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The Office of the Superintendent/President, Room A 110 in the MacDougall Administration Center is the location where documents that are public records relating to any item under discussion on a Board agenda (including documents distributed with the agenda and those distributed to all or a majority of the members of the Board within 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting or within 24 hours prior to a special or committee meeting) are available for public inspection.

Board agendas and supporting documents are also posted on the College website at http://www.sbcc.edu/boardoftrustees/.

1. GENERAL FUNCTIONS

1.1 CALL TO ORDER

President Dobbs called the meeting to order.

1.2 ROLL CALL

Members present:
Dr. Joe Dobbs, President
Mrs. Sally Green, Vice President
Ms. Joan Livingston
Mr. Des O’Neill
Mr. Luis Villegas
Ms. Nicole Ridgell, Student Trustee

Members absent:
Dr. Kathryn Alexander

Others present for all or some of the meeting:
Dr. Andreea M. Serban, Supt/President and Secretary Clerk to the Board of Trustees
Alarcon, Ignacio, Pres. Academic Senate
Dr. Arellano, Ofelia, VP Continuing Ed
Auchinloss, Liz, President CSEA
Bass, Lisa, Starr King PCW
Dr. Bishop, Paul, VP IT
Bliose, Matt, News Press
Croninger, Marsha, Student CE
Dowell, Mary, Counsel for SBCC
1.3 WELCOME

President Dobbs extended a cordial welcome to all.

1.4 MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING/STUDY SESSION OF MARCH 11, 2010.

Upon motion by Mr. O’Neill, seconded by Mr. Jurkowitz, the Board approved the minutes of the special meeting/study session of March 11, 2010. Ms. Livingston abstained.

1.5 HEARING OF CITIZENS was taken out of order.

Upon motion by Mr. O’Neill, seconded by Mrs. Green the Board approved adjourning into study session.

2. STUDY SESSION

2.1 Parent Child Workshops (Attachment 1)

2.1.1 Background information, clarifications and updates

2.1.2 Update on the status of negotiating an agreement between Santa Barbara City College and each of the four Parent Child Workshops to clarify, define and formalize the responsibilities of each organization

Superintendent/President Serban welcomed everyone and noted she is glad that there are so many here today to hear the discussion and updates being provided at this meeting. Suggested that everyone get a copy of the agenda (this is posted on the website as well) as it contains a comprehensive overview of the work that has been done to date related to the relationship between the College and the Parent Child Workshops, issues that have been analyzed and what the next steps will be.

Superintendent/President Serban reiterated that, as said in previous meetings and discussions, there is a clear agreement on the part of the Administration and Board of Trustees that we value the parent/child workshops and that we acknowledge the positive contributions that these programs have made to the entire Santa Barbara community. We do want to continue to be a partner with each of the four parent/child workshops in terms of providing the Continuing Education Parenting component in a fiscally responsible manner that complies with current state regulations and laws and consistent with the College mission. In spite of what some of you may have heard, the College is not trying to sever its relationship with the parent/child workshops, we do remain committed to offering the instructional component and we recognize that, although many people in the community think that the College owns and operates the parent/child workshop that is not the case. Since January of 2009, we have studied, discussed and analyzed the operations of the four workshops in a quest to fully clarify and understand the evolution of the relationship between the College and each of the four parent/child workshops. To date there has been no written agreement that clarifies this relationship. A number of issues have arisen over the years that have brought to light a variety of aspects that need to be clarified or changed in order to comply with legal statutes and regulations from the State Chancellor’s Office, which is the regulatory agency for California Community Colleges. The
core reason for the involvement of the college is to provide quality parent education to the Santa Barbara community and continues to be an important element of adult education. The College has taken the initiative to clarify and define this relationship and develop a written agreement that protects the respective interests of the parties involved. Trying to understand 50 years of history and practice is always a challenge, we have spent a year researching, learning and understanding the history and what the practice has been and what the relationship between the College and the parent/child workshops should or should not have been. I would like to acknowledge the parent boards of the four parent/child workshops because we have been engaged in discussions with some of them working in a collaborative way to develop an agreement between the college and each workshop. This process has led to good communication and we think that we are close to reaching a conclusion on a written agreement between the College and each of the four parent/child workshops. We are ready to go forward in a productive manner. By having a written agreement we will be in a better position to protect what can be a wonderful collaborative relationship between the College and the parent/child workshops in the same positive way it has been in the past. The purpose of this study session is to give a progress report to the Board on where we are.

