other uses for the deck, with attendant costs. Mr. Fillippini agreed with the suggestion, saying that in California such an outdoor area could be used much of the year. Mrs. Meigs commented that even if the deck were not fully developed for other uses now, it might be in the future if constructed strong enough originally.

Mrs. Lancaster said that last August the Board asked that a study be made of traffic flow and parking in planning for Phase II of construction on the Mesa campus. She said that, while the Board now has information that the campus can accommodate up to 4,000 for parking, "we haven't been allowed to discuss the possibility of employing local architects. I have gone through the minutes of our past meetings but I can't find when we hired the architects. If we ask our local people for tax money, we owe them consideration to see what they have to offer. We were to sit down to see where we wanted to go, to discuss our entire educational philosophy. The committee to deal with this disbanded and there has been no discussion. Is it better to have one campus here and one in Goleta, and what type of campus do we want? We haven't discussed this as a Board. Will we want one centralized library, physical education facilities, etc., for all these campuses to use? This may be our answer, but our answer has not been founded upon investigation."

Mrs. Alexander said she felt that all these points had been covered in the report prepared by Dr. Rockwell (Physical Needs of the Next Twenty Years, "Conclusions" of which, as amended, were adopted as policy by the Board on January 27, 1966 after detailed discussion). "It was my motion to authorize the architects to proceed with Phase II," she added.
Dr. Rockwell noted that a space adequacy report had also been adopted. He said it was his understanding that DMJM had been engaged for the completion of the Mesa campus.

Mr. Fillippini commented, "I agree 100 per cent with the philosophy that we use local people, including local contractors, who are all local taxpayers—but this isn't always practical. Local people are given consideration when bidding takes place. It is now too late to change architects and start from scratch with someone local. With respect to the local taxpayer, we must protect the investment we have already made."

Mrs. Alexander said she believed that the Board had proceeded in an orderly fashion. She asked how many architectural firms were interviewed when the bidding was first opened by the former Board. Mr. Dunsmore replied, "Sixteen."

Mr. Frank remarked that it would seem more efficient to continue in the same vein, although he concurred with Mrs. Lancaster that the Board had not formalized a continuation of the agreement but were proceeding more on assumptions.

Mrs. Lancaster emphasized that she was not questioning the competency of the present architects, but she hoped that in the future those involved would proceed in less of a rush.

Mr. Garvin stated it was his understanding that the agreement was formally entered into with DMJM.

Mr. Fillippini said, "The work the staff has done with the architects has taken much responsibility off my shoulders, with respect to all the details. It seems perfect for this campus, considering the limited space available and the terrain."

Mrs. Meigs then asked, "Could this motion be amended so it isn't limited to the physical education complex but will cover future areas,
too? It would be too extravagant and out of line to change architects now; we couldn't defend such action to the public."

Mr. Fillippini commented, "I don't like haste and I don't feel that we have been hasty; if we are serious in having November as the deadline for submitting plans to the voters, we must have these definite plans to present."

Mrs. Lancaster said, "I have never felt that we discussed the full implications adequately. We have not had full and ample discussion."

Mr. Fillippini opined that "Phase II is our immediate challenge; when it is consummated, then we will give full attention to another campus."

Briefly reviewing the procedures followed by the Board and its sub-committees, Mrs. Alexander said, "I would not vote if I did not feel that we had had full and ample discussion." Dr. Rockwell concurred with her feeling.

Mr. Fillippini's motion as seconded by Mrs. Alexander (to authorize Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall to proceed from the concept stage to preliminary drawings for the physical education complex, under Phase II) was voted on and carried unanimously.

After passage of the motion, Mr. Huglin said that the staff had spent many hours of work and had offered numerous ideas which had been incorporated into the planning; he commended the staff's enthusiasm.

Mr. Dunsmore then distributed to the Board copies of the Preliminary Production Schedule for Completion of the Mesa Campus for 4,000 FTE.

Mrs. Alexander inquired if Phase IV (Little Theater) must precede Phase V (Humanities, Sciences, Vocational Education). Dr. Rockwell replied that nothing definite has been decided on priority. Mr. Dunsmore stated, "At the present time, we are well into Phase V planning—in fact,
ahead of Phase IV. In the near future, we must allocate buildings to
the amount of bonds to be asked for. Four, or perhaps five, buildings
will be the difference between 3,000 and 4,000 FTE; we are splitting
Phase V into two parts."

After a short discussion of enrollment projections with Mr. Bresslin,
Mr. Garvin thanked Mr. Dunsmore for his presentation.

5. BUSINESS AND FINANCE

5.1 Purchase Order Reports

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini, seconded by Mrs. Alexander, and
unanimously carried, that the purchase of supplies, equipment, and
services on purchase order numbers 10528 through 10556, as listed in
Attachment 5.1-a, be approved.

5.2 Payment of Claims

It was moved by Mrs. Alexander, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and
unanimously carried, that payment of claims listed in Attachments 5.2-a
and 5.2-b be approved.

5.3 Authorization for Making Budgetary Transfers to Permit Payment of Fiscal
Obligations at the Close of the Current School Year

Mr. Dall'Armi noted that the District's accounts are in good shape.
The EOA and classified salaries may necessitate making a transfer, but
overall the District will end up well, he said.

