AGENDA ITEM BACKGROUND

TO: BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: PRESIDENT
SUBJECT: Emergency Preparedness Update

DATE
March 13, 2014
ATTACHMENT(S)
None

REASON FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION
☐ ACTION ☐ CONSENT ☐ FIRST READING
☐ SECOND READING ☒ INFORMATION
☐ REPORTS
ITEM NUMBER
1.6-a

BACKGROUND:

This presentation will provide the Board with an update on the Santa Barbara Community College District Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). As support, Business Services has completed a Red Emergency Binder of information that will include the EOP, and is provided to key college personnel electronically via Google Docs. Google Docs allows for real time updates and file accessibility on or off campus.

The district EOP is based on a realistic approach to the problems likely to be encountered on a campus during a significant incident or disaster. Since events in an emergency are not predictable, the EOP will serve as a guide and checklist. Disasters may affect widespread areas, therefore city, county and federal emergency services may be delayed or unavailable. Only the Superintendent/President or other authorized official in her absence may declare a formal campus State of Emergency when conditions warrant such a declaration. The EOP is, therefore, considered to be an extension of the State Emergency Plan and is intended to be in compliance with state and federal guidelines and policies. It addresses how the district will respond to extraordinary events, major incidents, or disasters, through response and recovery. Furthermore, the EOP describes the Incident Management Team (IMT), complete with titles, job descriptions, and duty checklists. The organization is based on the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and the Incident Command System (ICS), which provide clear lines of authority, direction, and communication during emergencies. The EOP is placed into operation whenever a natural or human-caused significant incident or disaster affects the normal or routine operations.

RECOMMENDATION:

None

Administrator Initiating Item: Joseph E. Sullivan, Vice President, Business Services
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20 pages

REASON FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION
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ITEM NUMBER
2.1

BACKGROUND:

This is the second reading of the Accreditation Task Force's March 2014 Follow-Up Report to the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). This report is required as a condition of the removal of the accreditation warning sanction. In addition to the submission of this report to the ACCJC, there will be a follow-up visit by an ACCJC Evaluation Team, in early April 2014. The first reading took place at the board meeting of February 27, 2014.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the Accreditation March 2014 Follow-Up Report.

Administrator Initiating Item: Robert Else, Sr. Director, Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning

Approved by: Lori Gaskin, President
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Report Certification Page

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
    Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Lori Gaskin, Ph.D.
      Superintendent/President, Santa Barbara City College

This report is submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in fulfillment of the requirement for a Follow-Up Report in the ACCJC notice of removal from Warning sanction issued to Santa Barbara City College in ACCJC correspondence dated July 3, 2013. We, the undersigned members of the Santa Barbara City College Accreditation Task Force, certify that the Follow-Up Report was prepared in an inclusive and broad-based manner and affirm that this document accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution.

________________________________________
Liz Auchincloss, Chair, Classified Consultation Group

________________________________________
Marty Blum, President, Board of Trustees

________________________________________
Allison Curtis, Associate Dean, Educational Programs Student Support Services

________________________________________
Robert F. Else, Sr. Director, Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning

________________________________________
Lori Gaskin, Ph.D., Superintendent/President

________________________________________
Peter Haslund, Ph.D., Former President, Board of Trustees; current Board member

________________________________________
Elie Katzenson, President, Associated Student Body

________________________________________
Kenley Neufeld, President, Academic Senate; Library Director

________________________________________
Dean Nevins, Ph.D., Interim Dean, Educational Programs
Introduction

On January 31, 2012, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) notified Santa Barbara City College that it had been placed on Warning sanction as result of its findings that during the difficult period of Board and Superintendent/President transition in 2011, the College had not met certain Accreditation Standards having to do with leadership and governance. The ACCJC action required that SBCC prepare a Special Report providing evidence that the College has corrected the violations, and evidence that the College has adequately addressed three Commission Recommendations, resolved the deficiencies, and now meets the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards. On February 25, 2013, SBCC submitted its Special Report to ACCJC. On April 30, 2013 an ACCJC Evaluation Team visited SBCC to conduct interviews and further evaluate the College in light of the Special Report.