Superintendent/President Serban provided a few highlights of some key points.

- Good progress has been made and it is understood that this is a complex issue.
- Originally the program started with hourly non-credit instructors, which at some point in September 1966 the positions were changed from hourly non-credit instructors to regular contract certificated employees at 60%. In 1968 their contract was increased to 67% and in April 1973 the positions became 80% which has been their status until June 2002, when at the June 2002 Board meeting their status was changed to 100% and the rationale used for this change was the increased duties as they relate to administrative work provided by the directors in support of running the 501(c)(3) independent organizations. In addition, the workload calculation that was used in that analysis was for credit instruction and it did not take into account the quarter calendar system used by Continuing Education. Board Policy 1920 clearly defines what a full-load is in non-credit instruction, which is 25 hours of lecture per week or 35 hours of lab instruction per week, or some equivalent combination. We think what has happened over time is that boundaries have been crossed regarding what is appropriate for the College to provide and claim for apportionment, which is our legitimate way of obtaining state funding, and what is not appropriate to provide and claim apportionment for.

- We stand by our parent educational component. This is and should continue to be the contribution of Santa Barbara City College to the parent/child workshops. We need to have in place a course of study outline for the parent education class offered at the parent child workshops that complies with state regulations. One of the issues has been developing a new course outline that is actually compliant; the one approved in 2005 is non-compliant. Progress is being made on this.

- We cannot subsidize an independent entity from the College, that is not appropriate use of public funds. We met with LeBaron Woodyard from the State Chancellor’s Office and discussed in detail what is and what isn’t appropriate to claim for apportionment and what is appropriate to include in a parent education course, as the one being offered at the parent/child workshops. Since he was here, we took the opportunity to discuss in depth the proper alignment of the parent education class with proper objectives and what could be appropriate or non-appropriate to include.

- As has been repeated in the many meetings with faculty, with representatives from the four parent boards, with their legal counsel, this is not to assign blame to anyone. On the contrary, we have four faculty members at the four parent/child workshops that have done the best they can and they’ve worked within what they understood to be their parameters of their operations at the time. We know that they are respected and appreciated in the community for their work and they have done a great job and we want to thank them for that.

- The clarification provided by the Chancellor’s Office is recent and challenging to absorb given its implications. Change is difficult, on all sides. The workshops have expressed a desire for a transition phase, we are willing to consider that possibility and we will need to discuss this and this should take place between the negotiators for both sides.
Superintendent/President Serban noted that there are still some outstanding items that need to be finalized. Need to finalize the written agreement, need to finalize an appropriate course outline to be taken through the curriculum approval process that begins internally and will end up at the State Chancellor’s Office. Need to address some issues regarding a process to manage open access, we are an open access institution and our courses need to be open access for us to be able to collect apportionment. Also need to have discussions regarding corrections that need to be made in the by-laws of each of the four parent-child workshops that is correcting language that is not legally accurate at this point. Appreciates the effort of all who have met with us, from the four parent boards, our faculty, our own administration, our legal counsel, and the parent board’s legal counsel. We have also met with the Instructors’ Association as these four positions have become part of that collective bargaining unit. Discussion is taking place regarding structuring and moving forward with the Oaks position and over time as retirements may occur for the other three positions. Superintendent/President Serban stressed that the three tenured faculty positions are full-time and that will not change, the College will fulfill its obligation to them for this status, however, in moving forward with the Oaks position it has to be understood that it has to be a position that allows the College to pay for what is covered by the instructional component.

