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Luria Conference and Press Center
12:00 pm -2:00 pm

SBCC East Campus
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 Haslund called the meeting to order

1.2 ROLL CALL

Members present:
Marty Blum
Marty Croninger
Peter Haslund, President
Morris Jurkowitz
Joan Livingston
Lisa Macker
Luis Villegas, Vice President

Others present for all or portion of the meeting:
Dr. Andreea M. Serban, Superintendent/President and Secretary of the Board of Trustees
Alarcon, Ignacio, Pres Academic Senate
Dr. Alsheimer, Cornelia, IA
Dr. Arellano, Ofelia, VP Cont Ed
Auchincloss, Liz, President CSEA
Bailey, Jack, Cont Ed Director
Dr. Bishop, Paul, VP IT
Ehrlich, Sue, VP HRLA
Dr. Friedlander, Jack EVP Ed Prgrms
Galvan, Joan, PIO

Griffin, Leslie, Controller
Harper, Andrew, Cont Ed Director
Monda, Kim, Faculty English Comp
McCammon, Cathie, Cont Ed Student
ACES Co-president
Dr. Nevins, Dean, Pres Elect Academic
Senate
Marsha Wright, Director EOPS/CARE
1.3 WELCOME

President Haslund extended a cordial welcome to all.

1.4 HEARING OF CITIZENS


ACES reviewed and analyzed this document that was first presented to the Board of Trustees at the Study Session on February 16, 2011. As a result of their analysis they think that much more information is needed than is provided in this document and this information needs public discussion. The assumptions that were used in the preparation of its recommendations need to be spelled out as do the implications of the questions. As a student organization representing Continuing Education Students, they were very concerned about what this will mean for a number of items in their current program. 1) The amount of cuts under the different scenarios are spelled out, however, what is the basis for arriving at these numbers? What are “the number of policy proposals at the state level, which if implemented, will change the funding for community colleges in very important ways?” and what choices may they not have in the future? 2) They are concerned about the use of the Wake Center for more credit classes. What is the evidence that there is additional capacity to offer more credit classes? Will these be replacing the traditional adult education classes that are now housed on this property? 3) They believe that cuts should affect all continuing education classes equally. They noticed that the recommendation is to cut enhanced non-credit classes, while a large cut is proposed for non-enhanced non-credit classes. 4) They are concerned about the implications of this recommendation on the instructors of adult education classes who are classified as adjuncts. One specific concern is that if non-credit non-enhanced classes are not given this summer this will result in our instructors receiving what amounts to a 25% cut. They hope that before decision are made of these very important policy questions that more information is provided. There needs to be a reasonable opportunity for the community to know and understand what will be the potential results of the state’s budget crisis and the effect this will have on Continuing Education.

2. STUDY SESSION

2.1 Approach to preparing the 2011-12 tentative budget and planning ahead for 2012-13 and 2013-14

Preliminary recommendations to and questions for the Board of Trustees from the Superintendent/President and Executive Committee (Attachment 1)

President Haslund noted that the purpose today was to continue the dialogue that began at the last study session, focusing on how the Board members are going to understand and cope with the fiscal realities. Asked the Board members what would be their objectives for the next two hours.

Trustee Livingston stated that the Board needs to identify the decisions that need to be made on a timely basis and carve out the ones that take a broader, longer discussion.

Trustee Macker stated that the Board needs to identify information they may request of administration, to help them make their decisions.

Trustee Croninger stated that the Board needs to talk about the process to make decisions, what are
President Haslund stated that his understanding of what the Board members said is that the Board needs to assess whether they accomplished what they said they wanted to accomplish and if that's not the case, to identify why.

Superintendent/President Serban stated she would like to emphasize that the role of the Board was to make policy-level decisions, the actual detail is done by the staff and the Board does not facilitate discussions within the college, there is a participatory governance process in place that is well established that is followed. The Board needs to provide the direction at the conceptual policy level that helps the staff move forward to build the detail. So, she hopes that in this discussion that the Board also arrives at some understanding of the difference between policy level decisions that are Board-level decisions vs the detail staff work that is critical at this point. Superintendent/President Serban provided a one page document related to the budget from Chancellor Jack Scott and Scott Lay, CEO Community College League of California (CCLC). It is the latest communication from the state and wanted the Board to have a copy.