At its meeting on June 5-7, 2013, the ACCJC reviewed the SBCC Special Report, the Evaluation Team’s Report, and the presentation by a College representative at the Commission meeting. On July 3, 2013 the ACCJC notified SBCC of its decision to remove the Warning sanction, with the requirement that SBCC submit a Follow-Up Report by March 15, 2014 providing evidence of full and sustained resolution of Commission Recommendations 1 through 3 as noted below. The Follow-Up Report will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives sometime in Spring 2014.

- **Commission Recommendation 1:** In order to meet Accreditation Standards, the Board of Trustees should receive additional and topic-specific training from “outside experts” on the appropriate roles of the Board and Superintendent/President, and the requirements of Standard IV. This training should be agendized and occur at a public meeting. The Board should further demonstrate compliance with these roles and responsibilities in its processes for Board evaluation and the Superintendent/President’s evaluation. (Standard IV.B.1.d, g and j)

- **Commission Recommendation 2:** In order to meet Accreditation Standards, the Board should revise its code of ethics policy to align With Accreditation Standards and policies (and the legal requirements of the board), identify a procedure, and the person(s) responsible for enforcement of the policy. The Board should also rectify its own behavior to comply. (Standard IV.B.1.h)

- **Commission Recommendation 3:** In order to meet Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards, the Board of Trustees should re-direct its focus to creating an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the Board should work with administrators, faculty, staff, and students for the good of the institution. The
Board should focus its Work toward ensuring that it Works in a collegial manner to support the accomplishment of the college mission and improvement of student learning programs and services. (Eligibility Requirements 3, 4, and 21; Standards IV.A.1; IV.A.2.a and b; IV.A.3; IV.A.4; IV.A.5; IV.B.1; IV.B.1.a, b, e and j; and IV.B.2.a through e)

This March 2014 Follow-Up Report provides evidence of full and sustained resolution of Commission Recommendations 1 through 3 above.
Report Preparation

This Follow-Up Report was prepared by the Accreditation Task Force (ATF), consisting of the following representatives:

- Liz Auchincloss, Chair, Classified Consultation Group
- Marty Blum, President, Board of Trustees
- Allison Curtis, Associate Dean, Educational Programs Student Support Services
- Robert F. Else, Sr. Director, Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning
- Lori Gaskin, Ph.D., Superintendent/President
- Peter Haslund, Ph.D., Former President, Board of Trustees; current Board member
- Elie Katzenson, President, Associated Student Body
- Kenley Neufeld, President, Academic Senate, Library Director
- Dean Nevins, Ph.D., Interim Dean, Educational Programs

The ATF was originally convened in mid-2012 to coordinate the College’s response to the ACCJC warning sanction issued in January 2012. When the College was removed from warning in July 2013, the ATF continued its work on the required Follow-Up report. The ATF met bi-weekly to research, communicate with other constituent groups across campus, and prepare the Follow-Up report. The basic timeline is shown below:

- July 3, 2013: Letter from ACCJC removing the College from warning and requiring a Follow-Up report and subsequent follow-up visit.
- July through early December 2013: Research, prepare and review drafts of the Follow-Up Report
- December 10, 2013: First Reading of the Follow-Up Report by the College Planning Council
- Late December 2013 - January 2014: Semester Break
- February 4, 2014: Second Reading of the Follow-Up Report by the College Planning Council
- February 27, 2014: First Reading of the Follow-Up Report by the Board of Trustees
- March 13, 2014: Second Reading of the Follow-Up Report by the Board of Trustees
- March 14, 2014: Report mailed to ACCJC
Commission Recommendation 1

In order to meet Accreditation Standards, the Board of Trustees should receive additional and topic-specific training from “outside experts” on the appropriate roles of the Board and Superintendent/President, and the requirements of Standard IV. This training should be agendized and occur at a public meeting. The Board should further demonstrate compliance with these roles and responsibilities in its processes for Board evaluation and the Superintendent/President’s evaluation.

This recommendation has two parts that are addressed separately below.

(1) The Board should receive training from “outside experts” during public meetings on the appropriate roles of the Board and Superintendent/President and the requirements of Standard IV.