Ms. Livingston asked where the College was on the timeline for hiring the director for The Oaks. Superintendent/President Serban answered that until the negotiations are finalized with the Instructors’ Association, the hiring process cannot begin on this position. Ms. Livingston also asked if there was a master agreement being negotiated for all of the workshops. Superintendent/President Serban answered that there will be an individual agreement between the College and each of the parent/child workshops, much of the content will be similar, but will not be a master agreement as they are four separate entities.

Mr. Villegas asked what type of an agreement is being negotiated. Ms. Mary Dowell, counsel for the College, reported that discussion has taken place with the counsel of the four parent child workshops and the parent boards, who have been very active participants in this discussion, to develop a template agreement and it will be an instructional services agreement and each of the four parent child workshops may need to do some tailoring to fit their particular needs. There will be four separate contracts and they will be submitted to the Board for approval. Mr. Villegas asked an example of a dollar amount to get a better understanding and Superintendent/President Serban provided information that is being proposed, but has not been officially agreed upon. Considering Board Policy 1920, a course that has 2.5 hours of lecture per week and 4 hours of lab per week constitutes 67.2% of a full load, in non-credit. If this is applied to the current salary and benefits of one of the instructors, sample used was Starr King, that’s $76,457 which is the portion of compensation applicable for that course and the remainder would be $37,318. One option would be if Starr King wanted to, they could reimburse the College for that amount and that is an annual amount and the College would not be subsidizing the administrative work component. The Starr King workshop has about 60 families per year at any one time. This means each family would need to contribute an additional $622/year which is $52/month to cover this cost. This is a very reasonable amount of money. Right now, a family pays about $120/month per child attending the pre-school 5 days a week. This would mean a family would pay $172/month per child attending 5 days a week. This is still a great bargain. Normally, preschools in town charge at least $800 to $1,000/month per child. Or the PCWs could get grants or fundraise this money if they do not want to charge the parents. Otherwise, the College is committed to the full-time salary and benefits of each of the three tenured faculty, so it would be a matter of fulfilling the full load by having the instructor teach other courses for which they are qualified to teach either in the non-credit or credit side of the College.

Mr. Jurkowitz asked what the job entails for the instructors. Superintendent/President Serban reported that the 3 tenured faculty members were hired on the credit salary scheduled and they work a schedule of a term of 175 instructional days. However, non-credit has had over the years a variation in the number of weeks per term, having an average of about 30 weeks per year with a lab component in the morning. What have been advertised in the schedule are 3 hours of lab per morning, five days a week and 2.5 hours of lecture per week, so in terms of instruction this would be 17.5 hours of instruction per week. Each instructor also supports the parent/child workshops by providing administrative work,
participates in the parent/board meetings, help with fundraising, help with the required work to maintain
their day care facility and various other administrative duties, in addition to the teaching of the parenting
class. In the fiscal year 2009-10 the College will only be able to claim the 17.5 hours of instruction and
also in the lab component there are not 60 students every day, currently the 5 sections of lab are being
run with 8-12 students per section, which normally we would not allow for any section. At 8-12 students
per section, it would be considered a low enrolled section. For all sections with enrollments under 20,
both on the credit side and non-credit side, the section is cancelled as it be very expensive to run with
this low enrollment.

Ms. Livingston noted that the letters received seem to have a sense that Santa Barbara City College
should be paying 100% of the full-time salary and I'm hear loud and clear that the Chancellor's Office
can't reimburse in terms of apportionment this 100%. Ms. Livingston wanted to be sure that everyone
understood that this is not discretionary and that we had been misapplying public funds for this 100%.
Superintendent/President Serban noted that if we continue this format, we are subsidizing a 501(c)(3)
corporation, which is not an appropriate use of college funds. We don't own and we don't operate
these four workshops, they are four separate entities. Superintendent/President Serban noted that it
had been verified through the Chancellor's Office that it would inappropriate for the College to try and
receive 100% apportionment for work performed by the instructors that is the administrative component
of their current jobs. Apportionment will only be paid for instructional activities that are appropriate for
and are part of a parent education class.

