Santa Barbara Community College District

Board of Trustees

Study Session
Thursday, February 8, 1996

MINUTES

All Board Members were present. The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Board Liability - Errors and Omission for Directors and Officers
   a. Mr. Mark Schulte, an attorney, available through the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC) provided an outline of the District's insurance coverage and spoke specifically of the protections that exist for members of the Board of Trustees. Specifically the District has three levels of coverage:

   - $25,000 deductible. This represents the District's responsibility.
   - Coverage up to $1 million. Provided by the Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), a JPA formed by the California community colleges to provide insurance coverage normally provided by commercial insurance companies.
   - $1 million to $15 million coverage. Provided through another JPA, the School Excess Liability Fund (SELF).

   The memo of coverage is very broad. Mr. Schulte offered the opinion that the College will not find a commercial policy that offers such extensive protection.

   Mr. Schulte then presented specific cases that related to the Board's immunity in carrying out their duties. The Board appears very well protected in terms of individual and collective liability.

   The major criterion in the coverage being provided is to ensure Board Members are carrying out their defined duties. If operating outside of their scope of duties, there is vulnerability.

   Mr. Schulte made the point that the SWACC and SELF Boards are peer group situations; i.e., community college or K-12 professionals make the decision as to whether to cover or not cover a case. Dr. Hanson serves on both of these boards.

   The presentation was viewed as having value.

2. Proposals by Student Trustee
   a. Proposal for Student Trustee-Elect Position

   Mr. Cruzito Cruz reviewed with the Board a proposal for a student trustee-elect position or associate student trustee. He explained his rationale for the proposal; specifically, that given the complexity of the duties of a student trustee, following the person's election, he or she would have the ability to serve in a
training capacity until assuming office. Board Members felt the concept was a sound one and urged Mr. Cruz to proceed through the appropriate procedures; i.e., ASB, Student Services Advisory Committee, etc.

b. Out-of-State Travel, Washington DC

Mr. Cruz presented his opportunity to go to Washington, DC, to represent students, and is seeking District support for that. Board Members outlined how most travel has been in State. However, Mr. Cruz was asked to prepare a proposal that would highlight what would be accomplished by the visit, particularly in terms of benefits that would accrue by the Santa Barbara Community College District.

3. Governor’s Proposed Budget, 1996-97

The Superintendent/President reviewed the budget with the Board, outlining the Governor’s proposal that contained the recommendation for a cost-of-living adjustment of approximately 3.4%; further, that growth be provided and some backfill for 1994-95 and 1995-96.

The budget is a good budget. The Superintendent/President offered the opinion that he feels that the budget will be passed close to the budget deadline period and a budget as proposed by the Governor, would be approved. In response to a question from a Board Member, the Superintendent/President offered the opinion that the salary increase effective on January 1, 1997, could be another five percent.

4. Proposition 203 - SBCC’s Projects

Outlined for the Board were the projects that were available for Santa Barbara City College. Board Members asked questions regarding what activity was being pursued to obtain support for the bond issue. The Superintendent/President stated that coordination was occurring with Vice Chancellor John Wiemann from UCSB, an opinion page piece was being proposed, support of the Industry Education Council was being sought, and there would be a focus on faculty and staff within the college community. All agreed that there was very little public knowledge of the proposition and that greater effort was needed to inform members of our community regarding the benefits to be received by SBCC.

5. Report on CCLC Legislative Conference

Trustees Livingston and O’Neill provided their perspectives on key areas that were covered at the legislative conference held the first weekend of February in Sacramento, California. Some of the highlights included:

a. Issues related to Proposition 98; i.e., the split between community colleges and K-12, and whether community colleges should stay in Proposition 98.

b. Backfill of property tax shortfall.

c. Greater decentralization and flexibility for local boards were also highlighted.

6. Priority Enrollment

A discussion took place regarding Santa Barbara City College policies which provide priority enrollment for DSPS and EOPS students who have completed less than 24 units. Background information was provided in the agenda for discussion of this area.
The concern was that the opinion received from Assistant General Counsel, Ralph Black, was not consistent with the wording of Title V. The Superintendent/President was directed to seek an opinion from District Counsel.

7. **Vision Statement for the Development of SBCC’s Technological Infrastructure**

Mr. Bill Hamre, Associate Vice President for Information Resources, presented an overview of the key policy issues in SBCC’s Vision Statement. Following Bill’s presentation, a vigorous discussion ensued regarding the role of technology in the future of the College.

A consensus appeared to be present regarding the importance of fully applying technology to assure access, educational program quality and effectiveness, and that students are provided with the best services in as cost-effective a manner as is possible.

Concerns were expressed in six areas:

- Planning needs to be thorough, comprehensive, and clear.
- In applying technology to educational programs, faculty within discipline areas need to be involved in and supportive of the direction taken.
- Priorities need to be established.
- Evaluation of the return on investment must be comprehensively applied.
- Ability of the College and/or students to assure access to technology is provided needs to be addressed.
- Need for consistent (ongoing) staff development in order to enable full utilization of the technology.

Board Members were enthusiastic about participating in the faculty presentation; however, four Board Members could not be present on March 14. Thus, that date was ruled out. An effort will be made to reschedule the presentation for sometime in April.

8. **Project Redesign**

The focus of the discussion was on the paper presented, *Santa Barbara City College: A Connected Learning Community*. The Superintendent/President stated that the key policy issue is whether there is Board support for a college policy that supports seeking out and participating with strategic partners from private industry or other public segments to accomplish college objectives. This approach was seen as vital in order to achieve what needs to be achieved and to support some of the key innovations being considered by SBCC faculty and staff.

Board members discussed the following:

- Concern was expressed about including a potential vendor list in the document. Board members felt that if it was to be included it should be much more exhaustive - and maybe just list in an appendix those corporations to which it was sent. The concern was - why were these particular vendors called out? It might look as though we’ve already made decisions about our partners.
b. In the description of Santa Barbara it was felt that we should note the large minority population and the number of underrepresented students being served by the College. The Board did not want to create the impression that Santa Barbara consisted only of wealthy, retired people and tourists. The College plays a significant role in providing educational opportunities for these populations that have traditionally been underserved.

c. The Board felt more clarity was needed regarding the kinds of arrangements that would represent good "fits" for the College. The RFI was a bit too open ended.

d. The Board had trouble with reconciling the identification of proposed fees for services with the request for development of economic support for Project Redesign. They recognized that there is a balance to be struck, and that no vendor would partner just because we're in Santa Barbara undertaking a worthy cause. The Board suggested relooking at this component of the response.

The Board acknowledged the appropriateness of proceeding in obtaining "strategic partners" given the magnitude of the work that lies ahead in applying technology throughout the College’s operation.

In addition, the Superintendent/President gave an overview status of Project Redesign and distributed a paper which identified key considerations in regard to specific project teams.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.
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