MINUTES

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

May 13, 2010

SPECIAL MEETING/STUDY SESSION
Room A218
4:00 pm

MacDougall Administration Center
Santa Barbara City College
721 Cliff Drive

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

Others present for all or some of the meeting:
Dr. Andreea M. Serban, Supt/President and Secretary Clerk to the Board of Trustees
Dr. Friedlander, Jack, Executive VP
Dr. Bishop, Paul, VP IT
Auchincloss, Liz, President CSEA
Arellano, Ofelia, VP Cont. Ed.
Ehrlich, Sue, VP HR/LA
Alarcon, Ignacio, Pres. Academic Senate
Sullivan, Joe, VP Business Services
O’Connor, Ellen, Athletics
Medina-Garcia, Yolanda, Starr King PCW
Schley, Mike, Counsel for PCW
Massetti, Steve URS
Stoddard, Ellen, Director Lou Grant PCW
Stoddard, Kelley, Oaks PCW
Galvan, Joan, PIO
Blackburn, Leah, San Marcos PCW
Croninger, Marsha, CE Student
1.3 WELCOME

President Dobbs extended a cordial welcome to all.

1.4 MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING/STUDY SESSION OF APRIL 8, 2010.

Upon motion by Mr. O'Neill, seconded by Mrs. Green, the Board approved the corrected minutes of the special meeting/study session of April 8, 2010.

1.5 HEARING OF CITIZENS

Mr. Mike Schley, Counsel for the four PCW's: Mr. Schley was asked by the Parent Child Workshops to confirm that the College and the PCWs have reached an agreement. On behalf of the PCWs, Mr. Schley expressed appreciation for the attitude with which the College has approached this issue and there have been constructive clarifications of the terms of the agreements. The Oaks Workshop would like to have some information about the salary range and the qualifications of the person who would be hired in that position.

2. BUSINESS SERVICES – Mr. Joe Sullivan

Ms. Livingston requested some further information on the work taking place on the track and field replacement because the question is being asked “It looks good to me, why do you have to replace it?” Mr. Massetti reported that the consultants have called the field’s condition as “border line.” The field has been tested for its ability to rebound and the results show that the field is just barely at the minimum safety level. The field has been deteriorating over time; complaints have been received from the College’s teams as well as opposing teams that have played here. The track was installed over 24 years ago and tracks tend to have a life span of 20-25 years, this facility does get heavy use. One of the ways tracks are refurbished is that a thin layer is shaved off and an overlay is put in, this has been done twice already here and that is the maximum allowed for this type of work. The College will close the facility to work on the field and track. The desire is to complete both by August 31 to not need to be closed again Dec 20, 2010-January 30, 2011. This would consolidate and minimize the impact to the community and all who use the facilities. Mr. Massetti reported that rather than close the whole stadium, it has been decided that only the track and field portion will be closed and the stairs will remain open for public use. The track and field will close once the contractor is on site rather than closing it on May 17. All of the demolition of the track and field will take place at one time. The contractor cannot begin working on the track until the field has been placed.

Ms. Ellen O’Connor reported that the field absolutely needs to be replaced. There are three areas of nine locations in the field that have failed the G-Max test; these are areas in the field that are part of the playing surfaces for both soccer and football. The other issue is that there are transitions between the track and the field that create under hazard and the field has sunk in some areas and those are things that have to be resolved. Once this is repaired, there will be a seamless transition between the turf and the field, it would make for a much safer environment. The question asked was who besides the college uses the facilities? Ms. O’Connor reported that the community uses the facilities from 6:00 am–10:00 pm, seven days a week; the field is used by the college, park and recreation, outside groups, club sports, and non-sporting activities. The facilities gets tremendous public use, which is good. However, it does wear out a lot faster than a facility that is kept under lock and key. Some of the agencies that use the field are Bishop Diego High School for five home games and five practices a year, YFL, AYSO, rugby, La Crosse, and personal trainers.

2.1 AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR LA PLAYA TRACK AND FIELD REPLACEMENT, CONTRACTOR AND COST TO BE DETERMINED
Upon motion by Mr. O’Neill, seconded by Ms. Livingston, the Board approved the acceptance of bids and awards the contract to Byrom-Davey, Inc. for $1,940,000.

