MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

July 10, 1982
8:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
La Casa de Maria
800 El Bosque Road
Santa Barbara, California

1) & 2) ROLL CALL AND WELCOME

The special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Santa Barbara Community College District was called to order by President Eli Luria at 9:05 a.m., Saturday, July 10, 1982, in the Terrace Room at La Casa de Maria, Montecito, California.

Mr. Luria extended a welcome to all.

Members present:

Mr. Eli Luria, President
Mr. Benjamin P.J. Wells, Vice-President
Mrs. Kathryn Alexander
Dr. Joe Dobbs
Mr. Sidney Frank
Mrs. Joyce Powell
Mr. Gary Ricks

Members absent:

None

Also present:

Dr. Peter R. MacDougall, Superintendent/President and Secretary/Clerk to the Board of Trustees

Mrs. Marjorie Lynn, Secretary

Guests:

Dr. Barbara Lindemann, President, Academic Senate
Mr. Sam Wake, Executive Director, Foundation for Santa Barbara City College

3) OVERVIEW OF THE DAY

Dr. MacDougall stated that this meeting would be structured very similarly to the retreat held in January. Time periods have been allotted for the agenda items and also responsibility for initiating discussion of items. He announced that at about 10:30, during discussion of Program Improvement and Staff Development, Dr. Lindemann would be here to make a statement on sabbatical leaves. In addition, at 1:00 p.m., Sam Wake is expected for the discussion of THE FOUNDATION FOR SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE. Mr. Hanson was invited but could not attend due to other commitments.

Dr. MacDougall distributed copies of the agenda with supporting reference materials (in booklet form) to each member of the board. Each numbered section related to a corresponding number on the agenda. He suggested that prior to discussion a short period be taken for review of this material.
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3) OVERVIEW OF THE DAY - continued:

At the suggestion of Mr. Luria, the board agreed that when guests come in, the board will stop whatever was being discussed to let guest speak and then go back to what board had been discussing.

Upon motion by Mrs. Powell, seconded by Mr. Frank, Mr. Luria declared the meeting as a "Committee as a Whole" for discussion of agenda items at 9:35 a.m.

4) REPORTS

a. College Readiness

Discussion led by Mrs. Alexander.

- faculty wants greater degree of participation in implementation of plan; also appointment of full-time assessment person
- use Elaine Cohen to act as part-time assessment person on a 9 TLU released time basis.
- disadvantage of part-time—would not have the clout wanted by Committee in original plan.
- advantage is that plan will progress more slowly
- feeling of Committee is that we are gaining more than losing by using part-time person for assessment
- Board does not wish it to appear that it is putting program forward with less clout
- might appear threatening to high school students; tests would be mandatory; a way of insuring that their time at City College would be profitably spent.
- feeling of fear should be defused at the beginning; should actually go out to high schools and talk to their counselors; start program at high schools
- Committee should put together a program that will really do the job; they are actually forecasting what a particular student will succeed in; could be tricky
- should endorse plan, including funding; use people now involved in producing plan to get it through the first phase; also give them satisfaction to see if their programs are actually working
- Board should set policy; eliminate false starts
- help student make choices they can succeed in, then follow-up with early warning system so that problems do not develop
- plan strengthens standards; if individual does not succeed, standards will be enforced.
- conceivable that a student could stay forever at City College, prior to tightening up scholastic standards
- key considerations: change in policy of educational philosophy; role that is supportive and helpful to student, at same time holds student accountable to succeed and demonstrate they can take advantage of opportunities at City College
4) REPORTS - continued:
   a. College Readiness - continued:
      - plan regrouped after full time assessment person asked for; decided
        to have a reduced time assessment person and have the faculty more
        involved in the actual implementation
      - college has obligation to communicate clearly what is expected of
        them at City College, many students need help in identifying where
        they can achieve their potential.

