REGULAR MEETING OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SANTA BARBARA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT
June 22, 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 Garvin on Thursday, June 22, 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 (late)  
Mr. Sidney R. Frank  
Mr. James R. Garvin  
Mrs. Winifred H. Lancaster  
Mrs. Dorothy N. Meigs  
Mr. Benjamin P. J. Wells

Members Absent: Mr. Wilbur L. Fillippini

Others present for all or 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  
Mrs. Marie Lantagne, Administrative Dean,  
Student Personnel  
Mr. Selmer O. Wake, Director-Administrative Dean,  
Adult Education  
Mr. Spencer Blickenstaff, Assistant Dean,  
Evening College  
Mr. James E. Foxx, Assistant Dean, Technical-Vocational  
Mrs. Margaret F. McGillin, Assistant Dean,  
Health Occupations  
Mr. N. Gary Mouck, Administrative Assistant,  
Research and Development  
Mr. Charles F. Rheinschmidt, Assistant Dean,  
Student Activities  
Mr. Paul Ash, Coordinator, Adult Education  
Mrs. Alma Ritchie, Coordinator, Adult Education  
Mr. William E. Miller, Vice-President, Academic Senate  
Mr. Calvin H. Reynolds, President, SBCC Instructors' Association  
Mr. Theron Barnes, Audio-Visual Assistant and  
representative of Chapter 289, CSEA  
Mrs. Louise H. Thornton, Secretary to Superintendent  
A number of other staff members of SBCC
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 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. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Meigs, and carried unanimously, to approve the minutes for the regular meeting of June 7, 1967.

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 carried unanimously, to approve personnel assignments for certificated staff as recommended in attachment 2.1 and addenda.

2.2 Classified Personnel Assignments

It was moved by Mrs. Lancaster, seconded by Mr. Wells, and unanimously carried, to approve classified personnel assignments as recommended in attachment 2.2 and the addenda.

3. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

3.1 Approval of Adult Basic Education Project

It was moved by Mr. Wells and seconded by Mr. Frank that the application for Federal funds for Adult Basic Education classes as
outlined in attachment 3.1 be approved. This program is fully funded under provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966. Mr. Wake explained that it was necessary to reapply each time, and that the program was the same type approved on other occasions. The motion was voted on and carried unanimously.

4. COLLEGE PLANTS AND PROPERTY

No report.

5. BUSINESS AND FINANCE

5.1 Purchase Order Reports

It was moved by Mr. Wells, seconded by Mrs. Lancaster, and carried unanimously, to authorize and/or ratify the purchase of supplies, equipment, and services on purchase orders 12473 through 12504, in accordance with attachment 5.1-a.

5.2 Payment of Claims

It was moved by Mrs. Meigs, seconded by Mr. Wells, and carried unanimously, to authorize and/or ratify the payment of claims in accordance with attachments 5.2-a and 5.2-b.

5.3 Adoption of the 1967-68 Tentative Budgets

Mrs. Meigs, chairman of the Board's subcommittee to study the 1967-68 Tentative Budgets, reported that the committee had some questions about expenditures and incomes; however, since these are tentative budgets, the committee thought it best to wait until some of the income items, in particular, were definitely established.

(Mrs. Alexander entered the meeting at this point.)

Mrs. Meigs asked if any further information had become available since the committee's meeting. Mr. Dall'Armi replied, "Yes," that
permissive taxes had been reinstated since then. Mr. Dall'Armi added that he understood that assessed valuation figures will be available next week; this will help clarify some of the picture. Information from Sacramento may not be available prior to the August Publication Budget, but the bulk of the District's income comes from local sources. He suggested that the subcommittee might wish to meet after the Publication Budget is assembled and report back to the Board on July 13, 1967. Mr. Frank agreed that the Board would be in a better position to make decisions after assessed valuations are determined.

It was moved by Mrs. Meigs and seconded by Mr. Wells to adopt the 1967-68 Tentative Budgets as presented in attachment 5.3.

Mrs. Lancaster said she was concerned that as the District's bond redemption reduced the amount of tax, the District continues to use that same amount. She hated to see the tax rate kept up as the bonds are retired. Mrs. Meigs stated that the subcommittee took this into consideration with relation to community services.

