

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
LONG BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

**Minutes of Special Meeting of
November 3, 2001
(Study Session)**

A special meeting (Study Session) of the Board of Trustees of the Long Beach Community College District, County of Los Angeles, California, was held at the Economic Development Office, Wing Office Park, 3950 Paramount Boulevard, Suite 110, Lakewood, CA, on Saturday, November 3, 2001.

CALL TO ORDER

President Clark called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Clark led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present: President Clark, Vice President Uranga,
Member McNinch, Member Thorpe, Member Uranga
(Student Trustee Torres joined the meeting at 11 a.m.)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

President Clark: Opportunity will be given to citizens to address the Board of Trustees on matters of general District business. This is the time for members of the public to speak and be heard and share their comments with the Board and for the Board to listen. Therefore, the public should not expect the Board to comment or respond to public comments. A particular position should not be inferred if there are no Board member comments during this time.

The time limits are five minutes for items appearing on the agenda and three minutes for items not appearing on the agenda. The time limits may be extended with approval of the Board. Action may not be taken on items not appearing on the agenda. After receiving testimony, the Board may recommend placing such item(s) on the agenda of a future meeting or referring the items to staff for a report. (There were no comments)

How Advisory Committees are Used

Mary Callahan and Felton Williams, Facilitators

Mary Callahan and Felton Williams presented the following report on How Advisory Committees are Used and how they would tie into the bond issue:

President Clark: I think that we have to look at how we can access these groups and do it off the campus, because once we get into the bond campaign, we would be prohibited to use resources of the college; so we have all of these organizations, but have you given any thought on how you access those away from the college.

Felton Williams: We talked a bit at the last meeting that Bill Flory is co-chairing. We talked about some of the things that would need to be done to contact the different constituency groups that are out there, and so we are working on that, Tom.

Lou Anne Bynum: I just wanted to let the Board members know that we've actually put together a list also and we just got the current updated list from the city of public organizations, neighborhood associations and that's very, very extensive as well; and the idea is to combine that with the list that is being created through the different schools and then be strategic with that and pare it down into a list that will work for the course you want to take.

President Clark: We have an enormous amount of opportunities. It's just a matter of how we access those without getting into the problem of using public funds to do that.

Member Uranga: And alumni -- I don't see anything here in terms of student-related participation and how we can approach the various service groups.

Lou Anne Bynum: The committee that we've got going right now has membership from student services and the Alumni Association and ASB, so we're looking at how to strategically work with it and get students involved.

Felton Williams: Roberto, Ginny Baxter is also on that committee and she has got a good handle on the alumni portion.

Superintendent-President Kehoe: We've also asked Mike Magsaysay, our past Student Trustee, if he would come back, since he's a recent graduate, and work with the current clubs and organizations, because he still knows so many of the students. He said he'd be glad to do that. So, at the point at which we need him, he is no longer, of course, with the institution, so he could very well work as an outsider with the students.

Member McNinch: This is just a comment. I think the student participation is very important. We've got students who are registered voters and who do live in the district, more than we have faculty and they are a very important component to making this work. And the faculty and administrative outreach is also very important.

President Clark: We'll do a voter registration on campus which we can do which is separate from the bond campaign.

Review of Board Goals 2000-2001

Examples of Work Done in Support of Board Goals - 2000-2001

Linda Umbdenstock, Facilitator

Linda Umbdenstock: You have a packet in your folders containing the Board goals for the preceding year, 2000-2001, and as we did last year, Joan and I went through the previous Board minutes and so forth to get some little prompts about things that have been done in terms of those Board goals by the Board and so it's time to probably go one by one and to see if there is any discussion on any of this or if there are items you want to add that we have forgotten about and to see what you want to do next with it.

1. Continue to implement and enhance a mentoring program that had been begun several years ago and the items that we used on that are: student success, workforce development, development of learning outcomes, on-going district-wide community appraisal program for use in program planning, the fiscal activities of the college and the fiscal activities of the Board.

In relationship to that is the annual institutional effectiveness monitoring which covers the first three. In addition, this last time, you will recall, Steve Wallech presented where we were on learning outcomes which continues.

We had a major opinion survey of Long Beach residents which was presented a little over a year ago.

President Clark: Is that this survey here in relation to the bond issue?

Linda Umbdenstock: No, but, in fact when you say that, the bond campaign survey is something that relates here as well that should be added.