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

3. STUDY SESSION

3.1 Board Self Evaluation 2009-10

3.1.1 Board individual self evaluation with student trustee input (Attachment 1)
3.1.2 Board group self evaluation with student trustee input (Attachment 2)
3.1.3 Board individual self evaluation without student trustee input (Attachment 3)
3.1.4 Board group self evaluation without student trustee input (Attachment 4)

Dr. Dobbs congratulated Nicole Ridgell for being elected as Student Trustee for the 2010-11 academic year, second year in this role. The Board members began to review the board evaluations and a consensus of the Board was to schedule a retreat to discuss these evaluations further and also to talk about various other items, such as meeting schedules, the role of technology for the Board, and the trustees’ travel budget. The consensus was to schedule a retreat in the Luria Conference Center within the next couple of months.

3.2 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures

3.2.1 Recommended renumbering of previously approved Board Policies (Attachment 5) – Item was deferred
3.2.2 BP 6800 Safety (Attachment 6) – Item was deferred
   3.2.2.1 AP 6801 Safety Driving (Attachment 7) – Item was deferred
   3.2.2.2 AP 6802 Safety Transportation (Attachment 8) – Item was deferred
3.2.3 AP 4800 Salary Class Transfer (Attachment 9) – Item was deferred
3.2.4 BP 2340 Agendas (Attachment 10)
   3.2.4.1 AP 2340 Request by Member of the Public to Place Matters on a Board Agenda (Handout to be distributed at the meeting)
   3.2.4.2 AP 2341 Request by Board Members to Place Matters on a Board Agenda (Handout to be distributed at the meeting)

Superintendent/President Serban provided handouts for AP2340 and AP2341. Dr. Alexander reported that this item on the agenda came about because she wanted to request that the following wording be added to the first sentence of the current policy BP 2340: “An agenda for the meetings shall be provided by the Superintendent/President under the direction of the President of the Board of Trustees.” This doesn’t change what this says, but it emphasizes that the person who has responsibility for the policy of the agenda is the President of the Board. This additional wording was discussed with Dr. Dobbs. Superintendent/President Serban asked what this change would mean in practical terms. Dr. Alexander responded that this would mean that she would need to confer with the President of the Board of Trustees for agenda items, as the final authority of what goes on the agenda rests on the President of the Board. Superintendent/President Serban noted that this would be a problem as this isn’t the way the agenda preparation has worked in practical terms, this has not been the case in the past and this would not work because of the way the way the agenda is developed. If there are controversial issues, the Board President is always consulted, but many are consent agenda items that are about the business of the College. If the Board President had to be consulted for every item it would be very time consuming and impractical in getting the agenda and materials put together in a timely manner. Ms. Livingston noted that the Board had delegated this function to the Superintendent/President. Board members concurred that this item be deferred
3.3 Apportionment report submitted April 20, 2010 (2009-10 projected full-time equivalent students) (Attachment 11) – Item was deferred.

3.4 Continuing education proposed 2010-11 calendar and approach to workload/FTES reduction imposed by the state (Attachment 12)

Vice President Arellano reported that Continuing Education is looking at workload reduction for the next academic year in terms of reducing 300 FTES. They have met with the newly formed Consultation Council that includes a student representative, faculty, classified staff and administrators to look at different ways to address the 300 FTES reductions. They have also met with faculty groups and have taken advisory votes from these groups. The recommendation is to look at reducing the summer session by approximately 200 FTES, which can be achieved by reducing approximately 270 sections. The enhanced courses that lead to certificates, adult high school diploma or GED would be the only enhanced courses that would be offered during the summer 2010 along with some fee-based courses. The cost savings for reducing the summer session would be approximately $345,000. The other area that needs to be reviewed with the Board is the 20 courses that were converted to fee-based in spring 2010, using direct costs only. Instead of bringing those courses back every term for approval, it will be proposed that the Board approve the fee-based status of the 20 courses for the entire next academic year 2010-11. The second recommendation being made is that courses offered during the fall 2009 have been evaluated and staff have identified additional courses that are not approved by the Chancellor’s Office, similar to those offered during spring 2010. The courses are in the area of cooking, music and literature and they also need to be converted to fee-based courses for fall 2010 and the fees will be based on direct cost only. A letter was received on April 26, 2010 from Barry Russell, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs of the Chancellor’s Office where he advises the college of additional courses that are no longer eligible for apportionment. These are approved courses, but it was indicated that courses that are under the 0835.xx or 1008.xx Taxonomy of Program (T.O.P) codes – physical education and dance - are no longer funded by the state. Staff will work with faculty teaching these courses to convert those courses to fee-based for fall 2010, using direct costs only.