Dr. Rockwell explained that some districts have levied this five-cent tax routinely and used it to match state and Federal grants. The SBJCD has not done this, and it is something to be considered. It would be a way to protect some part of a grant if funds are not forthcoming in the Fall. Mr. Dall'Armi said that this levy is a natural for junior colleges and told what activities and construction could be financed with it.

To Mrs. Lancaster's query about furnishing recreational facilities for the community, Mr. Dall'Armi answered that the District is obligated
under the joint-use agreement with the City to furnish these facilities. Dr. Rockwell added, "It is a bargain for us." Mrs. Lancaster inquired if there would be any conflict when the District went on an all-year program. Mr. Dall'Armi replied that under those circumstances, the District probably could not use the pool for summer classes.

Mrs. Meigs' motion was voted on and carried unanimously.

5.4 Adoption of Administrative Salary Schedule for 1967-68

Mr. Frank, chairman of the Board subcommittee to study administrative salaries, referred to the subcommittee's report and his graph distributed at the meeting (see attachments numbered 5.4) and diagrammed the following chart on the board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abcd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bcd</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>ef</td>
<td>bd</td>
<td>ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abcd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on Administrative Council Salary Committee's proposal for a fixed salary schedule.)

He explained where each administrator fit and what would happen in case of stratification. He said he felt administrative staff should be able to select qualified personnel without being tied to some sort of monetary computation which, while reflecting experience in one element of the school system, is not necessarily transformed into administrative experience, depending upon the talents of the individual concerned.
Moneywise, Mr. Frank continued, there is relatively little
difference between his proposed schedule and that of the Administrative
Council Salary Committee. It is advantageous for an administrative
staff to have the flexibility to choose whom they want for a particular
job and have the right to assign him into any one particular slot,
he added.

Mr. Carvin agreed that a subcommittee would be needed for further
study. He felt that there was one flaw in Mr. Frank's proposal:
technical or business salaries cannot be compared with school salaries.

Mrs. Lancaster said that the proposal to pay for the responsibility
of a particular job had the unanimous support of the subcommittee, but
not in any given amount. She expressed her philosophy that the lower
echelon of administration should not receive more than top teachers.
The top level of administration is something else again, she said.
It should be a question of personal taste in the lower levels – what
that person wants to do, teach or administer. She felt that a salary
schedule should not induce teachers to leave teaching for administration.

Mr. Frank stated that the present proposal would mean a $20,000
net increase for the total administrative budget, while his proposal
would amount to about $20,300. Level III would be brought up somewhat
by the new system; more money would go into Level II, taking away
from III, in the old system.

Mrs. Alexander said that the report prepared by Mr. Mouck
basically represented the same type of effort for administration that
the Board had given to the rest of the certificated personnel. She
said that she, personally, didn't want to decide in committee. There
is an honest difference of opinion among the subcommittee members. The committee's job is to lay out the question, and it is now up to the Board to give direction.

Mrs. Meigs asked how administrative salaries are worked out at the University, where they have not been previously tied in with elementary and high school districts. Mrs. Lancaster answered that lower-level administrators retain their professorship ranking because they do some teaching and they have a certain stipend in addition.

Saying she believed that the Board went overboard last year in administrative salaries, Mrs. Lancaster compared SBCC administrative salaries with those of other districts. She said/could not, for instance, justify the responsibility of college assistant deans as being higher than that of junior high school principals. Also, she continued, compared with County and City administration, the SBJCD is overstaffed with highly-paid administrators. At the University, the registrar and student activities staff are not placed on the administrative schedule.

Mrs. Alexander asked Mrs. Lancaster, "Would you be willing to adopt the schedule prepared by Mr. Mouck by applying a two per cent increase?"

Mrs. Lancaster replied that she would be willing to take the 1966-67 salaries and give a certain monetary increase but without the annual step for 1967-68. Or, perhaps each could be given a definite amount, such as $500, she suggested.

Mrs. Meigs asked Mr. Mouck if the Administrative Council Salary Committee were adamantly set on its policy. Mr. Mouck replied that,
in past Board minutes, he had found evidence that the Board favored the ratio system so proceeded on the assumption that the Board still favored it. Not until the group’s recommendation was made did it find there was a problem. The difference is not in the dollar amount, but in the structure.