Mr. Jurkowitz noted that all of the trustees received many letters which were well written and
passionate, it's a matter of who pays and what is appropriate for the College to support fiscally. The
state is in a financial crisis, the College is in a financial crisis and the Board has to be and is trying to be
judicious and sensitive but also recognizing what our responsibilities are in handling taxpayer money
during this crucial time. It will not be an easy decision, but something that we will have to do.

1.5 HEARING OF CITIZENS was at this time.

Marilyn Statucki explained that she was the instructor who retired last spring. At the time of her
retirement she had been an instructor for Santa Barbara City College for 37 years and with The Oaks
for 30. The Oaks has been in operation in Santa Barbara for 63 years and the other workshops nearly
as long. Ms. Statucki noted that the workshops are organized as cooperative organizations and that it
requires coordination, leadership and instruction. These programs deserve the best that the instructors
can give and the best that the College as a whole can possibly give. Successful parenting and family
life is an important cornerstone of our culture, being a parent is a unique and personal and intense
experience for which in our society there is very little preparation and guidance. For many people
parenting will be the most important thing they accomplish in their whole lifetime, the nurturing of new
life, the supporting, the guidance, the teaching of the young and the journey towards becoming mature
adults and citizens of the world. Ms. Statucki said a few words about the amount of time dedicated to
this issue by the College already and the workshop community. She thanked Dr. Serban and the whole
Board of Trustees for putting in the amount of time and energy needed to hopefully make a decision
that is supportive of the integrity of the work of these programs. In addition, she thanked the current
instructors and the parent representatives on their Task Force who spent so much time on this as well.

One of the primary concerns that they hope to address is the gap between the level of what the College
funds for the instructor position and any new level this will possibly have to be funded by an increase of
fees for the parents. There is concern about the change because it has been a foundation of the
workshops through the decades to keep the fees as low as possible and the workshops accessible to
any parent in the community. They wanted them to be accessible no matter what the economic level
was, and one of their big fears is that any large increase in fees would make the programs less
accessible. As instructors, as students, as community members they have a dilemma, they want to
work with the administration, and they understand the serious economic times facing everyone here at
the College and in the community at large, but they have come here today because they care so much
about the workshops and they wanted to share the realities of what makes some of these proposals
difficult for the workshops. So let's continue now by focusing on a discussion of apportionment by the
attorney representing the workshops, Michael Schley.
Michael Schley reported that he would address a few issues, not just apportionment. Mr. Schley is the attorney representing the four parent child workshops. Mr. Schley confirmed what Dr. Serban had said: there has been a significant need for clarification in the relationship between the workshops and the College. When he was approached several years ago by one of the parent child workshop to help them with their bylaws he asked to see the agreement with the College and was surprised to learn that there wasn't one. His clients are glad to see clarification and a written agreement that has been created at the College's initiative and they applaud the College for that effort. It has been an amicable association. In fact they're at a point that where they are just about prepared to sign an agreement. The agreement itself does not address what the economic specifics are going to be in the first year, the agreement creates the framework, talks about the relationship, talks about what each party will contribute, but there are some issues that are still being worked out, where the dollars come in and those issues have to do with apportionment, with a rewrite of the course outline, with whether the College is improperly subsidizing the administration of these non-profits. Mr. Schley noted that his own view is that the District has quite a bit of latitude on these three points based on his research, based also on his discussions with the Dean of Academic Affairs at the Chancellor's Office, LeBaron Woodyard. On the apportionment issue he was assured by the Dean that if the course outline could be properly structured, much closer to 100% of the current duties of the instructor it could be eligible for apportionment so it is important that the time be taken to re-write that course outline so that the College can get the highest apportionment level possible and to narrow the financial gap and the potential burden on the parent child workshops. Mr. Schley stated that he felt that the curriculum, the course outline issue could be best understood if we stopped and looked at Education Code 84757, Mr. Schley provided some historical information regarding this ed code and its historical context. Mr. Schley reported that LeBaron Woodyard encouraged him and his clients and the College to try to make the most in developing the new course outline and if successful in the process, he believes and he was encouraged to believe that if it was closer to 100% of the current activities of the instructor it would be eligible for apportionment. Mr. Schley addressed the subsidy issue briefly, his own research on the issue of a gift of public funds for a private purpose, which is prohibited by the constitution. It's the same issue that comes up with other organizations that work with colleges who have arrangements like this Instructional Service Agreement or even service agreements. He explained that he had done work with foundations around the state that support community colleges, often their administrative space even personnel are provided directly by the college and that is not a gift of public funds to a private 501(c)3 entity for the obvious reason that the college gets much more out of that relationship than it is giving and the same is true here. Mr. Schley stressed that it was important to discuss the transition period with these workshops, they have already done their planning for next year, they're budgeting, their tuition, etc. It will be very important to try to soften the change as much as possible and he encouraged the Board and the administration to be as generous as possible and as understanding as possible during this transition period.