President Haslund noted that it looked like the first and second question; identification of decisions to be made as well as the identification of the information necessary from the administration in order to make those decisions are linked. Would like to focus on that a bit and see what decisions need to be made and what information they need as Board members to make those decisions.

Superintendent/President Serban noted that she can say from the administration perspective what would be most helpful and by when, if that helps. The document that was provided to the Board on February 16, 2011 is a preliminary document. To move forward with the work on the budget, she and the college staff need the Board to make some important policy level decisions and absent those decisions, building the actual budget is not possible. For example, it would make a big difference if the Board agrees to have the cut implemented in a three-year phased approach, vs one year vs two years. So this decision needs to be made ASAP because from that flows the rest of the work. The other fundamental decision relates to recommendation number three, the reason that needs to be decided is because it relates to how the college is going to offer courses and what courses. It is not the role of the Board to decide the schedule of classes; however, it is the role of the Board to provide the decision as to how they will apply the workload reduction, meaning cuts in FTES that are funded by the state. The information being received is still the most optimistic version of $400 million cut, assuming the extension of the tax increase happens. However, recommendations 1 and 3 must occur very quickly because again they would detail how the budget was built.

Related to recommendation 3 is the summer 2011 non-credit term because as Dr. Arellano mentioned last time, building of the schedule for summer 2011 non-credit begins next week, so the decision here relates to whether to offer the same reduced summer session that was offered last year, which included only enhanced non-credit and a few fee-based courses, with no state supported non-enhanced courses offered and then there were three full terms with very good combination of offerings. Based on internal conversation, the recommendation was to do the same for summer 2011 and the decision needs to be made by March.

Trustee Blum stated that for her it would be answering recommendation 8, how much of the general fund reserves do they want to keep because the proposal is talking about spending in recommendation 1 quite a bit of the reserves and the question is how far down do they want to spend them. That would mean that recommendation 8 comes first and then recommendation 1. Trustee Croninger suggested that since none of the Board members had accounting background, except for Lisa Macker, it would helpful for the Board to have an outside third party look at the issues of reserves and provide the Board with a broader understanding of why they need the reserves, what they use them for, what are the possible important points that they need to consider in making that decision, and how much reserves
do they need. At this point she hadn’t seen anything that tells her about whether it was ever a good idea to have a particular amount, and it doesn’t tell her whether they should have more or less.

Superintendent/President Serban noted that she didn’t know what someone from the outside would contribute. An outside consultant would need to really understand our environment, so that would mean bringing in another CBO from another community college, and it would have to be someone from a college who has done as well as us fiscally, there are only very few colleges who have done as well as us. Secondly, the comment about accounting background, wanted to remind the Board that this why we have professionals at the college who are hired to do this kind of work. Also expressed her concern about timing, the college does have certain suggestions about reserves that could be an initial base, and if the Board still insists on having someone from the outside come in, the outside consultant can come later and take whatever time they need. Having someone from the outside come in would also take time from staff because the staff will need to explain our situation and information before an outside consultant can be helpful in any way regarding what is an appropriate level of reserves that the college should have.

Trustee Jurkowitz observed that the college has an administration and strong financials that have been in place for a number of years. He felt that the college has good balances and reserves and he thought that the college had been run in a very prudent manner, doesn’t see the benefit of an outside consultant. He feels that as Trustees, they should be on the conservative side. As far as getting into the reserves, he would like not to get into the reserves if possible. So he would not want to abandon the process the college used before, he has trust in the administration, and he would follow the administrations’ recommendations. Doesn’t see how an outside consultant would know as much as the staff does.

Trustee Croninger suggested that perhaps these questions had not seriously been examined, ever. What had been done is to adopt a particular philosophy, value judgments have been made in broad brush, but questions had not been asked that go specifically to why we had these reserves and how much we would need them for, in particular circumstances, nor have we gotten any overview of where we stand with other colleges, or with the entire system. We are being paid to provide a specific service and that is education, we’re not being paid to amass cash, we are expected to be fiscally stable, that is a value, that is important, we have to balance all these things and understanding where we are in the system and where we might want to be and what we need the reserves for, this would inform the Board’s discussion and informs their decision making. Trustee Croninger did not envision an outside person who has to be educated in the matter of the Board, she envisioned someone who already is familiar with community colleges, familiar with the financing of community colleges, and had expertise in the financial matters that they’re talking about and doesn’t see that it would be a great burden on staff.