But this one was basically an acknowledgement that they knew who we were, they preferred us amongst our competition. We asked them some things about scheduling and so forth.

You've heard recently the report on student surveys; today the use of advisory committees shows our relationship to our community. You will hear, when it is finished, about the Noel Levitz survey which is now being analyzed and fiscally, every quarter you receive a report as well as the Board review of the budget as a study session, usually early summer before your approval in September.

Member Thorpe: I was going to ask when do we do the new Board goals?

Assistant Secretary Bradshaw: If you approve these today then they can go on the November or December agenda.

Member Thorpe: I didn't think we were going to vote on these today; you said "if we approve..."

Assistant Secretary Bradshaw: I'm sorry, "approve" is the wrong word. If you decide on a format and changes today, they can go on either the November or December agenda.

President Clark: Do we have surveys that we do each year or periodically?

Linda Umbdenstock: We have many surveys and Fred talked to you about that. They are done within the context of program reviews; there are many departments who are surveying students about different issues, and so forth; and the Noel Levitz is a very major college-wide survey which, I'm forgetting the numbers, but I think it might be 1,000 students, but if he said 10%, it might be closer to 3,000 students, who were surveyed, as well as staff.

President Clark: Now the surveys that we do, are these shared with the Board? Do they come automatically to the Board or do we have to ask for those surveys to come to us?

Linda Umbdenstock: No, not every one. Basically they're used operationally. Something like the Noel Levitz survey, and the one that we did called "The Pulse of Long Beach," that we participated in, those we would bring to the Board, because they are a large scope of influence at a very high level.

Superintendent-President Kehoe: And they would come automatically.

President Clark: So any, you would say, significant surveys would come to the Board without having to ask for it.

Linda Umbdenstock: Yes. Any more comments on item one?

Member Thorpe: I would like to pass out my comments just to save time. We only have about an hour for this. I think that, in order to pass bonds and so forth, that we need to also maybe, and this is just my suggestion of course, do a couple of things maybe a little differently. I got enough of these for the Board and Dr. Kehoe today; but, anyway, let me circulate them in that order -- and one for Dr. Kehoe.

President Clark: Darwin, these are related to....

Member Thorpe: Only No. 1. I spent a lot of time trying to organize these. We discussed this particular sheet in the Budget Advisory Committee yesterday and pertinent to your question about whether we receive information. I think I could get the vote on the whole Budget Advisory Committee on this; we need to look at putting information on the back of the telephone directory cover as a way to disseminate our facts and so forth. I think they also need to come to the Board on a more continual basis -- we used to get those, and a number of other updates related to student success, workforce development and so forth. And I think if we don't receive these, the perception in the community may be that if we put out wrong information innocently, and as was pointed out yesterday by one of the members of the Budget Advisory Committee, those budget figures down there are perfectly correct. They just don't mean anything. One of them is \$400,000 off, when you look at the Adopted Budget. And I think we just simply need to,

when we're going for a bond, level with the community in every way we can, and try to even assume even the unintentional perception it might create that we're not right up there in the tower. That's what needs reform. For instance, and you've heard me say this before the Board, I think we need to hear from the faculty a lot more about equipment and so forth, and success and what they're doing. We just had a theft of equipment out of the D Building, which is crucial to the maintenance of the programs, and the faculty that I know will probably not miss a step teaching those students. But the real question is why shouldn't we report these right straight out. Why should we have to wake up and see it in the newspaper as we did for that theft, as I did.

Member Polsky: I didn't see it.

Member Thorpe: You have to take the *Press-Telegram*. But, at any rate, I think the Board needs more information on a regular basis on this. It's out there. And I know that, Chairman Clark, you did ask for significant information. I think the Board needs more information. I think the Board is charged with determining what is significant information. I think if we decide that no information is significant, then we should decide that. And if we decide A and B and H and Z are insignificant, and I'm proposing that these are what I think is significant, and of course I may be dead wrong on that.

As one of my jobs in measuring the fiscal activities of the college and the fiscal activities of the Board, which you have charged me with, I updated the operational plan. As you know, we had the discussion, and we have been using this particular plan. I redid it. It's Plan, View and Review. I think the Board is out of the review cycle completely. But I'm just simply saying that, and there it is and all the things that I've just said previous to this help the Board become part of the review cycle or better able to decide what is significant in reviewing the cycle. There are numerous publications, and you have one of them, that say the Board has a stake in the operations of the district at our level - not day by day. Dr. Kehoe has her hands full with all of that.

