REGULAR MEETING OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SANTA BARBARA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

December 14, 1967 - 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 Wells on Thursday, December 14, 1967 at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room at Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara, California.

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 of a portion of the meeting included:
Dr. Robert C. Rockwell, Superintendent-President and Secretary-Clerk to the Board of Trustees
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, Evening College
Dr. Martin M. Bobgan, Assistant Dean, Adult Education
Mr. Lisle C. Bresslin, Assistant Dean, Admissions and Records
Mr. James E. Foxx, Assistant Dean, Technical/Vocational
Mrs. Margaret F. McGillen, Assistant Dean, Health Occupations
Mr. Gary Mowick, Administrative Assistant, Research and Development
Mr. Charles F. Rheinschmidt, Assistant Dean, Student Activities
Mr. Paul Ash, Coordinator, Adult Education
Mr. Cedric Boeseke, Coordinator, Placement
Mrs. Alma Ritchie, Coordinator, Adult Education
Mr. Henry H. Bagish, President, Academic Senate
Mr. Calvin Reynolds, President, SBCC Instructors' Association
Mr. Theron Barnes, Representative of Chapter 289, California School Employees' Association
Mrs. Louise H. Thornton, Secretary to Superintendent
Mr. Ward Lindenmayer, student, tape recorder operator
A number of other SBJCD employees
Miss Melody Gillard, editor of student newspaper, Channels
Mr. Charles Dwiggins, photographer for student yearbook
Mrs. Katherine McCloskey, Santa Barbara News-Press staff writer
Mr. Roy C. Bagley, Executive Secretary, Santa Barbara County
Taxpayers' Association, Inc.
Messrs. Arendt and Peterson, architectural firm of Arendt, Mosher, and Grant

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

1.3 Welcome to Guests

Mr. Wells welcomed guests and staff members present and invited comments from the audience during the course of the meeting.

1.4 Minutes

It was moved by Mr. Carvin, seconded by Mr. Frank, and unanimously carried, to approve the minutes for the adjourned meeting of November 30, 1967.

1.5 Hearing of Citizens and Petitions

None.

1.6 Communications

None.

NOTE: Preceding Item 2.1, it was agreed to take up Item 4.1 in order to accommodate the architects. Please see Item 4.1 for this discussion.

2. PERSONNEL

2.1 Certificated Personnel Assignments

It was moved by Mrs. Meigs, seconded by Mrs. Alexander, and carried unanimously, to approve personnel assignments for certificated staff as recommended in attachment 2.1 and the addenda.

2.2 Classified Personnel Assignments

It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Fillippini, and carried
unanimously, to approve personnel assignments for classified staff as recommended in attachment 2.2 and the addenda.

2.3 Adoption of Classified Personnel Policies on Industrial Accident Leave and Overtime Compensation

a. & b. It was moved by Mr. Garvin, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and carried unanimously to approve the two classified personnel policies listed in attachments 2.3-a and 2.3-b:

"Industrial Accident or Illness Leave for Classified Personnel"

"Overtime Compensation for Classified Personnel"

These changes are necessitated by revisions in the Education Code. Answering Mr. Frank's query, Mr. Dall'Armi replied that the cost for implementing these two policies would not be large; that most of the overtime involved would be for custodians; and that this cost can be paid for by the community services tax.

3. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

3.1 Request for Approval of Adult Education Classes for Winter Term

It was moved by Mr. Garvin, seconded by Mrs. Alexander, and carried unanimously, to approve the Adult Education classes for the winter term, as listed in attachments 3.1-a and 3.1-b.

3.2 Report on Study of Four-Quarter Plan

The Board of Trustees has been directed by the State Department of Education to report the result of its study on the four-quarter plan by January 1, 1968.

It was moved by Mr. Garvin to adopt the Superintendent's recommendation of a "watch and wait" policy in regard to conversion to the four-quarter plan of operation of Santa Barbara City College. Dr. Rockwell said he would notify the State Department of Education of the Board of Trustees' decision. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fillippini, and carried unanimously.
4. PLANTS AND PROPERTY

4.1 Acceptance of Feasibility Study in Conjunction with the Hollister Property Gift Offer, and Authorization for Administration to Enter into Informal Negotiations with the Hollister Company

NOTE: This item was discussed prior to Item 2.1, to accommodate the architects.

Stressing that this was a "concept" presentation only, Mr. Arendt of the architectural firm, Arendt, Mosher and Grant, showed a slide of the 85-acre portion of the Winchester Canyon which would seem the only usable area for the purpose of constructing a college campus on a 150-acre site offered by the Hollister Company. The study proposes one large continuous building with courts, all under one cover, basically two or three stories, and covering approximately 500,000 square feet, to accommodate about 5,000 students. The "norm" of scattered buildings would use up too much land and not leave sufficient space for parking and physical education facilities.