Trustee Macker stated that they do have a lot of past information but again it's the way it's been done; it doesn't tell her what is the value of those reserves. They know they're going to have cash flow problems, there's ways to look at those, she feels very comfortable and confident of the cash flow situation here and feels that she understand it well. Doesn't think it would take any financial individual, especially someone with a background in community colleges, long to grasp the situation and just give them an outside vision, outside input. Supported the statement made by Trustee Croninger about what are those reserves for? This is an institution to educate, if the cuts they take, for instance if they choose to preserve the reserves and make the cuts to get to where they want to go to a balanced budget, feels it's up to the Board to state their values about the impact on the students and the impact on the faculty and the community at large that they serve. Yet having the reserves and keeping that number just because it's always been that way isn't a good enough answer, it doesn't speak to the values of what they're doing for the students.

Trustee Villegas would not be in favor of bringing somebody from the outside to consult because he doesn’t think it is needed. Does not want to get into the mode of constantly referring to outside
consultants to solve every little question that comes up and it seems that they're starting to get into that mode and since they're talking about budget doesn't like spending money on consultants that aren’t necessary. The budget is there and the college has been frugal over time and because of that the college has healthy reserves. The Board heard of colleges going out and trying to get lines of credit with financial institutions, and that is no way to operate a college. Trustee Villegas noted that in reference to Trustees Croninger and Macker’s comments regarding what is enough that would be a more theoretical conversation that they could have over time and educate themselves on. There was thought and consideration put into the recommendations that are before them, but he thinks that they also have to consider that before they get into philosophical discussions about what is enough and what is not enough and what is it for and not for, they have some decisions that they have to make so that the staff can start preparing a budget moving forward not getting into theoretical discussions about what may and may not be.

Superintendent/President Serban responded that it’s not true what was said: that they've always done it this way is the reason they want to keep doing it. As the Board knows from prior discussions, we had talked about cash flow, we had talked about the need to preserve equipment, construction funds, so the rational is built around several issues, at all times they should have enough money to pay the bills. Her opinion is that the Board should not borrow, therefore if they agree, the minimum reserve at all time needs to be enough to give them the ability to make payroll and fixed utilities. Staff presented the cash flow for six of twelve months, from the cash flow it was noted that they were in the red in some months and in some month’s were in the red as much as about $18 million which was offset by using the money in the reserves, so the idea was the minimum reserves need to be such that the cash flow can be met every month, and on top of that there is the concept of the deferred payments from the state.

Dr. Friedlander noted that his perspective was that the Board had the information it needs to make a decision and it’s hard to predict, a lot of these assumptions are the staff's best call as to what’s going to happen with the state funding in a couple of years. It is difficult to predict several years into the future at this point for how long the college would need the reserves without knowing what the state funding is going to be. He felt that the Board had the data they needed to make these decisions. Trustee Macker stated that talking about the past and what the college has is not a criticism of it, the administration is commended for the money that they've save, so didn't think that the subject had to be brought up again. The discussions being requested are part of their role as Board members, about reserves vs providing students services. Those are the discussions she wants to have with the rest of the Trustees to inform their choice about how deep are they going to go into the reserves.

Superintendent/President Serban reported that there was about $40 million in total reserves between the general fund, construction, equipment and JPA. Trustee Croninger added the $1 million in Continuing Education’s trust funds. Superintendent/President Serban noted that those funds could only be used for Continuing Education. Trustee Croninger stated that they were talking about Continuing Education, so these are all parts of the bigger picture, at least $40 million.