The Board of Trustees has demonstrated its commitment to ongoing training relevant to the above recommendation, as evidenced by the following events. All Board members took part in each event, except where noted:

Academic Year 2011-12

- **January 21, 2012: Board Retreat**, facilitated by George Haynes, PhD., Organizational & Communications Consultant. Topics included, but were not limited to:
  - Review of Board Self-Evaluation and Recommendations For Enhancing Board Effectiveness
  - Disagreements, Conflicts, Tensions
  - Role of the Board
  - A Shared Vision for SBCC
- January 2012: Effective Trustee Workshop, Community College League of California, Sacramento, CA
- May 4-6, 2012: Annual Conference, Community College League of California, San Diego. (Trustees Blum, Haslund, and Villegas)

Academic Year 2012-13

- November 2012: Annual Conference, Community College League of California, Los Angeles, CA
• January 25-28, 2013: Effective Trustee Workshop and Legislative Conference, Community College League of California, Sacramento, CA (Trustees Haslund, Nielsen, Kugler, Blum, Macker, Gallardo)
• January 31, 2013: Board Training on roles of the Board and Superintendent/President, and requirements of Accreditation Standard IV, conducted by Dr. Ben Duran, retired Superintendent/President of Merced College.
• May 3-5, 2013: Trustee Conference Lake Tahoe (Trustees Kugler, Gallardo, Haslund)

Academic Year 2013-14

• August 7, 2013 Board Retreat
  ○ Using BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities as a framework, Superintendent/President Gaskin led the Board through a series of scenarios which were reviewed and discussed as a group within the context of the role and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and the Superintendent/President.
• November 2013: Annual Conference, Community College League of California, San Francisco, CA
• December 5, 2013: Brown Act and California Public Records Act Training facilitated by Craig Price, Partner, Griffith & Thornburgh, LLP
• January 24-26, 2014: Effective Trusteeship Workshop, Community College League of California, Sacramento, CA (includes a special workshop on Ethics Training) (Trustee Blum and 2013-14 Board President Macker)
• Excellence in Trusteeship Program - Community College League of California (Trustee Blum, 2013-2014)

Note that the Brown Act and California Public Records Act trainings listed above in December 2012 and December 2013 are especially significant as they are directly relevant to Finding #6 as described in the ACCJC January 31, 2012 warning sanction letter to SBCC: “Board violation of the Brown Act, public disclosure, and employee contracts and agreements.”

The Board’s 2012-13 Annual Goals include a goal relevant to Commission Recommendation 1:
• Board Relationships: Cultivate and maintain constructive working relationships among Board members and between the Board and the CEO.

In the Board’s 2013-14 Annual Goals, four of the seven goals deal with topics directly related to Commission Recommendation 1:
• Accreditation: Provide leadership in ensuring:
  ○ (a) The college meets the standards of accreditation as set forth by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).
  ○ (b) The Board’s governance practices align with the standards of accreditation.
(c) The structure and processes are in place to undertake the institutional self-evaluation study in preparation for ACCJC's comprehensive site visit in Fall 2015.

- Board Relationships: Foster constructive working relationships among Board members and between the Board and the Superintendent/President.
- Creation of a Board Development Program which includes regular and ongoing education and training. As stated in the minutes of the August 7, 2013 Special Meeting, “In December the Board will review the Board Policy on ethics. Every year a presentation on the Brown Act will be provided, and on election years, an orientation for prospective board members. Study Sessions will be noted as part of this plan.”

(2) The Board should further demonstrate compliance with these roles and responsibilities in its processes for Board evaluation and the Superintendent/President evaluation.

Board Self-Evaluation

The processes for Board evaluation is defined in Board Policy 2745: Board Self-Evaluation. The Policy references the appropriate section of Accreditation Standard IV.

The Board of Trustees has demonstrated its compliance with the roles and responsibilities regarding Board Self-Evaluation, through an institutionalized process of regularly-scheduled steps, as evidenced by the following agendized events:

Academic Year 2012-2013:

- August 9, 2013 Board meeting: Continued discussion of Board self-evaluation instrument and 2012-13 Board Goals.
- August 23, 2013 Board meeting: Approval of 2012-13 Board Goals
- January 24, 2014 Board meeting: Mid-year check-in, review, and discussion of 2012-13 Board Goals
- April 25, 2013 Board meeting: Establishment of Board working group to finalize the Board self-evaluation instrument.
- May 23, 2013 Board meeting: Explanation of finalized Board self-evaluation instrument. The self-evaluation will be conducted, and the responses will be collected and collated.
- June 27, 2013 Board meeting: Results of Board self-evaluation presented and discussed. This information will be used at the Board retreat in August 2013 to develop 2013-14 Board Goals.