Ms. Livingston noted that she too called the Chancellor's Office and asked if an entire pre-school operation could be claimed for apportionment and the answer was no, didn't understand how Mr. Schley spoke with the Chancellor's Office and was told it could. Superintendent/President Serban reported that she spoke with the Chancellor's Office and that the information presented by Mr. Schley was incorrect. She would be interested to see if Mr. Schley has something in writing from dean Woodyard that would confirm what he said because she does not believe Dean Woodyard said that we should include administrative work in the course outline in order to justify the 100% level of compensation for the directors/instructors. What both parties have in writing from Dean Woodyard, states that "Courses addressing these activities (parenting education) may be approved for apportionment if all elements of approval are demonstrated and the relationship between the description of the course and its objectives make sense. Consequently, it would not be accurate to say that a course with any of these activities would be approved for apportionment. The course outline of record requires a description of the course and the objectives of a course have to support the description of the course. For example if a course is designed to teach a parent about the behavior of a child at age 6 but a course objective is teaching the parent about issues related to maintaining and operating a parent cooperative preschool, I would question the connection between the two." This is contrary to what Mr. Schley just said. What was being presented was not accurate.

Mr. O'Neill paraphrased what he thought Mr. Schley was saying was "you might be able to re-write the course outline to conform to the Chancellor's requirements much closer to a 100% line." How
imaginative would you think we would have to be in re-writing it? Because he looked at the course outlines currently being operated under and they do present problems because obviously the duties that are listed are not all functions related to teaching a parent education course.

Mr. Schley noted that the he was not involved in the writing of the course outlines, but he had looked at the drafts and the way Mr. O’Neill characterized what he was saying is correct, he did not misrepresent what the dean said. He did say we could get closer to 100% if we could characterize this correctly and another comment he had was that we had tried in the past to describe this as a teaching course and then dropped in other tasks that seem to come from another subject and something like that would never be approved.

Superintendent/President Serban noted that when she spoke with Dean Woodyard he was very clear that we could not push into a course outline a justification for running the administrative component of the operation and he was also very clear after looking at the draft of the course outline that the proposed 2.5 hours labeled as parent cooperative lab component are highly questionable and would most likely not be approved. It was also noted that there was written documentation that was received today from Dean Woodyard addressed to Yolanda Garcia where it is stated what she mentioned earlier in this meeting, that it would be questionable to include activities related to maintaining and operating a in a parent education class. It was also noted that the College was not going to this creative side of curriculum just to justify something that is not appropriate, because in the end it’s the College that is responsible for the curriculum we submit to the State Chancellor’s Office and claim for state apportionment.