Trustee Macker went over recommendation 1, to implement the ongoing cut to base funding in a three-year phase and that she thinks the break down would be, $15 million if the cut is $10.5 million, $7.6 million if the cut is $6.8 million and $4.8 million if the cut is $3.9 million. Trustee Blum noted that she was thinking that 20-25% was the least they should keep in reserves and doesn’t like the idea of borrowing money over the three years. Trustee Livingston asked if they should phase-in the cuts that they see coming up over a period of time or do they take them all at once. Perhaps they need to look at what the college would look like if they take them all at once, and take the reserves off the table. Superintendent/President Serban reported that if they implement the cuts all at once, the college would be devastated and that even with recommendation 3, she thinks that's a reasonable level considering where they are and considering what is happening, that would still allow the college not to borrow, still allow the college to make payroll and pay utilities, be able to meet the cash flow. The Vice Presidents
and Superintendent/President Serban had spent time and the point is this is the way to implement the cuts without hurting the college. We are not here to decimate the college in a year. It requires an organized and planned implementation that allows students to know that next year there are going to be fewer of certain classes so that they can plan ahead. Superintendent/President Serban feels that this three-year approach, as it is now, not only keeps the college solvent, but saves the students and saves the community, allows for preserving core services and instruction, keeps everybody employed who is a permanent employee of the college, and keeps Board commitments that are really important.

Trustee Croninger noted that the reserves are still not informed by the facts. The Board needs to make intelligent decisions and have intelligent discussions and this touches on the subject of what do they need to decide on how much money is needed in the reserves. Point two is the chart reflects phasing in the cuts, she is in favor of phasing in the cuts and she was with an intelligent discussion about reserves, possibly in favor of even holding off the first year in terms of making any cuts and phasing in beyond that, in other words status quo for next year and then start cutting if that’s what they decide in 2012-13. Trustee Croninger would like to know what classes cost for Continuing Ed, for credit, for different kinds of credit, there are classes where it is teacher classroom, there are classes that are much more complicated in terms of the programs, what do they cost and how does that fit into their philosophy as a college. These decisions were made much to quickly in the last two years and that caused a great deal of disruption and unhappiness and she would hate to see them make that mistake again and just make it quickly without a lot of discussion within the college and in the community. She hasn’t seen anything yet about how they are going to discuss this with the community.

Trustee Macker wanted to touch on four points. She is in favor of the phase in approach and using the reserves to facilitate this transition. Echoed what Trustee Croninger just said about the reserves and the actual cash, while they do go into the red periodically, she can count the months here, where they go into the red but the balances are $16-$30 million in the general fund, on top of that they have all the other funds. If they are looking at the cash not including the JPA, there is $26-$42 million, that’s not counting the JPA, so any concerns, that they’re getting to close, they’re going to have to borrow, or anything, she doesn’t see that and what is being said is that let’s all be real and know what they’re discussing, they need to know those numbers, they’re not talking about being on the edge of borrowing, at all, there is plenty of cash flow. In terms of Continuing Education and the cost, that is a relative question for the Board, as they come up with their priorities, Continuing Education it seems would not cost as much as credit classes and it is an important thing to help them be aware of this. Just making a choice, for instance to cut Continuing Ed because they’ll save more money, the Trustees just want to make sure that administration is looking at the actual cost of the classes, because different classes whether they are non-credit or credit, enhanced, non-enhanced, there is a different cost associated with them. And the last point would be the budget, she understands that people want to keep their little pockets of money, waiting for when there are sunny days again. Asked administration to take a very close look at the budget and those areas that have been perennially over budgeted and under spent and she feels that they can go a long way towards coming up with a million from just those areas, from her review of the last five years of financials.

President Haslund reported that there was a growing consensus on the issue of a phased in cut. Several Trustees had concerns about how they achieve that, whether they supplement it or not supplement it and how they would do it. There’s some ongoing discomfort and that is kind of natural with the implications of the cuts, what is going to be cut, how not specific in terms of programs, but are there ways they can avoid the cuts, or are there ways that they can soften the blow? How can they go about that? Also heard some concern about the nature of the reserves, how is it constituted, where it is, is there a range on how much and is there a way that administration can help them understand the nature of the reserves? Trustee Blum thanked President Haslund for the summary and that she wanted to know if what they’re asking staff to do is to try to find $1-$2 million in cuts for this coming year, which she thinks can be found, it’s always hard. Superintendent/President Serban wanted to
reiterate what she heard. $2 million cuts in the budget for 2011-12 and staff would come up with a proposed way to do it and they would bring it to the Board for discussion. Trustee Macker stated that Superintendent/President Serban had mentioned two ways to create reserves and she wanted to note that there is a third way to create a reserve and that is that they budget the reserve and have them right on the table. Superintendent/President Serban agreed, this is just how the college does it with construction and equipment funds.