Academic Year 2013-2014:

- August 22, 2013 Board Meeting: Approval of 2013-14 Board Goals
- January 9, 2014 Board meeting: Mid-year check-in, review, and discussion of 2013-14 Board Goals
- Upcoming meetings to be conducted, following the previous year’s pattern:
o April 2014: Establishment of Board working group to finalize the Board self-evaluation instrument
o May 2014 Explanation of finalized Board self-evaluation instrument. The self-evaluation will be conducted, and the responses will be collected and collated.
o June 2014 Results of Board self-evaluation presented and discussed. This information will be used at the Board retreat in August 2013 to develop 2013-14 Board Goals.

The roles and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees are also discussed in response to Recommendation #3.

Superintendent/President Evaluation

The process for Superintendent/President evaluation is defined in [Board Policy 2435: Evaluation of Superintendent/President](#) and [Administrative Procedure 2435: Evaluation of Superintendent/President](#). Both the BP and the AP include appropriate references to Accreditation Standard IV. Compliance with the roles and responsibilities with regard to evaluation of the Superintendent/President is evidenced by the following agendized events:

Academic Year 2012-13 Superintendent/President Evaluation
- July 27, 2012 Board Retreat
- September 27, 2012 Board Meeting
- January 10, 2013 Board Meeting
- May 9, 2013 Board Meeting
- June 6, 2013 Board Meeting
- June 27, 2013 Board Meeting
- July 25, 2013 Board Meeting

Academic Year 2013-14 Superintendent/President Evaluation
- September 12, 2013 Board Meeting
- January 9, 2014 Board Meeting
- Upcoming meetings to be conducted, following the previous year’s pattern

Summary
In summary, the Board has amply demonstrated compliance with [Commission Recommendation 1](#) through recurring topic-specific public agendized trainings on appropriate roles and the related accreditation standards. The Board demonstrates plans to continue relevant training. The Board has also demonstrated compliance with these roles and responsibilities for Board evaluation and Superintendent/President’s evaluation through well-established, institutionalized processes.
Commission Recommendation 2

In order to meet Accreditation Standards, the Board should revise its code of ethics policy to align with Accreditation Standards and policies (and the legal requirements of the board), identify a procedure, and the person(s) responsible for the enforcement of the policy. The Board should also rectify its own behavior to comply. (Standard IV.B.I.h)

The Board continues to demonstrate its commitment to reviewing and revising Board Policy 2715: Code of Ethics as evidenced by the most recent policy revision dated July 25, 2013. The Board began its review of the policy at the January 10, 2013 Board Study Session. The revision clarified and strengthened the policy by adding the following headers which grouped the code of ethical behavior thematically:

- Act in a manner that reflects the values of the institution
- Demonstrate effective leadership
- Promote and maintain good relations with other Board members
- Promote a healthy professional relationship with the Superintendent/President, faculty and staff

BP 2715: Code of Ethics was previously revised in March 2012. The evidence supports the dynamic nature of how the Board regularly reviews and updates BP 2715 Code of Ethics.

BP 2715: Code of Ethics is compliant with Accreditation Standards and state and federal legal requirements. The policy delineates the process to be followed to address violations by any member(s) of the Board. It designates the Board President as the person responsible for the enforcement of the policy. If it is alleged that the Board President has violated the policy, the responsibility is delegated to the Vice President of the Board.

The Board further demonstrates its commitment to BP 2715 by scheduling ethics training at regular Board meetings. This is evidenced by the minutes of the December 13, 2012 meeting reflecting that the Board President distributed and stressed the importance of BP 2715 with the newly elected and incumbent Board members. Ethics training was also conducted at the regular Board meeting on December 5, 2013.

The Board has also implemented orientation training for new members.

The Board acts with civility and is attentive to ethical conduct. As evidenced by the videos of its meetings, the Board is no longer a contentious assembly of decision makers. Honest disagreements are heard, trustees listen to each other with respect, and policy decisions are
made. The Board continues to modify and update its policies, approve recommendations designed to ensure student success, develop evaluation procedures for itself and the Superintendent/President and engage in training programs (both new member orientation and ongoing board development) consistent with ACCJC standards and recommendations.