Yolanda Medina-Garcia noted that the section in the packet called Notes on Apportionment, was too long to read this afternoon in its entirety, but hoped that the Board would take time to read it and she provided a summary. There are several things about the parent/child workshops. One is that they want to be able to continue to offer comprehensive parent education in a way they know to be effective. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the whole purpose of the parenting subsection of non-credit education as an allowable funding category by the state is to produce better parents, not to produce train parents in running pre-schools. They fully agree with this statement and ask the following questions: What is a better parent? How do we become better parents? What activities help people learn to become better parents? Hand in hand with the instruction in parenting skills and human development, the activities at the parent/child workshops bring people together to build a community, a community that welcomes people from all walks of life, all income levels, and all ethnic groups, united in their commitment to work for the common good. This precious experience is unique to the parent/child workshops and is something all want to preserve. Ms. Medina-Garcia stated that they had written a new course outline, the draft is in the review process, the old course outline was written in 2005 before the Chancellor’s Office published non-credit at a glance. This new course outline adheres to the guidelines for parent education, the administration has spoken to Dean LeBaron Woodyard in the Chancellor’s Office, they have spoken to Dean LeBaron Woodyard and Michael Schley has spoken to the dean as well. We ask the administration to help us construct this course outline so that the instructional hours we need to maintain the integrity of the parent/child workshops are apportionment eligible. We do not ask this lightly, we recognize that the college needs to cut funding and the parent/child workshops must share in this effort, yet we point out that the parent/child workshops pay for all operating expenses for the practicum labs, except the salaries of the instructor/directors and the parent/child workshops are committed to low fees to maintain accessibility. They’ve looked for ways to compromise without gutting the programs and agree that the parent/child workshops will shoulder the administrative costs for running the cooperative programs. They will all work together within the parent/child workshop community to find a way to pay for these costs. They have worked to clarify areas of confusion and concern and are very near the completion of the memo of understanding between the parent/child workshops and Santa Barbara City College.

Kelley Stoddard is now currently co-chair of the Parent Board at the Oaks. Ms. Stoddard noted that she did not fully appreciate the relationship between the College and the Oaks, until they attempted to seek a replacement for their retiring instructor. She also never pondered questions such as: how did the relationship between adult education and the PCW begin; why did the College take responsibility over instead of leaving it with what became the K-12 district; why did the College choose to make the
PCW instructors tenured, regular contract, certificated employees; who decided and why were the instructors placed on the credit side instead of non-credit; why did the College steadily increase the salary of those instructors over the next 44 years; and why did Dr. MacDougall turn the instructor positions into 100% tenured credited faculty positions in 2002? She didn’t know the answers to these questions, however, over the last year while she has been trying to convince the College to replace their retired instructor, she has come to understand the importance of their relationship with the College and she wants it to continue. Ms. Stoddard noted that the instructor’s position is a fulltime workload and she acknowledged the economic crisis the Board is facing. However, to survive the program needs the College to continue to provide the position with tenure and benefits and without this it would be difficult to convince an instructor to remain. The administration discussed a possible proposal that would provide the Oaks with a tenured part time adult education instructor with pro rata share of benefits. However, we have yet to show the financial impact of changing the position from being a faculty member to being an adult education instructor and there remains the fact that the Administration is proposing to fund 67-70% of that position. Ms. Stoddard acknowledged that in recognition of these financial times they believe they can make the position work at somewhere between 80-85%. Ms. Stoddard expressed a concern that she has not been able to find the information with regard to a range or schedule for the position on the college website. Ms. Stoddard understands that the College does not want and cannot fund the administrative part of the position because it is not eligible for apportionment and she is confident that they can prove to the administration and the Board that 82% can be legally supported by apportionment. They are committed to trying to raise the funds to make up the difference between what the College formerly gave and what will now be provided.

Lisa Bass thanked the Board for their long-term commitment and continued interest in the parent/child workshops. She hopes that the Board has gained a greater understanding of the depth of the parent/child workshop educational experience as they learn parenting skills that will support them now and as they continue to raise the next generation. Ms. Bass reported that they appreciate the opportunity and the many hours of time spent on the part of all parties to clarify the details of the work that has taken place. They are very conscious about the economic pressures facing the College and they are open to moving forward in a collaborative way. Ms. Bass noted that their workshops and families are also facing difficult economic times and they asked the Board to also recognize the burden that this will place on the families of the parent/child workshops if they are required to support the administrative component of the program. Ms. Bass on behalf of the alumni and community members in attendance today, the thousands in the community who have benefited from this important parent education experience, and the thousands more who will continue to reap the benefits of these programs, thanked the Board for their long-term commitment and continued interest in the parent-child workshops. The hope is that we can work together to preserve these important comprehensive parent education resources. The parent/child workshop leadership is present this afternoon to answer any questions and help you better understand these issues in-depth.

