MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
March 12, 2009  

SPECIAL MEETING/STUDY SESSION  
Room A-218  
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 Alexander called the meeting to order.

1.2 ROLL CALL

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

Member absent:  
Mr. Morris Jurkowitz

Others present for all or a portion of the meeting:  
Dr. Andreea M. Serban, Supt/President and Secretary Clerk to the Board of Trustees  
Alarcon, Ignacio, President Academic Senate  
Dr. Arellano, Ofelia, VP Continuing Ed  
Auchincloss, Liz, President CSEA  
Dr. Bishop, Paul, VP Information Tech  
Ehrlich, Sue, VP HR/LA  
Dr. Friedlander, Jack, Executive VP Ed Prgms  
Galvan, Joan, PIO  
Garey, Tom, Theater Arts  
Harrington, Emily, Guest  
Lindberg, Kenny, The Channels
1.3 WELCOME

President Alexander extended a cordial welcome to all.

1.4 MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 12, 2009

Upon motion by Dr. Dobbs, seconded by Ms. Livingston, the Board approved the minutes of the Special Meeting of February 12, 2009.

1.5 HEARING OF CITIZENS

No citizen expressed a wish to address the Board.

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

2. STUDY SESSION

2.1 Board Policy 2510 Participation in Local Decision Making

Superintendent/President Serban reported that this policy was discussed both with the Academic Senate and CPC, was approved by CPC and it reflects input from the various groups that it would affect. The wording for this policy was taken from the CCLC template with the addition of the eleven points under the Academic Senate heading and the added sentence that reads “In addition, the consultation will include the faculty hiring processes”. Also added was the paragraph regarding non-credit instructors, wanted to acknowledge that we have a large contingent of non-credit instructors, more so than other districts may have and wanted to mention them specifically in the policy.

Dr. Alexander asked that a change be made in the first paragraph: “that responsibility” to read “this responsibility” and directed her question about this change to Dr. Friedlander. Dr. Alexander noted that she called upon Dr. Friedlander because he is the ultimate authority on grammar, as he was educated in America. Superintendent/President Serban responded that it could be changed to say “this responsibility” and this policy was not about Educational Programs, rather it is an institution-wide policy.

Dr. Alexander noted that in executing, which ever way it will be put, either “this” or “that”, the Board is committed to its obligation to ensure that appropriate members of the District participate in developing recommended policies for the Board and the budget for Board action. Dr. Alexander stated that for clarification of the rest of these documents the word Academic Procedures be used and there are Board Governance Procedures that the Board is responsible for adopting, this is a Board governance procedure and the Board is responsible for adopting it. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that the Board will only be taking action on Board policies, per the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the accreditation standards and the Board will not approve administrative procedures. Superintendent/President Serban asked that the word “procedures” not be used when referring to a policy because “procedures” has a defined meaning by CCLC and the accreditation standards and if we start mixing policies with procedures, we will never get out of the situation we are currently in trying to move forward with this effort. CCLC is very specific about what policy means and what procedure means, so it is important to preserve these meanings in order to have clarity. The Board approves all Board policies, whether they are about their own operations or whether they are about academic programs, student services, faculty, or anything else. All policies are Board
policies, but procedures are administrative procedures, they are about what it takes from an operational level to implement the policy. Administrative procedures, if necessary or desired, can be reviewed as an information item by the Board, but they will not be approved by the Board.

Sue Ehrlich reported that Board policies dealing with instruction and student services will come to the Board for approval. One of the challenges we are facing now is that the distinction between policy and procedure has not been recognized for years in our District, they have been mixed together and we need to work on separating policies from procedures. The Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Committee (BPAP), in addition to reviewing the policy element of documents, will be going through the consultation process, to separate policies from procedures, so that policies can be brought to the Board for approval and administrative procedures would go through the consultative process and will not go to the Board for approval.

Superintendent/President Serban wanted to be sure that everyone was clear on the difference between policies and procedures. Superintendent/President Serban feels we currently only partially meet Standard IV.B.1.d because policies have not been reviewed on a regular basis and because we have combined into policies what CCLC considers policy, combined with how operationally the policy would be implemented, which CCLC considers administrative procedures. This is why the BPAP committee was established so that 1) we have a mechanism for regular review of all Board policies and administrative procedures and 2) administrative procedures can be separated from current policies. CCLC is very clear and it is imperative for the College and in order to meet the accreditation standards that we finally acknowledge the importance of separating policy from procedure and take the necessary steps to do so.

Dr. Alexander reported that given this discussion, the policy should be left as is and it can be revisited if the Board feels there is a need to.