The Board’s behavior demonstrates compliance with BP 2715: Code of Ethics. A review of minutes of meetings of the Academic Senate, College Planning Council, Student Senate, Curriculum Advisory Committee, and Board of Trustees since the ACCJC Warning sanction in March 2012 reflects that there is no evidence that the Board has engaged in intrusive behavior into College matters, including College governance committees and processes, curriculum processes and college operations, or other actions as described in the ACCJC January 2012 findings. The Board has adhered to Board policies and administrative procedures as evidenced by its conduct during its meetings, its official Board actions, and the work carried out in its active subcommittees.

Further, as a direct example of the Board understanding its role and that of the Superintendent/President, the Board reviewed Board Policy 2410: Board Policy and Administrative Procedure on July 27, 2013. The revised policy appropriately delegates the responsibility for administrative procedures to the Superintendent/President:

“Administrative procedures are statements of specific methods to be used in implementing Board policies. Administrative procedures are issued and revised by the Superintendent/President, in consultation with the appropriate participatory governance groups as stipulated in Board Policy 2510 titled Participation in Local Decision Making. Such administrative procedures shall be consistent with the intent of Board Policy.

The Board recognizes the role of the Superintendent/President in operationalizing Board policy through administrative procedure. As part of the Board’s oversight function, the Board will hold the Superintendent/President accountable for ensuring that administrative procedures are consistent with Board policies.”

Summary
In summary, the Board has amply demonstrated compliance with Commission Recommendation 2 by revising its code of ethics policy to align with Accreditation Standards and policies and the legal requirements of the board, and has identified the procedure and persons responsible for the enforcement of the policy. The Board acts with civility and is attentive to ethical conduct.
Commission Recommendation 3

In order to meet Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards, the Board of Trustees should re-direct its focus to creating an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the Board should work with administrators, faculty, staff, and students for the good of the institution. The Board should focus its work toward ensuring that it works in a collegial manner to support the accomplishments of the college mission and improvement of student learning programs and services.

As detailed in the March 2013 Special Report, the Board addressed this recommendation and continues to focus its attention on these fundamental aspects of governance. This March 2014 Special Report provides an update of the Board’s efforts in this regard by examining the three parts of Commission Recommendation 3:

1. Board re-direction of its focus;
2. Board should work with the College for the good of the institution;
3. Board should work in a collegial manner.

(1) Board Role and Responsibilities
Evidence of the Board re-directing its focus, working with the College for the good of the institution, and working in a collegial manner can be measured by its actions. The Board has accomplished this by further stepping back from a more involved role in operational aspects of the college and assuming an appropriate place within the governance structure of the institution more congruent with the policy-level responsibilities of a board of trustees. The Superintendent/President assisted (and continues to assist) the Board in this effort by ensuring that the Board has a perspective of its role as the governing body of a community college district.

The Board has also taken steps to insure the broad dissemination and timely discussion of Board subcommittee outcomes and recommendations by adding a separate line item to the agenda of regular Board meetings requiring the standing committee chairs to report about these activities (see the December 6, 2012 Board minutes).

In addition, the Superintendent/President, in conjunction with the Board president, is deliberate and purposeful regarding the nature and scope of items which are presented to the Board for consideration and action. Such careful consideration ensures that Board discussion and action are focused on issues that are aligned with the roles and responsibilities of a governing board. Examples include the following agendized discussion items on the Board agenda over the past year. These topics document the policy-level nature of Board dialog, interaction, and engagement:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy-Level Topic</th>
<th>Date Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities planning/needs</td>
<td>Board Study Session August 7, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future bond consideration</td>
<td>February 21, 2013 Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 14, 2013 Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 8, 2013 Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Master Plan</td>
<td>March 14, 2013 Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 12, 2013 Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 9, 2014 Regular Meeting (First Reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 23, 2014 (Final Reading and approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board policy revision and update initiative</td>
<td>June 27, 2013 and prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 25, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 11, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Subcommittee (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>April 25, 2013 Regular Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 23, 2013 Regular Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement redefinition</td>
<td>January 10, 2013 Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 28, 2013 (First Reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 25, 2013 (Second Reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint meeting with the two local K-12 school districts</td>
<td>April 16, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining budget reserves</td>
<td>August 26, 2013 Fiscal Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 7, 2013 Fiscal Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Status</td>
<td>July 25, 2013 (and other dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Organization and Structure</td>
<td>December 6, 2013 Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 Board Goals Mid-Year Review</td>
<td>January 9, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Bond Programs: Proposed Projects</td>
<td>January 23, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Scorecard Review</td>
<td>May 23, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 27, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure V (Bond) Annual Report</td>
<td>February 27, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the 2013-2014 Board Goals provide insight into the Board’s focus and direction. These goals are suitable for a governing body of a community college district and emphasize the appropriate role and responsibilities of such boards.