      CONSENSUS OF BOARD - Support College Readiness Project
   b. Instructional Reorganization

      Discussion led by Dr. MacDougall at the request of Mrs. Alexander
      - process of reorganization is going smoothly, not a major problem area
      - much of alignment of divisions that has taken place shows that input
        from Superintendent/President's office has been followed.
      - major issue at this point is appointment of Division Chairperson
      - Representative Council should submit two names to administration for
        selection of Division Chairperson. Representative Council maintains
        they have difficulty getting even one person to run for Department
        Chairperson.
      - position is now a "stepchild" - not given any importance by faculty
      - by reorganizing, attempting to make position more attractive; put
        some money on it, and recognize the selection process is important.
      - accreditation team felt we ought to change the Cluster Leader process
        - too diffuse
      - process was assumed to be a faculty process by the faculty; should be
        administrative and should meet with administration's approval
      - during one of the periods when no administrator to do it, faculty took
        it on.
      - no written policy; faculty took initiative
      - organizational flow chart is confusing; no one able to understand it
      - proposed structure is an improvement over the cluster structure
        we have had in past; should adopt modified plan.
      - key factor is the expectations that are given Division Chairs.
        Identify 4 or 5 substantial, significant projects that will become
        the responsibility of Divisional Council. Give organization clout,
        sense of its importance; indicate to rest of college that board is
        taking Division Leadership seriously
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4) REPORTS - continued:
   b. Instructional Reorganization - continued:
      - stipends not equitable, necessary to insure proper importance of
        Divisional Chair. Representative Council felt stipend should
        be $500; administration felt it should be $1,000.
      - if we want people to think of these positions as being valuable,
        must give them value to make attractive
      - will be moving into new organizational structure for Instructional
        departments
      - key factor for success is how it is initially presented to faculty
   c. College Mission Statement

Discussion led by Mrs. Alexander.
- Board complimented Mission Statement Committee for an excellent job;
  all agreed with first draft of statement.
- statement is now out to individuals within college and community for
  review is to be returned to Committee in the Fall.
- Mission function as we see it today not same as we will see it 10
  years from today.
- committee's work not finished, should wait for completion this
  coming Fall semester
- have to determine college priorities; as funds get less, are we
  going to continue emphasis to be adult education, transfer program,
  or vocational education.
- when dollars are not there, we have to make choice between priorities.
- committee started out by getting mission statements from other colleges,
  after reviewing, built our statement from there.
- will Mission Statement have impact on Master Plan? How?
- shift emphasis to increase credit classes, decreases non-credit classes?
- must adjust to shifting realities as funding decreases; must look at,
  then determine which of the functions we would support and to what
  degree
- State has designated categories for funding, we must live with if we
  can.
- Santa Barbara City College's Mission Statement compares favorably with
  mission statements from other colleges. Better than most.
- must be flexible, must be able to update in future as needed
4) REPORTS - continued:

d. College Planning Approach

Discussion led by Dr. MacDougall

- need to improve our procedures for college planning

- now have finalized planning model; has been endorsed by Representative Council

- College Planning Council (CPC) replaces CLC/CPC in organizational structure

- CPC consists of cabinet members, 3 representatives from Divisional Council, Academic Senate President, a student, representative of classified staff and an additional representative from Student Services and Continuing Education

- Dr. MacDougall will chair initial meeting to emphasize importance of group and kick off concept; Pat Huglin will take over responsibilities

- CPC will be responsible for producing a Statement of Institutional Directions

- will be developed from demographics of our district, fiscal picture, where transfer program and occupational program stand

- report will be submitted to Superintendent/President, then go through organizational structure

- Administrative Deans, Business Manager responsible to see that planning in their area is carried out effectively.

- in planning, Administrative Dean of area is responsible for plan for improvement of that area and priorities

- provides for involvement at all levels, identifies areas of responsibility and coordination; systematic, provides better decision making, greater clarity, greater acceptability and support

- try to keep as simple as possible; need to look very hard at what we are doing.

- Superintendent/President will consult with board at various points along the way and keep them informed what is being done

4-B FINANCE & BUDGETING

Discussion led by Dr. Dobbs and Dr. MacDougall

- some borderline classes that were not cut at first, may be cut in second round if $30 million savings is not achieved.

- issue on reserves is: should reserves of other districts be used in order to give other districts a COLA, Dr. MacDougall needs direction on this; is it a bad policy? should Board take a stand on it?

- on reserves - Santa Barbara City College cut back to 5%, well below the 10% reserve given by Chancellor's office says is prudent

- next year, there will not be enough reserves left for state to attack
4-B FINANCE & BUDGETING

- some larger districts have more than 10% reserves, those districts will receive less dollars until reserve is used up

- board divided in their opinion whether surplus reserves of some districts should be taken by state for redistribution to districts with less than prudent amount; community colleges should stick together in reserve issue and not fragmentize stand

- should we continue to retain as much authority and responsibility at local level as we can? Board agreed we should.

- understood that a reserve in excess of 10% of Operating Budget is now perceived as being in excess of what is prudent.