Answering questions from the Board and audience, Mr. Arendt said the proposed campus could be built in increments, that there is indication of land slides and that his firm recommends a geological survey. Based on present prices, estimated costs to develop the site would range from $742,000 to $1,008,000. It was noted, also, that these estimates could be reduced by recovery of one-third of the costs of certain expenditures; the low estimate of $742,000 being reduced by $142,000 to about $600,000, and the high estimate of $1,008,000 being reduced by $203,500 to $804,500. Mr. Fillippini referred to the report's mention of increase in land values in six to seven years from now and added he was interested in the type of construction necessary for this property as compared with the type of construction for flat land.

To Mrs. Meigs' question about fire hazards in canyons, Mr. Arendt
replied that this is why it is extremely important to add another
access and egress road to that already existing. Additional campus
roads would necessitate negotiations regarding rights-of-way.

Mr. Frank asked if parking space could be developed in the
peripheral areas rather than as shown in the picture. Mr. Arendt
said that if terraced, parking lots would be costly because of neces-
sary retaining walls. Double-deck parking could be investigated, he
said; also, adequate bus line service may be established by the time
the campus would be completed.

Mr. Fillippini remarked that this particular feasibility report
seemed to cover every problem under consideration at this time.

It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Garvin, and unanimously
carried, to accept Arendt, Mosher, and Grant's report, Feasibility
Study of a Proposed Junior College Campus to be Located in Winchester
Canyon, Prepared for the Trustees of the Santa Barbara Junior College
District, dated November 28, 1967.

Dr. Rockwell asked if the Board felt it had enough information
at this time to adopt a motion to indicate to the Hollister Company
that the Board is ready to receive a formal written offer. If the
Board would prefer to explore other areas first, however, this could
be done, he said. Dr. Rockwell stated that his own recommendation was
to request the formal written offer. If the property is accepted but
the District does not comply with the requirements within the time
set, then the property will revert back to the owner.

Mr. Fillippini wanted to be informed of the specifics of the con-
ditions of the offer and any possible ensuing action. Mr. Dall'Armi
explained procedures for formal and informal negotiations.

It was moved by Mr. Fillippini and seconded by Mr. Garvin to
authorize the administration to approach the donors and enter into
informal negotiations with the Hollister Company. Mrs. Alexander said she thought because the feasibility study restricted the proposed campus to these specific 85 acres, it would be wise to get estimates on the cost to purchase four years from now other 150-acre areas. Dr. Rockwell said such estimates can be obtained, although perhaps fees would be charged; he thought maybe banks could provide this information. Although the proposed campus might be restricted to 85 acres at present, perhaps in 10 to 12 years the District could afford to dig into the surrounding hills to enlarge the campus.

Mrs. Alexander noted that although the study shows many more acres available for parking than there are on the present campus, at least the parking on the Mesa Campus is out of sight. If the parking area on the Hollister Company property would be in the form of a quad, she believed this should be discussed now.

Mrs. Meigs quoted Mr. Fred Hand, President of the Tax-Action Association of Santa Barbara County, who said at a previous Board meeting that the Prevedello property owner wanted to give the District 150 acres to build on. Dr. Rockwell said that the owner of the Prevedello property had offered to sell the District some property, but that Dr. Rockwell had told him there was a gift offer pending and Mr. Prevedello's letter would be placed on file until the Board had made a decision regarding it. Mrs. Meigs suggested that perhaps there are others who would like to negotiate to give the District property for building a campus.

Mr. Fillippini said he didn't think six years would give the District enough time to construct a second campus. He asked if it would be considered a default if the Hollister Company kept the property off the market for the District and then, after all that time, the District decided not to take it. Dr. Rockwell said that the Hollister
Company representatives had been told at a meeting that the District was thinking in terms of 10 years.

Mrs. Lancaster said she was interested in obtaining some estimates on other properties with perhaps some free acreage thrown in. She said she felt that in the feasibility study Arendt, Mosher, and Grant has held up one red flag after another, and that their report was on the cautious side. She did not think the Board should give anyone an idea that it is interested in taking a gift until all possibilities are investigated. Mr. Fillippini said the District had previously offered to confer with anyone else interested.

Mr. Frank said he wanted to learn the specifics connected with the offer. Mr. Fillippini pointed out that the donors are busy people and want some answer at this time. He said he had many questions yet, himself, and wanted the whole package, including this report and any facts in the negotiations that might be prohibitive, but he emphasized that the District must show some intent.

Mrs. Lancaster said it is known that this is a mutually beneficial offer and that the Hollister Company stands to gain, also. Information from all sources is needed. Mrs. Alexander asked if the District could proceed by following up to find out the Hollister Company's exact terms and also, at the same time, investigate other properties.