(2) Board Education and Development
The Board’s commitment to ongoing education and professional development has helped the trustees clarify and affirm their role and responsibilities vis-à-vis that of the Superintendent/President and that of college employees. This has shaped and directed their
focus and efforts. Of primary importance in this regard is the focus of presentations and discussions placed on the Board agendas at monthly study sessions and regular meetings. Presentation and discussion topics are of an educational, fiduciary, strategic planning, and institutional policy nature. Examples include the following which have engaged the Board in matters aligned with its role and responsibilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Education and Development Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Needs and Future Bond Program</td>
<td>March 14, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Assembly Bill 955</td>
<td>March 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>April 11, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Board meeting with Santa Barbara Unified School District and Carpinteria Unified School District</td>
<td>April 16, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX</td>
<td>May 9, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Student Success Scorecard</td>
<td>May 23, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 27, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCC's One College Initiative</td>
<td>June 27, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of Accreditation</td>
<td>July 25, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the Board of Trustees: Scenarios Our Capacity as an Institution</td>
<td>August 7, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility needs and future bond program</td>
<td>August 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility needs and future bond program New Educational Program Initiatives</td>
<td>October 10, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simms/Mann Early Childhood Development Think Tank and Fellowship Program</td>
<td>October 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of SBCC Programs in Support of Underserved Populations</td>
<td>November 7, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Education and Development Topic</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Act Workshop/Ethics Training</td>
<td>December 5, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities improvement projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year review of Board Goals</td>
<td>January 9, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Academic Programs</td>
<td>February 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Update: A Review of Campus IT Initiatives</td>
<td>March 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board’s commitment to ongoing education and professional development is further demonstrated by the development of a schedule of study session topics for 2013-14, discussed at the September 12, 2013 Board meeting, that is aligned with the roles and responsibilities of governing boards.

In addition, the Board’s commitment to education and professional development is demonstrated by the trustees’ attendance at conferences and workshops including ongoing participation at the Community College League of California’s annual Effective Trusteeship Workshop each January, the annual Trustees Conference each May, and the annual League Convention each November. Specific conferences and workshops, with dates of attendance, are listed under the response to Recommendation #1.

(3) Board Actions
Evidence of the Board re-directing its focus, working with the college for the good of the institution, and working in a collegial manner can be found by an examination of its actions - specifically the absence of behaviors incongruent with the roles and responsibilities of trustees. The Board has consistently demonstrated an absence of involvement in day-to-day operations of the college. In the period of more than 2 years following the events cited in the January 31, 2012 ACCJC findings, Board members have not attended college governance meetings unless invited. Minutes from January 2012 onward of the College Planning Council, Academic Senate, and Curriculum Advisory Committee meetings attest to the absence of Board member influence into the nature and content of the college-level governance meetings. The Board has engaged in appropriate discussion, commentary, and inquiry during Board meetings and study sessions. Minutes and recordings of Board meetings and study sessions provide evidence as to the absence of comments, directives, and questions by the Board that stray into operational details and administrative responsibilities.

That is, it is the absence of actions and behaviors cited in the January 31 2012 ACCJC findings that attest to the Board’s redirection of its focus, its efforts to work for the good of the college,
and its commitment to work in a collegial manner.

(4) Empowerment, Innovation, and Institutional Excellence

In March 2013, the Aspen Institute announced that SBCC was awarded the Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence. This award was given on the basis of the following (as excerpted from the Aspen Institute website):

"... in recognition of the education and workforce imperatives facing our country, the Aspen Institute, the Joyce, Lumina and W.K. Kellogg Foundations, and the Bank of America Charitable Foundation have partnered to launch the $1 million Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence.

The purpose of the Aspen Prize is to recognize community colleges with outstanding academic and workforce outcomes in both absolute performance and improvement over time. By focusing on student success and lifting up models that work, the Aspen Prize will honor excellence, stimulate innovation, and create benchmarks for measuring progress."

Such an honor could not be achieved absent a board committed to empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence.