- after Prop. # 13, the state did redistribute some reserves judged as excess.

- districts are funded differently by ADA. Larger districts are able to derive more ADA than smaller districts can. Santa Barbara is lowest in state in terms of money we receive for ADA

- important for board to recognize cuts that have been sustained in budget to bring it into balance

- key consideration is the $30 million and what our loss will be

- Dr. MacDougall feels we should not absorb any loss; generated 321 units in credit program this year for which we received no funding because of cap

- list of classes subject to defunding gives less than 321 units of ADA. Feels it illogical for State to deduct from community college's operating budget funds we were never given. Principle should be that deduction of classes should begin after deduction of units of ADA which were not funded.

- legislators took their position due to their perception of Mickey Mouse courses in community colleges. If perception incorrect, legislature should know we have been doing job in excess of funding.

- have done job by going into reserves, cutting operational budgets, not adjusting salaries, deferring maintenance

- our position should be supported by CCCT

- if Chancellor does not agree would work through Gary Hart and Charles Imbrecht

- list of courses to be cut is beginning to go into areas the legislature did not intend it to go into.

- mistake to go beyond level of course identification we are not confortable with. There is discrepancy in legislature's assumption that $30 million will be saved by defunding recreational/avocational classes. Possibly will be made by fees charged or reducing money and pro-rate over all districts.

- could achieve same amount by reducing ADA and forget about cap
4-B FINANCE & BUDGETING - continued:
- should have legislative advocate to speak for us in Sacramento and keep us informed
- extremely difficult for Superintendent/President to keep on top of what is going on in Sacramento while attending to other duties
- no way to guarantee if its worth the money. Advocate would monitor bills developed and bring to Dr. MacDougall's attention; introduce legislation; also speak negatively against bills
- CCCT has full time legislative advocate, also CCJCA; might consider going in with other college(s) to cut costs
- board agrees there is a need to get more political; Dr. MacDougall should defend the fact that we deserve a COLA - leave to state to determine how it is done

4-C PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, STAFF DEVELOPMENT & SABBATICAL LEAVES
Dr. Barbara Lindemann was present for this portion of the meeting (arrived 10:30 a.m.). Item was taken out of order
- faculty very concerned, would like to convey to board what they are trying to achieve in their report
- sabbatical leaves not specifically addressed in report
- as resources become more stringent, potential for conflict becomes greater; where will Board decide to put money?
- Dr. Lindemann explained she had no formal report to give, but had hoped to take part in general discussion and speak on behalf of faculty
- faculty feels sabbaticals should be included in overall picture of professional development. Should neither be put to one side nor considered by itself; part of budgeting even though not mentioned specifically. Sabbatical Leave Committee needs to know it has some definite amount of support - specific amount of dollars to plan on when considering sabbatical leaves
- sabbatical leaves have a definite purpose, not used as vacation time. Weak area seems to be what is being accomplished by person on sabbatical, Committee has tightened up accountability; looks more closely at purpose of sabbatical when application first reviewed; again, later, before final approval.
- understood that approved project should occupy 34-40 hours per week for as many weeks as leave is during time regular classes are in session
- in overall picture - where should sabbatical leaves be considered in terms of importance? Sabbatical leaves should not be kept at sacrifice of other improvement programs, but are just as important to faculty
4-C PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, STAFF DEVELOPMENT & SABBATICAL LEAVES - continued:

- should be considered individually, different faculty members have different needs.
- very small percent of faculty take sabbatical leaves
- have Division Chairman enter into determination of choosing who is to go on sabbatical
- investigate no-cost sabbaticals. Replacing person on leave with part-time person doesn't always work out very well
- money to come out of different categories of budget such as LAC, Mastery Learning, etc.
- have about $59,000 for sabbaticals this year, in addition, small reserve in President's budget that could be used to augment. Impacts directly on instructional progress
- Mastery Learning, In-Service seminars directly related to professional development
- $15,000 allocated into LAC
- Computer Assisted Instruction operating this year, how to integrate high technology into our programs
- need to support those faculty members who are involved in their development and improvement of our programs; brochure has been published on staff development
- in spite of how difficult budget picture gets, have pool of dollars we maintain to do this or we will become stagnant
- $60,000 not budgeted separately as item for sabbaticals but has been committed for this purpose
- cannot make any promises for next year sabbaticals - funding may not be there; don't know what budget will be
- lower the visibility of sabbaticals for budget cuts if they are a part of something else
- need for sabbatical reports to be recognized by board to improve feeling that something was accomplished by sabbatical
- pursue alternate ways of funding sabbaticals; Dr. Lindemann suggested two plans; 1) take total salary - subtract summer replacement cost, establish proportion and that would be proportion faculty would get - this would help faculty on upper end of salary schedule; 2) take difference between normal salary and divide that between the people who have been approved to go - would help faculty on lower end of salary scale

Mr. Luria thanked Dr. Lindemann for coming today and for excellent input.
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4-D FACILITIES

Discussion was led by Mr. Wells.