The question was asked “How is this information going to be communicated to the affected groups?” Dr. Arellano reported that she has sent an email blast to all of the Continuing Education students, informing them of the recommendations. Superintendent/President Serban also noted that this information has been posted on the Continuing Education website. Dr. Arellano noted that flyers will be posted at the Centers for those students who do not use the internet.

Superintendent/President Serban reported that the following would be brought to the next board meeting for approval: the Continuing Education calendar for 2010-11, including the condensed summer 2010; and approval will be requested for the 20 courses that were converted to fee-base for spring 2010 to continue with the fee-base structure based on direct costs only for the 2010-11 academic year.

Superintendent/President Serban noted that by not providing the non-enhanced summer the College is saving approximately 200 FTES and this was preferred by faculty and students rather than cutting some sections every term. There is still a lot of work that needs to take place, Dr. Arellano, the directors and faculty need time to conduct a major review of all course outlines, to make sure that they are all within the guidelines of the state, that are now a lot stricter than they used to be.
3.5 Review of changes in the 2009-10 unrestricted general fund budget throughout the year, preliminary 2009-10 unrestricted general fund year-end projection and preliminary tentative budget 2010-11 unrestricted general fund (Attachment 13) - Item was deferred.

3.6 Memorandum of Understanding with the Parent Child Workshops (Handout to be distributed at the meeting)

Superintendent/President Serban provided handouts of the instructional services agreements between the College and the Parent Child Workshops (PCWs) and provided an update. The May Board agenda will include new parent education courses for approval. The four faculty members have worked with Dr. Arellano and Andy Harper, the Continuing Education Curriculum Committee as well as the College’s Curriculum Committee and the new course outlines were reviewed by these two committees and were approved. The course outlines will be on the Board agenda for approval and once they are Board approved, they will be submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office for approval. Based on the significant amount of work that has been done in understanding the state regulations, we feel optimistic that in this format the courses will be approved by the state. The second piece is the agreements. They are close to being finalized. These documents reflect the conversations and the many exchanges involved in our various meetings. The reason the documents are different is that we are committed to maintaining the full-time tenure status of the three faculty members teaching at the Lou Grant, Starr King and San Marcos PCWs and the difference would be the workload requirement change made to the new faculty position who will teach at Oaks, as previously discussed.

Superintendent/President Serban reviewed with the Board some of the items in the document for Lou Grant, Starr King and San Marcos PCWs. The College has agreed to assist the parent child workshops for a year to help them transition into the new structure, previously assistance was going to be provided until December 2010 that has been changed to June 2011. Superintendent/President Serban explained that for the 2010-11 school year, the College has offered to provide the services of an instructor for the number of hours per week to equal 12.8% to assist with non-instructional/administrative work. Once this period is over, the College has offered the possibility to the three workshops to reimburse the College for the balance of the instructors’ compensation needed to cover the administrative work. Based on the information provided by Mr. Mike Schley, two of the workshops, Lou Grant and Starr King, are interested in paying for this part of compensation and reimburse the College and San Marcos is not. To be able to plan for the academic year and for each year this agreement is in effect, each of the three Workshops will need to notify the College by February 15 whether it wishes to reimburse the College for the services of the instructor to provide non-instructional assistance. It was also noted that the termination notice of each agreement would be 6 months, rather than 120 days and that this will be corrected in the final agreement. This is an annual agreement that will roll over unless either party gives notice of non-renewal. Each workshop would have its own separate agreement with the College.

Superintendent/President Serban explained that the document for The Oaks is different because the position will be for 67.2% and in order to provide the same transitional assistance being received by the other three workshops, the College has agreed to provide for the 2010-2011 period only, additional assistance of 12.8%. Because this position is at 67.2%, the Oaks could choose to hire the same person for whatever percentage over the 67.2% they would need to.