President Haslund requested that they move on to agenda item 3, reducing non-credit, non-enhanced FTES.

Trustee Blum stated that it looked like from 2009-10 and 2010-11, there was a 15% reduction, from 1,263 FTES to 1,065. Superintendent/President Serban noted that part of this reduction was because 120 FTES of parent-education courses taught at the Parent-Child workshop couldn’t be counted until there was state approval for these courses. So, assuming course approval is given in 2011-12 then the 120 FTES can be included. The recommendation was to lower them even more, however, did want to clarify that the decline from 1,263 to 1,065: 120 of that was from the Parent Education classes and in addition it was also the PE courses for older adults. If the Board recalls, a memo received in April 2011 from the State Chancellor’s Office stated that non-credit Physical Education courses for older adults are no longer funded by the state. In addition, there were the cooking classes for which FTES couldn’t be claimed. Superintendent/President Serban’s recommendation would be to reduce non-enhanced, non-credit to 800 FTES, to maintain the enhanced non-credit at 930 that is about the level it was in 2009-10 and hopes to end the year 2010-11 at the same level. Credit will also need to be cut over a three year period by about 750 FTES, that is a significant number.

Dr. Friedlander reported that the Legislature was real clear about two things, they’re reducing the workload, funded FTES and provided priorities and they’ll be watching very carefully that the priorities are met. The accountability measures are all focused on those priorities, basic skills, degrees, certificates, transfers, that’s what being measured and nobody cares that there are cuts in funding; colleges are expected to make improvements in each of those areas. What will have to be done in credit is within whatever allocations there are, some painful decisions would have to be made to reduce the breadth of offerings in order to provide enough of the core courses students must have and what they absolutely have to have to complete their major field in certain areas and career technical education certificate programs. And a number of classes that are offered that add to the richness of the curriculum might have to be readjusted to offer more core, so students can get what they need, when they need it and that would have classroom implications, staffing implications and once the Board gives the direction, staff would begin to plan for this.

Trustee Croninger noted that the Board was looking at various iterations of the budget and they won’t know until June what budget version would be presented, so how would staff plan the schedules. Superintendent/President Serban reported that they would plan for the $2 million cut in the budget and if the tax extension passes, it would be easy to implement less of a cut, but the plan will be $2 million. Dr. Friedlander reported how these cuts would be handled on the credit side. Trustee Croninger asked why not have two schedules built for credit. Superintendent/President Serban reported that having two different schedules would be quite an endeavor. In the end, even if the tax increase passes they would implement the $2 million cut in the 2011-12 budget, even in the best case scenario they would need to cut $3.9 million over three years, and that may save some effort that doesn’t make sense to put on the staff. Dr. Friedlander noted that it’s already too late to make any changes to the summer or fall schedules and the changes would need to take place in spring. Trustee Croninger asked what would happen if it turns out that the cut would be at the lower level. Superintendent/President Serban noted that if that were to happen they would have time to add back classes. Superintendent/President Serban reported that on the credit side the summer and fall schedules would be out soon, since early registration starts in April, and they would have the exact same volume of classes, as summer 2010, and fall 2010, there would be no cuts. However, the schedule for non-credit summer 2010 and fall 2010
hadn’t been built so in non-credit there is an opportunity to build the summer and fall schedules, implementing some cuts to truly reflect the targeted FTES. Trustee Croninger questioned the savings of the previous cuts to the summer 2010 non-credit to maybe $350,000 that seemed like a huge impact on the program for not much savings.

Superintendent/President Serban noted that part of the discussion is not only the cost of FTES, cost of a class, it’s what’s the core mission of the college, what is the mission of the state, what are the state priorities, to what extent do we want to honor in any way the state priorities. Would like the Board to return to the policy level discussion, that is, what do they want the core mission to be, is credit at the core mission or not, and what are the relative priorities. Looking at that minutia level, how much this class costs vs how much the other class costs, is staff level work and that is what the staff does and does it well. But the core question is, what is the core mission of the college, what are the state priorities and what will be done at SBCC. The key question is what is core, what is the core mission, do we care about career technical education, basic skills, transfer direction of the state, do we care that the state says within the non-credit area, non-credit, enhanced non-credit, is a higher priority than non-enhanced non-credit. If we don’t, then we need to recognize it up front and that changes the entire conversation.