- there are 3 critical problems for board:
  a) floor space and classroom space are inadequate
  b) Library inadequate to take care of present needs
  c) Student Services dispersed over wide area and in unsuitable locations

- architects' fee for remodeling Campus Center is $25,000, or 12½% of cost; seems high; negotiated down from $36,000. Outline distinctly what portion of work is responsibility of college - could lower cost, high cost reflects many change orders on previous contract

- possibility of arranging for different architect to obtain lower bid?

- Board should be the one to select architect on large contracts - able to negotiate cost.

- take closer look at Master Plan for West Campus

- strengthen Master; be more realistic in terms of funds and financing. Bond funds gone, not much chance of raising another bond issue

- some things on Master Plan have no chance of being done, no intent to accomplish when placed on Master Plan

- State asks us for plan - we submit plan but cannot get funding for projects on plan. State still wants plan

- plan for Library submitted about 10 years ago, turned down by Librarian at that time as being inadequate. Library still waiting for improvement. Has no addition, no new building and still waiting for improvement.

- Dr. MacDougall has met with Chairman of Library Committee; looked over various plans for library, none provide satisfactory alternative

- Library Committee to provide recommendation on what should be done regarding Library improvement

- do not have viable plan right now

- addition to Library-most recent plan discussed

- Campus Center needs improvement; should be next project for use of cafeteria fund

- board agreed enhancement of Campus Center should be done

- enhancement of Campus Center should not be confused with Snack Bar & Remodeling project

- enhancement is lighting, furniture, PA system, painting of Student Lounge area of cafeteria

- proposed to use cafeteria fund for this.

- suggested when lounge completed-explore possibility of using Campus Center Lounge as a conference center, charge community a fee for use
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4-D FACILITIES - continued:

- if board decides to use cafeteria receipts for upgrading Campus Center entrance and lobby, discuss with John Dunn ahead of time. Give him a chance to plan. Need specific plan before going to board with it

- policy is that money generated by cafeteria must be spent on that area of operation

4-E THE FOUNDATION FOR SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

Mr. Sam Wake was present for this portion of meeting, (arrived 1:00 p.m.).

Discussion centered on:

a) Enhancing Foundation's effectiveness
b) College funding priorities
c) Board/Foundation relationship
   - need for additional staff support in approaching high potential donors. Foundation board has selected Ms. Sheridan Gerard for job
     .. she is well-known in community
     .. well qualified
     .. will be instrumental in developing a Master Plan and objectives of Foundation
   - board has primary responsibility for determining needs of campus
   - faculty at college is good resource for needs as well as donors
   - board should operate in such a way that image and good will of college is promoted in community
   - board has final say in accepting gifts
   - need to develop list of possible needs of college to go to board in Fall for approval. Should consist of what college needs are.
     - could use list in agenda reference material as a beginning of a needs list for this year
     - list would be specific, held for possible donors to become available
     - closer communication between Board of Trustees and Foundation on needs of college
     - when should faculty and staff ask Foundation to consider major funding drives?
     - discussed chain of communications when accepting gifts
     - anything departments do to actively seek funding for must relate to programs that already exist and have been approved by board
     - Superintendent/President should authorize any direct contact between Foundation and Division/Department Chair regarding possible donation for Division
     - needs list would serve as a basis for direction for Foundation
     - after approval by board, could then be used as a start for funding projects. Items now on list are college's primary needs and should be pursued at this time
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4-E THE FOUNDATION FOR SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE - continued:

- anything else Foundation as a group wants to pursue, should be submitted to Board for approval prior to its being added to the list.
- if occasion arises that a donor wants to contribute specifically to a project not on list and not foreseen, Superintendent/President should communicate immediately to board and obtain approval or non-approval.
- complete process of acceptance should take no longer than 1 or 2 days
- gifts other than cash (real estate, bonds, etc.) more difficult to handle. Need advise of tax attorney on an individual case basis.
- the means used by Foundation to raise funds is a Foundation decision.
- Foundation is now taking 7% of large cash donations for operation expenses. If excess builds up will put excess into funding of projects
- need to clarify difference between large and small gifts, what is dividing line
- most donations to Foundation are less than $1,000
- if new flat tax rate goes through, it will seriously curtail Foundation sources for raising money

Mr. Luria thanked Mr. Wake for coming to meeting, also for his excellent job in keeping Foundation costs down.