It was moved by Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and unanimously
carried, to authorize budgetary transfers between the undistributed
reserve and any expenditure classification as necessary to permit the
payment of obligations at the end of the current school year; and to
authorize the Administrative Dean, Business Services, to complete the
necessary forms provided for this purpose.
5.4 Renewal of Naval Reserve Training Center Use Agreement

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and unanimously carried, to ratify the renewal of the agreement with the Department of the Navy for the use of certain classrooms and other facilities located in the Naval Reserve Armory, at no charge to the Santa Barbara Junior College District, for the 1966-67 school year; and that a letter of appreciation be directed to Commander Clark Seagraves for his efforts in behalf of the District.

5.5 Adoption of Tentative Budget for the 1966-67 School Year

Mr. Fillippini, chairman of the Board's Budget Sub-committee, presented the Sub-committee's report and recommendations concerning the Tentative Budget for the 1966-67 school year, and distributed copies of the report to the Board.

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini and seconded by Mrs. Alexander that the Tentative Budget for the 1966-67 school year be approved.

Mr. Dall'Armi noted that there are some indications that the estimated 8 per cent increase in assessed valuation may be a conservative estimate; should the valuation increase beyond the level anticipated in calculating this source of income for the Tentative Budget, adjustments will be made prior to presentation of the Publication Budget in July. Receipt of this revised figure is hoped for by the time that the Publication Budget materials are distributed prior to the July 14, 1966 Board meeting.

Mr. Fillippini remarked, "In speaking as an individual Board member, not as chairman of the Budget Sub-committee, I think the Board can be proud that the budget is reasonable and closely confined to our past tax rate; when we consider the increased staff, etc., we are very fortunate in this District to accomplish what we have without any serious overrides."
Regarding the recommendation in paragraph two of the Sub-committee's report" (that any new information relative to assessed valuation be included as a part of the Board of Trustees' consideration at the next reading of the budget), "it would be wonderful to accomplish what we want with the same tax rate; this would be very influential with the taxpayers."

Mrs. Lancaster agreed, saying, "Since we are going to the voters for a big bond issue and want to show that we are genuinely trying to have a good school and keep costs down at the same time, we certainly should retain the present tax rate without the increase of 2.6 cents mentioned in the Tentative Budget. This would place us in an excellent position with the voters."

Concurring that this is a vital point, Mr. Frank said he thought it could be accomplished without too much effort.

Mr. Dall'Armi stated that the bond redemption rate will be calculated as soon as the assessed valuation is learned. "I think," he said, "that assurance can be given that the 2.6 cents can be reduced by these two means: (1) an increase in assessed valuation beyond the 8 per cent will bring about part of the reduction and (2) the rest can be taken out of the community services tax override."

Mrs. Alexander inquired, "May we have a statement of the assessed valuation as soon as it is available to you?" Mr. Dall'Armi replied, "Yes, this is our plan--perhaps by the middle of next week."

Mrs. Lancaster stressed that, although this is a tentative budget, she would like it on record that the Board wishes to retain the present tax rate.
Mr. Fillippini's motion as seconded by Mrs. Alexander (to approve the Tentative Budget for the 1966-67 school year) was voted on and carried unanimously.

5.6 Financial Aid Contract with the State Division of Real Estate

Mr. Dall'Armi noted that last year the District applied for $300; this year the District is entitled to twice that amount.

It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Fillippini, and unanimously carried, to approve the contract with the California State Division of Real Estate, which entitles the Santa Barbara Junior College District to a grant of $600 to initiate or expand and/or improve the real estate curriculum of Santa Barbara City College; and to authorize the Administrative Dean, Business Services, to execute the necessary agreement.

6. Student Personnel

No report.

7. Community Relations

No report.

8. General Information

8.1 Annual Organizational Meeting July 14, 1966

Dr. Rockwell announced that the annual organizational meeting of the Board would be held July 14, 1966, a regular meeting date.

Mr. Frank said that, as discussed in a previous meeting, a committee to survey methods used by other junior colleges in determining an administrative salary schedule should be appointed. Mr. Garvin suggested that appointment of such a committee be done at the aforementioned organizational meeting, after the 1966-67 officers are determined. It was moved by Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and unanimously carried, that a Board committee to survey methods used by other junior colleges in
determining an administrative salary schedule be appointed at the annual organizational meeting on July 14, 1966.

Dr. Rockwell will check the Education Code to ascertain if all Board members must be present at the annual organizational meeting.

Mr. Fillippini said he would be glad to serve in his present position again next year.

8.2 Adjourned Board Meeting August 3, 1966

A public hearing on the proposed 1966-67 budget must be held between August 1 and August 7, 1966. Board members were polled to determine if a quorum would be present for an adjourned Board meeting and public hearing on Wednesday, August 3, 1966. Mrs. Alexander and Mrs. Lancaster indicated they might be absent on August 3, 1966.

9. ADJOURNMENT

No further business being presented, President Garvin declared the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held Thursday, July 14, 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 July 14, 1966