And, lastly, pursuant to the money angle here, this was also in the *Press-Telegram* twice. And forgive me for passing out articles from the *Press-Telegram*, but it's our only big dinosaur community newspaper, and I have a lot of things to say about them. But, again, I want to hear at the table and apparently the Grand Jury at Sierra College said that it's illegal not to hear when there are settlements made and the Board doesn't know about them until we wake up. And we got the message on this two days later, and we wake up and see that there's a settlement made in our name by the insurance company. That's the same thing that occurred at Sierra College. The Grand Jury went in there and really clobbered the Board of Trustees. It's on the Internet if you'd like to see it and after the meeting I'd be glad to give you the website. I just want to keep us out of trouble. We're not in trouble yet, but I don't want to get in trouble. I think the bond needs to be passed, whatever the number is, and I pass these out in good faith to try to say that I think these are problems.

President Clark: OK. Anyone else have any comments?

Member McNinch: I'd just like to make a comment that I still feel that the Board's position is to implement policy and we're running a real danger of micro-management by having Dr. Kehoe have to dispense to us each day all of her decisions and I'll just be quiet with that.

Linda Umbdenstock: If I could just comment in terms of the history of this item as we've worked with it over a couple of years - Item one - is that, after a series of presentations and discussions in retreats, if you will recall, particularly the institutional effectiveness monitoring framework that the group agreed to, was its way of reviewing where the institution was in terms of the results of its plans as relates to mission, and that framework is what's presented annually in approximately February. That, along with the fiscal reviews, is the framework that you are basically addressing here, unless you want to change it.

President Clark: Well, I think that obviously if you're going to make good decisions you have to have the information to do it with. I think that's a concern that we all have, is that we get adequate information to make proper decisions. I think we're, at least as far as I'm concerned, we're certainly getting good information and I think generally in a timely manner. There may be exceptions as there are in any organization, but I think, by and large, we do get information. But, you know, we're continually looking to see what we can do to enhance our ability to make those good decisions. OK, anything else?

Member Thorpe: Member Clark, let me just reply to those two comments. First of all, I would never leave the impression that I want all of Dr. Kehoe's decisions every day. Horrors. And I don't think there was any implication of that in my presentation. Secondly, we are having great difficulty with information. For instance, I have specifically requested for pieces of information as far back as October 15, which I do not have the answers to, and I understand that there are a lot of problems associated with getting information.

President Clark: It takes time.

Member Thorpe: Absolutely. It depends on what you're asking for, and so forth. But, if you go on the website, there is a summary of statewide data of some of the material which this district reports on the Partnership for Excellence. It's in color, but my computer can't copy the two sheets, and it says that our college reported data on Partnership for Excellence in certain areas and I asked about one of them and I figured that would be forthcoming since they already reported it and probably could copy the report and say, "Here, Member Thorpe, I think this is the answer to your question." And then last week -- even our trustee organizations -- we come back from trustee meetings and I'm guilty of this - I will give that report on November 13 - I went to the Los Angeles County School Trustees Association meeting to hear the former Superintendent of Schools in San Diego tell us what a good Board is, and I was going to leave the meeting, because I flunked. But in our latest quarterly ACCT Board proposals, in terms of measuring student successes, and I would hate to think that my surgeon was given a satisfactory survey and now he becomes my surgeon. I don't think we're doing as much as we could there. And our own national organization put this out as the guide, and

we're supposed to come and tell you folks, based on this, if you agree with it, how to measure student success. It says here that the lowest priority is grading systems and yet, when you look on that sheet I passed out to you, we gave 41% As and Bs last year, which is remarkable when you consider the environment in which we work. The year previously, we gave 38% As and Bs. That's an improvement. We should be writing to the *Chronicle* and everyone else and have people come here to study how we do this. If we're proud of this, in order to pass bonds, we should be telling the community this. It says here that grading systems are a low priority. Grading is subjective and less informative than measuring student satisfaction. I had to go home and take some medicine after this.

President Clark: Oh, can we get back to...

Member Thorpe: I am right on point.