4-F SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES FOR 1981-82

Discussion led by Mrs. Powell, who acknowledged the labor that went into annual reports from various departments. She also listed some of the things she felt were accomplished by the board.

....strengthened legislative ties by dealing with Assemblymen Gary Hart and Charles Imbrecht
....Dr. Dobbs election to CCCT
....past President's dinner - a real master stroke
....Santa Barbara Bicentennial dinner - outstanding
....made some decisions and took some steps that showed planning ahead on reserve picture
....negotiations with certificated people went better this year than it has ever gone. More understanding by board and faculty of each other's problems.

Board unanimously agreed that a lot had been accomplished in the past year by faculty and board.

- agreed it was important for board to have a sense of what had taken place at the college
- staff at college is excellent and reports reflect this, would like to see repeated at end of each year.
- Dr. MacDougall commented that reports were almost self explanatory; becoming increasingly difficult to do "regular" business of college. Changes from Sacramento, etc. put a strain on college to operate effectively.
4-F SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES FOR 1981-82 — continued:
- there is danger of becoming so busy "doing" and "responding" that no time is spent thinking about where we are going.

4-G GENERAL COLLEGE GOALS 1982-83

Discussion led by Mr. Luria.
- Superintendent/President, acting as agent of board, needs to have a sense of purpose, what it is the board is trying to achieve and what he is to do to accomplish this
- there were 2 major changes this year
  ... reorganization of Instruction Office
  ... reorganization of Student Services
- Dr. MacDougall does not see any changes in organizational structure for 1982-83
- efforts will be spent in insuring effectiveness of development of areas
- approval of Mission Statement
- Support of College Readiness Committee and of staff development
- continue to strengthen curriculum in terms of transfer and occup- utional programs
- support areas of adjustment listed in Budget Report
- seek ways to increase members of full-time staff where appropriate
- complete Campus Center projects by September, 1983
- develop recommended direction for Library
- clarity of board members regarding West Campus
- external relations, Sacramento, District and professional organizations will continue to improve
- support new plan for Foundation in relation to needs of college
- monitor CCCA next 12-18 months. Provide progress reports periodically.
- pursue transfer programs with UCSB
- increase linkages with local business and industry

ADDED ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Mr. Luria led discussion of
- Parking lots
  ...possibility of going direct to City Council and get them to deed property to us?
  ...SBCC would do maintenance, but would have control in terms of fees charged.
MINUTES - Special Meeting
SBCCCD Board of Trustees
July 10, 1982

ADDED ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION - continued:

- should college institute parking fee in order to generate revenue to maintain lots?
- plan should first be discussed with City Recreation Department (D. Thomas) before taking farther
- if nothing is accomplished by this, then go to City Council with the suggestion
- board opposes fees in beach lots at Ledbetter beach which City has proposed. Would be hardship on students
- Metal sculpture on West Campus
- board agreed that it should be removed.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON TODAY'S ACTIVITIES

Board will review reference material and get back to Dr. MacDougall by phone with any suggestions/problems. The board agreed it was an excellent idea but if they could have them earlier would be able to review them and be better prepared for day's discussions.

Upon motion of Mrs. Powell, seconded by Mr. Frank, Mr. Luria reconvened the Committee of the Whole session back to regular meeting.

Upon motion by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mrs. Powell, meeting reconvened as a CLOSED SESSION AT 4:35 p.m. for personnel matter.

6. ADJOURNMENT

At 5:05 p.m., when the Closed Session ended, the Board of Trustees adjourned their special meeting upon motion of Dr. Dobbs, seconded by Mr. Ricks.

ATTEST:

[Signatures]

MR. ELI LURIA
President, Board of Trustees
Santa Barbara Community College District

Dr. Peter R. MacDougall
Superintendent/President and Secretary/Clerk to the Board of Trustees

Approved by the Board of Trustees

on August 12, 1982