Ms. Livingston expressed a concern that there is no deadline set for the resolution of this issue and also asked when approval would have to be reached on the course outline so that the Oaks could go ahead with hiring an instructor. Superintendent/President noted that the course outline would have to go through our internal process that includes the Board of Trustees and then it is submitted to the Chancellor’s office for their approval. Depending on their work load could take months, however, if it is approved internally we would feel somewhat secure that we could base it on the number of lecture and lab hours for which the course was approved internally, with the hope that in the end it’s approved by the Chancellor’s Office.

Mr. Jurkowitz noted that the College is a vehicle here, gets state funds to help the workshops. The administration has spent a lot of time working on this and didn’t know what direct benefit the College got. There seems to be mistrust on the workshops’ part as to whether we are working in good faith and I think the Administration is working in good faith. I understand the problem, it’s a dollar problem. As Trustees we have a responsibility with the taxpayers’ funds that goes beyond the workshop., We need to look at the entire College and the community in terms of our responsibilities to the community, the state and the taxpayers.

Mr. Schley noted that each of the presidents from the four workshops had a very constructive meeting
recently with Dr. Serban, her counsel and staff. Believes there was some distrust early in this process; but has seen a tremendous improvement. We are hearing some optimistic statements and think it is in the College’s interest to put forth the course outline and try to get the best level of funding possible and the workshops have committed that they will put up the difference.

Mr. O’Neill noted that clearly the ultimate decision will be made in Sacramento, all we can do is put the best course outline forward.

Dr. Dobbs thanked the presenters for their presentations, hopes the audience got something out of what was heard today and like most of us have said, we will do the very best we can.

2.2 Confirmation of process by which members of the Board of Trustees request items to be added to agendas of future Board meetings (regular meetings, special/study sessions, or Board committee meetings) (Attachment 2)

Superintendent/President Serban reported that this item was on the agenda because at the last Board meeting the question was raised again about how individual board members could bring forward items to be considered for future board meetings and it was agreed that this item would be brought back. Attached to this agenda was the process that was agreed upon a year ago and every study session agenda since April 2009 has had the standing item to provide the board members the opportunity to propose agenda items for future board meetings. The concept behind this was to avoid situations where one board member would keep bringing back an item numerous times even after the Board had already voted on a course of action, which has happened last year. The Board needs to function as a whole. This process would allow for discussion and allow the Board as a whole to decide if the item should move forward or not. We need to have clarity on the process as without an agreed upon process, the College has been put at times in a difficult position when actions that the Board voted on were brought back to be discussed again the very next meeting after the vote was taken to move forward.

Dr. Dobbs asked the Board for input to the following:

   a) Do we go ahead with what has already been agreed upon a year ago?
   b) How many trustees does it take to make an agenda item?

Superintendent/President Serban suggested that if there is a consensus among the majority of the Board members present at the meeting, then the item would move forward and if not then it should stop there.

After discussion there was a consensus of the Board members present at the meeting. Then, the item would move forward and if not then it should stop there.

Dr. Dobbs requested that a policy or administrative procedure be drafted and presented to the Board at the next study session to formalize this process for which we have a consensus.

2.3 Discussion of proposed items for future agendas of Board meetings (regular meetings, special/study sessions, or committee meetings). This agenda item is for the members of the Board to discuss proposed or potential items for future Board meetings.

There was an item presented by Ms. Livingston for consideration, however, after discussion there was not a consensus of the Board to move forward with the item.

Upon motion by Mr. O’Neill, seconded by Mr. Jurkowitz, the Board approved adjourning from study session.
3. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion by Mr. O'Neil, seconded by Mr. Villegas, the Board approved adjourning this meeting. The next Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held on Thursday, May 27, 2010 at 4:00 p.m. in A211. A Study Session will be held on May 13, 2010 in A218C.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON May 13, 2010

[Signatures]

President, Board of Trustees

[Signatures]

Superintendent/President
Secretary/Clerk of the Board