Dr. Rockwell noted that in a recent meeting of all administrators (except Mr. Wake, who was ill), there was unanimous endorsement of the report compiled by Mr. Mouck. The administrators felt it had been thoroughly researched over many months. Dr. Rockwell stressed that he felt it would be tragic for the Board to disallow any fair increase for administrative staff at this time. He urged that, in view of the study that is going to be made of the two approaches to administrative salaries, the Administrative Council Salary Committee’s recommendations be considered favorably at this time. He added that he welcomed a study by the Board, for there are imbalances.

Mr. Wells said he thought a fair increase was justified. The problem as he saw it was that a schedule was developed by administration with the ratio approach, while the Board subcommittee developed a fixed salary schedule; these are two different areas. Mr. Dall'Armi noted that Mr. Mouck had not been asked to prepare a fixed schedule.

It was moved by Mrs. Alexander and seconded by Mrs. Meigs that the administrative salary schedule submitted by the Administrative Council Salary Committee be adopted as outlined in column three:
Administrative Level II

Director-Administrative Dean, Adult Education $19,456.56
Administrative Dean, Business Services 18,818.64
Administrative Dean, Student Personnel 18,818.64
Administrative Dean, Instruction 18,818.64

Administrative Level III

Assistant Dean, Evening College 17,223.84
Assistant Dean, Health Occupations 16,904.88
Assistant Dean, Admissions and Records 17,100.60
Assistant Dean, Student Activities 16,789.68
Assistant Dean, Adult Education 16,521.36
Assistant Dean, Technical-Vocational 16,355.52
Administrative Assistant, Research & Development 15,921.36

Administrative Level IV

Coordinator, Adult Education 13,159.80
Coordinator, Adult Education 11,492.25
Coordinator, Placement 10,239.08

Mr. Frank then stated he felt the Board should ride with the old system until next year. Mr. Dall'Armi said that Level III needed to be brought up to competitive level. Mrs. Lantagne said she spoke for herself and Mr. Huglin in concurring with Mr. Dall'Armi. Mr. Rheinschmidt said that there has to be some incentive in salary to keep level III staff in administration instead of going back to teaching.

Mr. Wells said he favored column three over column two.

Answering a question from Mrs. Meigs directed to him, Mr. Miller, vice-president of the Academic Senate, said that there is a good relationship between administration and teachers. (One example would be the study of the budget jointly by both segments.) "We are in a special situation at SBCC - a healthy relationship," he concluded.
Mr. Wake said that he would be taking the greatest reduction in salary, but he realized that level III was too low,

(Mrs. Lancaster left the meeting at this point)
and that he endorsed the proposal of the Administrative Council Salary Committee.

Mrs. Alexander's motion was voted on and carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mrs. Alexander, and carried unanimously, that a subcommittee of the Board be appointed to study administrative salaries and that a firm proposal implementing a separate administrative schedule with fixed salaries shall be presented by this committee to the Board of Trustees by February 1, 1968.

5.5 Approval of Agreements with Area Hospitals for Use of Clinical Facilities

It was moved by Mrs. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Wells, and carried unanimously, to approve an agreement whereby clinical facilities located in the area hospitals may be used by the vocational nursing students of Santa Barbara City College.

6. STUDENT PERSONNEL

6.1 Approval of Addition to Student Housing Policy

It was moved by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Wells, and unanimously carried, to adopt the following addition to the policy concerning student housing approved by the Board on May 26, 1966, said addition to appear as item "a" under point 2:

Landlords wishing to have their housing facilities listed must indicate that they, in offering student housing, do not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, or national origin. A signed statement to this effect must be on file in the Student Activities Office prior to listing.
7. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

No report.

8. GENERAL INFORMATION

No report.

9. ADJOURNMENT

9.1 Future Meetings of the Board

a. An adjourned meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Santa Barbara Junior College District will be held Wednesday, June 28, 1967, at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room of Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara, California. The purpose of the meeting is to hear a report from the Citizens' Advisory Committee on recommendations for meeting the future needs of the District.

b. To comply with Section 964 of the Education Code, which requires the Board to set the date of its annual organizational meeting at its last regular meeting prior to the organizational meeting, July 13, 1967, is designated as the annual organizational meeting. This date will also be the time when the Publication Budget is to be adopted. The meeting will be held at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room of Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara, California.

9.2 Superintendent's Salary for 1967-68

At 6:40 p.m. the Board convened in executive session to discuss the Superintendent's salary for 1967-68.
The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

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 13____, 1967