Trustee Croninger agreed with Superintendent/President Serban that there needs to be a larger discussion and this is why she suggested that perhaps a status quo on the classes to allow for that discussion. A savings of $350,000 proposed in exchange for that longer and more informed discussion would be well worth it, they have a very important relationship to their community, as well as to the college and they need to have these discussions and they need to have them at all levels and with a wide variety of input and $350,000 is not a big price to pay given $40 million in reserves, and that doesn’t count whatever they may or may not have at the end of this year in additional ending balances. And doesn’t agree with Trustee Livingston that this is answered for us by the state, the state has always been clear that it has priorities, but at this point in time, unless they enacted additional legislation, the relationship to this community is a very high priority as well, and that’s part of the discussion. And so as they struggle with these issues, they need to do it within the college and outside the college and they need some more time to do it and do it better than it had been done in the past.

Superintendent/President Serban stated that now it seems that what is being said is that in 2011-12 non-credit takes no cut in classes and whatever cuts need to be made, would be made in credit. Trustee Croninger stated that it would be what was already discussed status quo for credit. Superintendent/President Serban reported that what was discussed earlier was that they were going to be a $2 million target cut in the budget for 2011-12 and not status quo. Trustee Croninger stated that she suggested a $1 million target and what she heard was that there be a summer and fall in credit that is status quo, and she suggested that they have a summer and fall non-credit status quo as well. Also added that they offer as many community service classes as possible that adds potential revenue.

Dr. Arellano noted that the community service courses are not totally covered by the course fees so district funds are being used to subsidize them. There needs to be a larger discussion with the Board because the Education Code does say that district funds cannot be used to fund community service courses, so she will need direction in the future from the Board regarding the fees for community service classes.

Superintendent/President Serban reiterated what she heard said and that was no cuts, that will mean really dipping into the reserves and there was no full direction given by the Board. So knowing now that they’re not going to cut anything in spring 2012 basically means no cuts whatsoever. This will need to be discussed further at the March 10 study session. Dr. Arellano will start moving forward on her schedule and will proceed to have a reduced summer session in 2011 the same as last summer session and provide some fee-based classes in addition to the enhanced non-credit classes. Wanted to note for the record that Continuing Education has a Continuing Education Consultation Council, they
have staff serving as advisors to ACES and the other student group, they had student representatives come and address the Board under hearing of citizens, so the Board does hear from those constituents. However, if the Board wants to schedule community meetings, staff will assist. The issue is timing and process and really looking forward to the longer term stability of the college.

Trustee Livingston requested that the Board give direction on recommendation three because that was the critical one. Trustee Livingston supported the recommendation from staff, administration on number three. Trustee Jurkowitz supported it also, as did Trustee Villegas. Trustee Croninger suggested status quo for summer and fall and come back with additional information at the next study session. President Haslund wanted to know whether the idea of making use of anticipated end balances, if those anticipated end balances could cover those costs to give them the kind of time that is required to have a more in-depth discussion and if the answer to that question is yes, it will cover it, then he was in favor of that. Trustee Blum agreed with Trustees Haslund and Croninger, but would really like to know how much classes really cost. Trustee Macker was in favor of pulling out the discrete amount and funding the summer status quo as last year and looking at the anticipated ending reserves to cover costs.

President Haslund announced that the time allowed for this meeting had come to an end.

2.2 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.

Trustee Livingston proposed that the Board evaluate the policy of Ventura Community College District that she handed out at the last Board meeting and discuss whether the Board should institute similar policy as required by accreditation at Ventura that addresses the very issue of looking at the Board as a whole rather than individual board members and what is their official relationship with college staff as individual board members vs the Board as a whole. Trustee Croninger noted that some suggestions were made before regarding looking at various policies and procedures and this could be one of the ones they look at. The Board concurred and Trustee Livingston asked that this be put on the next study session agenda.

3. ADJOURNMENT

President Haslund adjourned this meeting. The next Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held on Thursday, February 24, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. in A211. A study session of the Board of Trustees will be held on Thursday, March 10, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. in A218.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON July 14, 2011

[Signatures]
President, Board of Trustees

[Signatures]
Superintendent/President
Secretary/Clerk of the Board