Dr. Rockwell stated that the Hollister Company people are a fine group and expect to explain in detail all terms involved. A District planning committee has looked at other sites on past occasions, accompanied in some instances by Dr. Lehman of the State Department of Education. Dr. Rockwell noted that the District doesn't have the money for even a fraction of a down payment. Mrs. Alexander concurred but indicated her desire to get a general idea on how much it would
cost to buy a suitable area in the Goleta Valley in four years. Mr. Garvin commented that when it is known somebody is looking for something to purchase, the price goes up. The future land available for the District would probably be in the foothills, he added; level land will have been built up in residences.

Mr. Dall'Armi said that the 10-year study just completed for the State Department of Education took into consideration the District's eligibility for funds under SB 691. It would take seven or eight years to get funds to complete this campus and the District couldn't go to the public for half the funding to get this second site; it would take eight years before the District could ask for money for a second site. Mr. Garvin noted that if the Board rejects this generous offer in the Goleta Valley, it would lose faith with that portion of the District. Preparations for growth should be made in that area.

The motion made by Mr. Garvin and seconded by Mr. Fillippini was voted on and carried 6-1, Mrs. Lancaster dissenting.

Dr. Rockwell asked if the Board would like Mr. Titcher, managing director of the Hollister Company, to talk with the Board. Mrs. Meigs replied, "Yes." Dr. Rockwell assured the Board that all information will be presented to members as soon as it is made available.

Mrs. Lancaster asked if the matter of the Prevedello and Jobbins properties would be pursued, getting estimates of costs of acreages in four and ten years. Mrs. Meigs interjected that the District wouldn't have the money. Mrs. Lancaster said she thought the taxpayers could be convinced if something feasible were done. She also said she was so upset by the negative tone of the Arendt, Mosher, and Grant feasibility study that she had written her own impressions and had brought copies with her. These she distributed to all Board members, Dr. Rockwell, and Mrs. McCloskey of the Santa Barbara News-Press.
Mrs. Lancaster concluded by saying that in view of the cautious stand taken by the architects in their just-released feasibility study of the Winchester Canyon property as a site for a second junior college campus, she felt that the Board must reconsider its position with regard to the multi-campus concept; and that the materials she had just handed out contained her comments and suggestions.

Mr. Fillippini pointed out that the Board has not taken any action—negative or positive; it is only getting information.

Mrs. Meigs commented on her favorable impression of facilities built for Westmont College (about 800 students), all financed by private funds; she wondered if something like this might be possible for City College.

4.2 Authorization for Administration to Proceed with Necessary Steps to Comply with State and Federal Requirements in Financing Life-Science-Geology Building, and to Instruct Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall to Prepare to go to Bid at the Earliest Possible Date

It was moved by Mr. Frank and seconded by Mr. Garvin to authorize the administration to proceed with the necessary steps to comply with state and federal requirements in financing the life science-geology building, and to instruct the architectural firm of Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall to prepare to go to bid at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Dall'Armi noted that the District had to accept tacit approval from the State, rather than the written notification preferred, as to transferring Entitlement 3 funds from the physical education building to the life science-geology building; however, the funds are there, he said.

It was moved by Mrs. Lancaster to table the motion until Board members had time to digest the report she had just distributed to them. The motion died for lack of a second.
Mr. Fillippini asked what was meant by "to prepare" to go to bid. Mr. Dall'Armi explained that working drawings have been approved and the District is committed to pay the State Board of Architecture. Now, estimates for the costs of the job must be prepared; the District must comply with requirements to receive the grants of monies. Then the architects will come back with the cost of the projects and ask authorization to advertise for bids. Mr. Fillippini inquired, "Then this concerns mostly procedures--we will not be taking a major step on a cost item?" Mr. Dall'Armi confirmed this.

The motion made by Mr. Frank and seconded by Mr. Garvin was voted on and carried 6-0, Mrs. Lancaster abstaining.

5. BUSINESS AND FINANCE

5.1 Purchase Order Reports

It was moved by Mr. Garvin, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and carried unanimously, to authorize and/or ratify the purchase of supplies, equipment, and services on purchase orders 14155 through 14214. (Please see attachment 5.1-a.)

5.2 Payment of Claims

It was moved by Mrs. Lancaster, seconded by Mr. Frank, and carried unanimously, to authorize and/or ratify the payment of claims as recommended in attachment 5.2-a and the addenda.

5.3 Approval of Assignment Forms to be Used in Transferring Ownership of the Four New Relocatable Buildings

It was moved by Mr. Garvin and seconded by Mr. Fillippini to approve assignment forms to be used in transferring ownership of the four new relocatable buildings from Don Greene, contractor and present owner, to a holding company, said forms having been approved by the County Counsel. Mr. Dall'Armi suggested designating Dr. Rockwell as the party to sign the transfer forms, and this designation was incorporated by
Mr. Garvin and Mr. Fillippini into their motion and second, respectively. The motion was then voted on and carried unanimously.