Further evidence of the Board’s commitment to empowerment, innovation, and excellence are two prominent awards recently garnered by SBCC employees. In May 2013, an SBCC classified staff member was honored as Classified Employee of the Year by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. And in November 2013, an SBCC faculty member was honored as U.S Professor of the Year for California by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

(5) College-Level Governance

Empowerment is fueled by genuine engagement in decision-making and participatory governance. The Board and Superintendent/President are aligned in their commitment to empowerment of the College principally through engagement of College Planning Council (the primary constituent-based participatory governance body of the College) on decision-making matters of import. This has been borne out by the following examples of initiatives launched over the past year through College Planning Council’s oversight:

- Zero-based budgeting to build the 2013-14 budget
- Classified staffing prioritization needs
- Educational master planning process
- Integrated planning process
• Budget reserve principles
• Adding a second summer session
• Facility prioritization

As further evidence, beginning in 2012-13 the Board embarked upon an extensive review and update of its policies and administrative procedures. It was recommended through the College's governance process that the Board focus its review solely on Board policies and delegate oversight of the review and updating of the administrative procedures to the President. The Board acknowledged the appropriateness of this recommendation and codified this practice in BP2410: Board Policy and Administrative Procedure.

(6) Collegiality
The Board engages as a governing body and as individual trustees in an effective, ethical, and professional manner. They treat each other and all who come before them with respect. This is evidenced by Board dialog, interchange, and commentary of the Board’s meetings (see recordings of meetings). Further, the professional conduct of the Board is supported by examining the comments and outcomes of its 2013 Board self-evaluation, as discussed at the June 27, 2013 Board meeting. Of particular note, 100% of the Board ranked the statement “once the Board makes a decision, it acts as a whole” with marks of outstanding and/or excels on its June 2013 Board self-evaluation. An additional marker is the ratings for the following Board self-evaluation question: cultivates and maintains constructive working relationships among Board members and between the Board and Superintendent/President. One hundred percent of the Board ranked this statement with marks of outstanding, excels, and/or good on its June 2013 Board self-evaluation.

Summary
In summary, the Board has amply demonstrated compliance with Commission Recommendation 3 through its deliberate focus on creating an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. The Board has worked through established governance structures, processes, and practices in a collegial manner to support the college mission and the improvement of student learning programs and services.
Appendix: Listing of Evidence

Collection of minutes and other evidence is in progress, and this list will be provided in final printed version.
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TO:  BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM:  PRESIDENT
SUBJECT:  2014 California Community Colleges Classified Employee of the Year Nominee

DATE
March 13, 2014
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REASON FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION
☒ ACTION  ☐ CONSENT  ☐ FIRST READING  ☐ INFORMATION  ☐ REPORTS

ITEM NUMBER
2.2

BACKGROUND:

Each year, districts are invited by the Chancellor's Office to submit nominations for the California Community Colleges Classified Employees of the Year award. The award honors classified employees who demonstrate the highest level of commitment to professionalism and community colleges. Districts may nominate one staff member who must be endorsed by the local Board of Trustees. Once this endorsement is official, the college will submit the nomination packet to the Chancellor's Office. State award winners are selected by representatives of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors, Chancellor's Office, and the Foundation for California Community Colleges. Nominees are evaluated on their commitment to the mission of community colleges, professional ethics and standards, and service to the institution and community. Recipients will be announced and honored at the May Board of Governors meeting. A $500 cash award and plaque are presented to each honoree.

The college's nominee for the 2014 Classified Employee of the Year Award is Nancy Tolivar, Network Specialist III. Nancy has worked for the college since 1995. Nancy’s can-do attitude, her contributions to campus-wide IT projects that impact us all, her dedication to supporting teaching and learning as the foundation at the college, and her keen ability to train, teach, and connect with non-technical employees are all qualities that are valued, appreciated, and recognized. She exemplifies the attributes that our system seeks to recognize.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended the Board of Trustees endorse the nomination of Nancy Tolivar as Santa Barbara City College's nominee for the 2014 California Community College Classified Employee of the Year Award.