2.2 Update on the development of the institutional self study for re-affirmation of accreditation

- Remaining timeline for completion of the self study (Attachment 2)
- Accreditation standards – summary and full text (Attachment 3)
- Draft #4 of the self study sections on Standards I through IV (Attachment 4)

Superintendent/President Serban provided an update of where the College is with the timeline and what the next steps are. Acknowledged the work of many faculty, staff, administrators and students on the self study and noted that there is still a lot of work to be done. May 14 will be the next study session where the Board will spend time reviewing the entire self study and approval of the final self study will be at the May 28 board meeting. The final proofing and production of the self study should be completed by July 15 and submitted to the Accrediting commission by July 30.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance standard is the one the Board will focus on at this meeting. Section A deals with the overall institutional governance and the governance and decision making processes and how the institution as a whole operates and demonstrates how we operate in a collegial manner. The template used for writing the self study is recommended by the Accrediting commission and provides the headings for the description, self evaluation, and planning agenda. The description is a factual statement of what is. The self evaluation is a critical analysis of the information included in the description. In the self evaluation we conclude whether we meet a particular standard, we partially meet the standard, or don’t meet the standard. The planning agenda is used only when College needs to address a problem noted in the self evaluation. Superintendent/President Serban acknowledged the Standard IV workgroup that includes Joan Livingston, Ignacio Alarcon, Liz Auchincloss, Lynne Stark, Allison Curtis, and Diane Rodriguez-Kiino. This workgroup will meet again to finalize this standard.

Superintendent/President Serban provided a broad overview of Standard IV A. The evidence
that has been gathered shows that there is a very strong structure in place at the College that has worked well over the years and we are meeting every standard in Standard IV A. Standard IV B is about the Board and the Superintendent/President and this is why Superintendent/President Serban wanted to spend time on this standard with the Board members to find out if they felt anything was missing regarding the description and self evaluation of how the Board operates, and what they have accomplished. It was also noted that any information that is enclosed in parentheses is a reference provided as evidence in support of the statements made in the self study. All references will be available online in one place to the campus constituencies and the Accreditation visiting team. Work is still taking place on gathering, indexing and organizing these documents in one online repository.

Superintendent/President Serban requested that as the Board members review the others standards and as questions or comments arise they should contact her. Superintendent/President Serban noted that the final version will be given to the Board by May 7 and the final complete draft will be reviewed in detail at the May 14 study session.

2.3 Process for requesting items to be added to agendas of Board meeting (regular meetings, special sessions, or committee meetings)

Superintendent/President Serban asked for a clarification from all Board members regarding the process for requesting that items be added to Board meeting agendas, including study sessions and committees of the Board. There has been a practice in place that has not been institutionalized in a written format. Superintendent/President Serban wants to make sure that she and all Board members understand and agree on how requests are submitted and wants to make sure that all requests are discussed with her so that she has an opportunity to understand what is being asked, provide her recommendation on whether the items are appropriate or have been already addressed, and involve appropriate staff in preparing the requested items.

Trustee Villegas noted that the way it should be done is that for Board agenda items, the Board member(s) should go to the Board President to add any items to the agenda, either for the next Board or future Board meetings and these should be discussed with the Superintendent/President at which point the decision is made whether to place the item on the Board agenda or the study session agenda. Any requests for the standard committees should be presented to the chair of the committee, who would then discuss the item with the Superintendent/President.

One suggestion was made that there could be a standing agenda item on every study session agenda to have Board discussion on proposed agenda items for either the next study session or future agendas. This will give the Superintendent/President an opportunity to hear what is being requested and required, whether the other Board members concur or need clarification on the item requested, and this will also give her an opportunity to discuss the requested item in a productive way. Trustees Livingston, Green, O'Neill and Dobbs commented in support of this suggestion and concurred that this would be a better approach given that some of the items that were included in study session agendas because they were requested by the Board President would not have been necessarily agreed upon by the rest of the Board members. One example is the repeated discussion at three different Board meetings about the recruitment for the Dean of Continuing Education. Board members concurred that there should be a standing agenda item added to every study session agenda for discussion of future study session or Board committee agenda items. This will be a practice that will be put into place starting with the April 9 study session. It could be formalized in the future if required.

2.4 Process for requesting information and reports
This item was already discussed as part of 2.3.

2.5 Status of recruitment for the Dean of Continuing Education

Superintendent/President Serban reported that this is on the agenda because Dr. Alexander asked that this item be brought back again for discussion. However, this item has been already discussed on three different occasions with the Board, including at the last study session. All aspects of this position have been discussed, such as budget, the impact, how it is helping the operation in Continuing Education. Superintendent/President Serban stated that at this point no further discussion needs to take place. Board members concurred.