Dr. Alexander noted that when The Oaks addressed the Board they wanted a tenured instructor in that position, just like the other workshops and they felt that they needed to have it to be in parallel with the other workshops and putting in a 67% position would qualify it as part-time position. Superintendent/President Serban explained that the 67.2% would actually be a permanent, non-credit tenured position with pro-rated benefits and a copy of the qualifications
for this position were presented at the last study session, noting what the State Chancellor’s
guidelines were for a non-credit parenting education instructor. Salary and benefits are part of
the collective bargaining negotiations with the Instructors’ Association and negotiations continue
with this item. Dr. Alexander noted that the position should be parallel to what is at the other
three workshops, that’s what they want. Superintendent/President Serban noted that it’s what
they want, but it’s not what the college is reimbursed from the state for and this is not what we
have discussed at prior meetings. Ms. Livingston reported that the Board has weighed in on
this and the decision that had to be made was whether the Board could continue to subsidize
four programs beyond the instruction hours we are getting funding for. The time to make these
difficult decisions is when there is a retirement or an opportunity to review what is in place.
Superintendent/President Serban noted that as retirements occur in the other three workshops,
then the instructor position would be reverted to 67.2%. It was also noted that in the past
positions have been “grandfathered” in and as retirements occur and positions become vacant
they are moved into the structure that had been developed. The College tries very hard, in spite
of changes over time, to let employees stay in their position until they retire and it’s because we
honor their service and we protect them.

Mr. O'Neill suggested to Dr. Alexander that if she felt very strongly about her position on this
matter that she call for a motion at the Board meeting where action may be taken.

3.7 Reorganization of the Human Resources and Legal Affairs Division (Attachment 14)

Vice President Ehrlich reported that the basic reason for the HR proposal is that they had one
person retire and one accepted employment at another college that allowed the restructuring of
this division. Vice President Ehrlich reviewed with the Board the proposed reorganization. One
of the vacant positions will not be filled and the critical components of that position have been
identified and will be assigned to two existing employees whose positions will be upgraded.
There is an employee in HR who is at the same classification as the position that was vacated in
the benefits section who has been asked and accepted to take on the benefit processing.
Student hiring was moved to HR from the Career Center some years ago. HR has observed
that, while there are some peak periods when the demand for this position is high, there are
some other periods when this position can pick up some other work.

By making these changes, HR will create some savings and with these savings they would like
to rectify an oversight that has been in place for a very long period of time. HR on this campus
does not process all of the non-credit adjuncts, that work has been performed by an individual in
a job position that was supposed to be an Administrative Assistant to the Vice President of
Continuing Education. That position was recently reclassified because the individual was doing
HR level work and a critical piece for Continuing Education. The savings that HR would see
would be used to provide the funding for this HR Continuing Education position. Dr. Ofelia
Arellano thanked Vice President Ehrlich for taking on this project that now allows her to have an
Administrative Assistant.

3.8 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.

Dr. Alexander noted that she saw a copy of a letter from Robert Bezemeke regarding
Negotiations of a new collective bargaining agreement and District Policy or Procedures-
Bargaining Demand in the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda of May 12. Dr. Alexander asked
the Board if a hold should be put on further review of policies and procedures until they find out
what is going on. Vice President Ehrlich explained that it was not necessary to stop the review
of policies as there are a number of polices that don’t touch on negotiable issues. It is Vice
President Ehrlich’s understanding that it’s not the intent of the IA to bring this process to a halt
and the way to handle this going forward is item by item. As a policy comes up that impacts on a subject that is a negotiable item, staff will have a process in place to deal with this. All polices will be screened properly and nothing will come to the Board that has not gone through the appropriate internal consultation process. The Board members concurred that work on policies and procedures should continue.

Ms. Livingston expressed her concern regarding the wider media today that includes anonymous blogs and that of late there has been misinformation on these blogs. Some of it is opinions, some of them are outright lies and misrepresentation and the Board hasn’t discussed how they should be responding to these blogs. Would like to see this as an agenda item at a next study session or retreat for the Board to talk about what our policy should be using our Public Information Officer to deal with the wider media, rather than just press releases to a limited media. The Board members concurred that this item should be on a study session agenda for further discussion.

Upon motion by Mr. O’Neill, seconded by Mr. Jurkowitz, the Board approved adjourning out of study session.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion by Mr. O’Neill, 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 June 10, 2010 in A218C.