Administrator Initiating Item:  Lori Gaskin, President
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TO: BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: PRESIDENT
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DATE
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2 pages

REASON FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION
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BACKGROUND:

As part of the preparation of our 2015 Accreditation Self-Evaluation report, the Board is asked to provide its comments in response to questions taken from Accreditation Standard IV: Leadership and Governance. Board responses to these questions will provide material that will be used in the preparation of this section of the Self-Evaluation report. It will be especially helpful if, in their responses, Board members can reference specific processes, structures, or instances relevant to each question, in order to provide the supportive evidence that is required in the Self-Evaluation report.

RECOMMENDATION:

None

Administrator Initiating Item: Robert Else, Sr. Director, Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning

Approved by: Lori Gaskin, President
Please provide your thoughts on the following numbered items following each of the selected Accreditation Standards:

**Standard IV.A.1:** Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

1. SBCC leaders and the Board create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence.

2. Participative processes are used when considering ideas for significant institution-wide or policy improvement.

**Standard IV.A.3:** Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

1. Through our governance structures, processes, and practices, the board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of SBCC.

**Standard IV.B.1.a:** The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

1. How do you act as whole once you’ve reached a decision on a topic?

2. What steps do you take to ensure your decisions are reflective of the entire board?

3. In relation to policy making, how do you balance public input and external influence and ensure protecting the mission of the college?
**Standard IV.B.1.b:** The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

1. What steps have you taken to ensure the college policies are consistent with the mission and up-to-date?

**Standard IV.B.1.e:** The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

1. Can you provide examples where the board has acted in a manner consistent with your policies and bylaws?

**Standard IV.B.1.f:** The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

1. Did you have an orientation as a board member and do you feel it was sufficient to perform your duties?

**Standard IV.B.1.h:** The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

1. What is the purpose of the Board's Code of Ethics and provide examples of how is it applied?

**Standard IV.B.1.j:** The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the college chief administrator (most often known as the president). The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds her accountable for the operation of the college.

1. What criteria do you use to decide whether to delegate to the president or consider as a board?
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DATE March 13, 2014
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BACKGROUND:

Each year the Information Technology Department presents an update to the Board of Trustees on IT projects and goals for the current year and beyond. Each of the three IT areas, User Services, Infrastructure and Administrative Systems, and Instructional Support, will present key activities in their areas. The presentation will consist of a set of slides in Google Docs that will be shared with the Board members. The respective IT Director will present each area summary. The IT Vice-President will present an overview of changes that have impacted the organization as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION:

None

Administrator Initiating Item: Paul Bishop, Vice President Information Technology
Technology Update 2014

Presented By: Paul Bishop, Dan Watkins, Jim Clark, & Jason Walker
Administrative Systems

- Mobile Apps
  - Online Schedule Optimization
  - Grades/Schedules/Registration Date/Holds
  - Rosters/Add authorization
- Positive Attendance
- U.Direct
- Duplicate ID Resolution
- Perceptive Document Management

Network Services

- Virtual Desktop Implementation (VDI)
- Wireless
  - Expansion
  - Refresh
- Virtualization Expansion
  - 175 servers on 15 hosts
- Electronic Door Access
  - ID Re-card Project
  - Door Access Plan Training
  - Door Installation and Issue Resolution
- Backup to Disk - 3 hour vs 3 days
User Services

• Classroom Technology Upgrades
  o Modernized 12 classrooms and 5 conference rooms
  o Humanities remodel - Multimedia upgrade 22 rooms
  o Created on-demand computer labs in IDC 110 & 114 classrooms and STEM lab using thin clients

• ECC modular building removal
  o Relocated networking infrastructure
  o Repurposed multimedia equipment

• Provided laptops to County Jail for GED testing
• Replaced 182 computers in refresh cycle

Academic Technology Support

• Department Reorganization
  o Expanded Support to Wake and Schott
  o Implemented newly created job descriptions
  o ATS now a department of Information Technology

• Distance Education
  o Moodle LMS Upgrade Project
  o Transitioning from Remote-learner to Moodlerooms

• Humanities and IDC Building Remodels
• Wake GED Testing Center Implementation
• System Center Implementation Pilot
• GoPrint Upgrade and Online Printing Pilot
Future Projects

- 3 Banner Project
  - Non-Credit into Banner/Two Summer Terms/Learning Community Expansion
- Fiscal Independence
- Portal Upgrade
- System Center
- Apple Infrastructure
- Thin client / VDI expansion
- Multimedia technology upgrades
  - 22 more classrooms at main campus, 14 at CE
  - 5 more conference rooms