Dr. Alexander questioned whether or not the hiring freeze should continue. Superintendent/President Serban noted that at the last Fiscal Committee the frozen positions were discussed and her recommendation was to proceed with filling the positions and the process has begun to fill them. The concurrence of the Fiscal Committee was to proceed with this. Trustee O’Neill noted that concurrence has been reached to hire the essential positions and that the Fiscal Committee at their last meeting had determined that the hiring process should continue. Clearly administration is entitled to make the decisions regarding staffing and it is the Board’s responsibility to approve the hires. Superintendent/President Serban reported that every position is reviewed and, as indicated in the report discussed with the Board in two prior occasions, there are clear impacts on the organization. It is the administration’s role to determine how long a position can stay frozen before it causes severe impact on students, College operations, or on other employees. Significant amount of time is spent on discussing and analyzing these positions before a decision is made to have positions filled. Superintendent/President Serban noted that given that the report on frozen positions has been discussed with the entire Board and again with the Fiscal Committee there is no reason to bring back this item for further discussion with the Board. Dr. Alexander had no argument with the fact that the Board has reviewed this enough to establish the fact that the Board is behind the hiring process. Dr. Alexander agreed that the Board has to sort out what is management and in planning for our budget; they will have to make certain decisions. However, the Board also handles the hiring freeze that will impact other facets of the budget. Vice President Sullivan noted that all frozen positions were included within the amounts that were projected for the expenditures within the 2008-09 budget. We are not exceeding any of the budget expenditures that were approved by the Board and they are all within the budget. Actually, there will be savings within the 2008-09 budget because positions stayed frozen for varying periods of time. Dr. Alexander expressed her concern not with the 2008-09 budget but with the 2009-10 budget and the decisions being made now that will impact that budget.

Trustee Livingston noted that in going back to item 2.3 regarding the approach to placing items on study session agendas, this item would be a good example of why a procedure for the placement of agenda items should be in place. This item was placed on the agenda and there was not a concurrence from the Board and it sounds like no further discussion needs to take place. Dr. Alexander stated that the question asked and perhaps it wasn’t understood was “Do we have a hiring freeze on and do we want to proceed with this process at this time?” Superintendent/President Serban stated that the point is that the hiring is currently taking place and she had specifically asked at the last study session whether the Board was in concurrence with this and the response was yes. The Fiscal Committee also concurred at their last meeting. The Continuing Education dean position was scheduled to close on January 30, 2009 and at President Alexander’s request the closing date was postponed to February 20, 2009, which was already interfering with an administrative process. The closing date was postponed so that discussion on this could take place again at the February 12 study session, as requested by President Alexander (although this item was discussed twice at the Educational Policies Board Committee meeting on October 7, 2008 and also at the Board Study Session on October 16, 2008. In both occasions, the Board concurred with the proposed structure and with recruiting for
the position). The discussion took place and six of the board members concurred that the process could proceed. Superintendent/President Serban noted that sometimes asking for an item to be placed on the agenda without the concurrence of the other Board members is not representing the whole Board; it is representing the view of only one Board member. Constantly having to change beginning and ending dates on recruiting for positions reflects poorly on the College and is also very costly. Dr. Alexander stated that these items have been included in the document she is now referring to the Fiscal Committee. Superintendent/President Serban stated that items that have already been discussed and on which concurrence has been reached by the Board will no longer be considered for discussion. The only reason to discuss an item again would be if something significant has changed and it would be her responsibility to inform the Board. At some point, discussion on the same question over and over again becomes counterproductive and interferes with the administration being able to do its job.

2.6 Board Travel

Dr. Alexander requested that this item be placed on the study session agenda. The President of the Board is responsible for overseeing Board travel. Luis Villegas did call Dr. Alexander to request permission to go to Washington and approval was given. It was requested that student representation travel expenses be billed to the Student Senate fund for reimbursement. Trustee Livingston suggested that future Board travel be limited to in-state conferences, until the fiscal situation improves. The Board discussed this and agreed that during these difficult budget times, the Board should restrain from national travel and focus on in-state travel. All travel in the future for national, out-of-state conferences should come before the Board for approval. Dr. Alexander noted that since the Board nominated Trustee Villegas for his CCLC position that the Board needed to continue to support his travel and the Board concurred.

2.7 Memorandum to the Board by Board President Alexander

Board President Alexander presented a document that she wanted to present to the fiscal committee for possible review and discussion, however, she was reminded that the document was not part of the agenda. After clarification from Dr. Alexander, it was decided that this document could be given to the Fiscal Committee for possible review and discussion. The document was given to Mr. Villegas, the Fiscal Committee chairperson, and Superintendent/President Serban who will discuss the questions and consider them for placement on the fiscal agenda.

4. ADJOURNMENT

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

The next Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held on Thursday, March 26, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. in A211. A Study Session will be held on April 9, 2009 in A218.