5.4 Awarding of Bids on Microscopes to be Purchased for Life Science Division

It was moved by Mrs. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Garvin, and carried unanimously, that the bids for 24 monocular microscopes (at $185.00 each) and for 24 stereo microscopes (at $112.00 each) be awarded to Johnson & Company, as shown on attachment 5.4-a. The grand total for the 48 microscopes, including sales tax, is $7,484.00; half the funding for this purchase will come from an NDEA project.

6. STUDENT PERSONNEL

No report.

7. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

No report.

8. GENERAL INFORMATION

8.1 Discussion of Membership of Academic Senate in View of the County Counsel's Opinion

During the discussion at the last Board meeting, regarding the new opinion of the County Counsel which ruled against administrators serving as members of the Academic Senate, the Board requested Senate president Henry H. Bagish and Senate member Robert Casier to prepare papers stating their reasons for and against the County Counsel opinion. Mr. Bagish's and Dr. Casier's papers are included in the agenda as items 8.1-a and 8.1-b, respectively.

In an effort to clarify the position of the Academic Senate on this question, Mr. Bagish said, he had just conducted a secret ballot among Senate members; 51 of the eligible 82 members voted, as follows:

Q. Do you want administrators to be members of the Senate?
A. 34 yes; 17 no.
Q. Do you want to appeal the opinion of the County Counsel?
A. 36 yes; 15 no.

Mr. Bagish explained that the appeal, if made, would be through the Attorney General. It was pointed out that the previous vote of the Academic Senate not to appeal had been ruled invalid because a quorum was not present. Also, it was noted that the administrators voted not to appeal the County Counsel opinion at a meeting on December 1, 1967.

Mr. Frank asked if the new result were efficacious as far as the presentation of any particular policy statement offered by the Academic Senate and what the Board should accept as the Academic Senate position.

Dr. Rockwell said he didn't think the results of the poll mentioned above would come as any surprise, because of the fine faculty-administration relationship existing at the college; he felt that the results were an endorsement of the administration by the faculty. However, he was concerned about the precedent the Board might establish in appealing future County Counsel opinions. He said he had not changed his position from the one he held at the last Board meeting—that the ruling should not be appealed.

Faculty members who spoke to the question included Dr. Casier, Mr. Frank Cox, Mr. Ralph Vernon, Mr. Stanley Sofas, Dr. Robert Profant, and Mr. Keith Kerr.

Answering Mrs. Alexander, Dr. Rockwell said that the Academic Senate's appeal may be made to the Attorney General through either the County Counsel or a legislator; the County Counsel has indicated informally that it would probably refuse to submit such an appeal.

What really should be done, Dr. Rockwell stated, is for the legislature to straighten out Section 131.6 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code and eliminate ambiguities. The Board agreed with Dr. Rockwell's suggestion that he and Mr. Bagish take action through local legislators
to bring about the necessary changes. Mrs. Alexander expressed a
desire for the Academic Senate to bring the Board a formal resolution
regarding its wishes. Mr. Bagish commented that the two-to-one vote
in the poll mentioned at the beginning of Item 8.1 indicated that the
Academic Senate wished to have the County Counsel ruling reviewed by
the Attorney General.

Addressing Mr. Roy Bagley, Executive Secretary, Santa Barbara County
Taxpayers' Association, Inc., Mrs. Lancaster referred to his remarks
at the previous Board meeting. She asked if he thought getting the
appeal would help. Mr. Bagley said that in the case to which he had
referred, the District Attorney was restricted by the Board of Super-
visors. As an observer in the SBJCD Board meetings, he thought that
Dr. Rockwell's approach of communicating with the legislature to
straighten out the Code section was the correct approach. He also said
that one is not obligated to accept the Attorney General's interpretation
any more than that of the County Counsel, but that one would be bound
by legislation.

Mrs. Lancaster commented that if this were a long-term issue, she
thought it would be best to decide on it at this time; however, she
anticipated that the problem would be given to the new junior college
governing board after it is organized.

8.2 Commendation of College Choir

Mrs. Lancaster reported that the Santa Barbara Woman's Club had
been most favorably impressed by the performance given before its
members by the City College Choir under Mr. Dunn's direction.

9. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Mr. Garvin, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and unanimously
carried, to adjourn at 6:30 p.m.; and, because the next regular meeting date
of the Board will fall during the holiday season, to hold the next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Santa Barbara Junior College District on Thursday, January 11, 1968, at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room of the Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara, California, (thus omitting the regular meeting date of December 28, 1967).

Attest:  
Mr. Benjamin F. J. Wells  
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 January 11, 1968