President Clark: I'm not saying you're not right, but I

Member Thorpe: I know you don't want to hear this, Member Clark. I'd like to pass this to Dr. Kehoe -- I only have this one copy, because those people don't see our trustee journals and I think they should have access to them somehow.

Linda Umbdenstock: I think you will find, again, when we do the annual report in February, that the item of student learning outcomes will be on it again, because faculty have been working on that, exactly the way you described and did their entire flex day with it this past September.

President Clark: When do we get the Noel Levitz report?

Linda Umbdenstock: December, probably.

Member Polsky: Tom, I just want to make a comment about these reports that Member Thorpe is talking about. We have a Board policy that this Board has passed a couple of times, that, when a single Board member wants a report, it puts a tremendous burden on our administration, and that is to come before the Board and the Board is to vote on it, whether or not we want our administration to spend several hundred hours on that report. And I don't see that process being followed. I would never dream of coming to Dr. Kehoe or any other administrator and asking for some kind of a report that would take many of their hours. They already are overburdened. And I'm wondering why Member Thorpe's requests for reports aren't coming before the Board so we can all have a chance to vote on it?

Member Thorpe: Can I reply to Member Polsky?

President Clark: Very quickly.

Member Thorpe: First of all, I think Member Polsky is very forgetful of what the policy says. Nobody's violating that policy, let alone this speaker. The Grand Jury, in fact, at

Sierra College found that trustees who took the position of Member Polsky were out of line in violating Public Records Act for information. The information that I asked for could be retrieved, if it was done and sent to the state, in 24 hours or less. One of the pieces of information I asked for would have been answered by the previous Vice President of Business and ours left, of course in September, in 24 hours. I understand that policy. We also have before the Board, Dr. Kehoe saying she would never deny a trustee information requested, unless it were, in fact, a real problem for the staff and then I would have heard about that instantaneously, which I did not. But, I appreciate your observation.

President Clark: Well there is a differentiation between asking for simple information and asking for a report that's extensive.

Member Thorpe: And I asked for simple information.

Member McNinch: I think that's subjective.

Member Thorpe: I know you don't want to hear the truth, but that's my job as a trustee.

President Clark: Let's proceed with ...

Linda Umbdenstock: The second item is to continue Board commitment to interest-based negotiations, and, by authorizing the chief negotiator of the District to engage all of the employee organizations in discussions about that, is the way that you've indicated your commitment to date.

Member McNinch: Absolutely.

Member Polsky: Good.

Linda Umbdenstock: Third one - to encourage more staff development activities through the college's professional development program for faculty, orientation of new faculty, and staff development for staff. Some of the ways that you've done that is by approving additional expenditures to support faculty conference attendance, which was one of the priorities in last year's budget; the enhancement of the new faculty orientation program, which is very intensive here; offered management team department heads leadership training workshops. We're involved in a consortium of those on our campus here. Are there any others that you would like to add?

President Clark: I think it's important particularly to work with new faculty and assist them so that they do develop, because I think it does take a while.

Linda Umbdenstock: It does. We have, before the Fall starts, several days of programs and then an ongoing mentoring program throughout the first year.

President Clark: How does the faculty feel generally about our educational opportunities there?

Steve Wallech: As far as faculty development for conferences, we're pleased as punch. As far as the orientation is concerned, they find it outstanding, from the orientation. I'm really pleased.

President Clark: I asked the right question.

Member Polsky: We're doing something right. Does that mean we're doing something right? Thank you. That's so nice to know.

President Clark: OK, let's move on quickly.

Linda Umbdenstock: Number four, "Continue Board study sessions and monitoring of the Board of Trustees' policies and administrative regulations." And you have here the dates on which, indeed, you have developed your goals, done your institutional effectiveness monitoring in a formal manner, your Board self-evaluation, the update on economic development and on distance ed, the policy changes that you adopted earlier this year in terms of Board of Trustees-related policies and admin. regs. Anything else?

Member Thorpe: I'd like to pass out two things on number four. Again, I have to bring up the *Press-Telegram*, my favorite newspaper, a little bit. I think if we're going to monitor the college's efforts, that, again, we need to monitor what comes to us from the college, and not what comes to the college by way of newspapers, and let me say, these are the cases in point. This is the example of the theft of equipment and I will write a letter congratulating the *Viking* for bringing that up. And then, I'd like to give this one copy to Member Clark in the last two *Vikings*.

Member McNinch: Now we know what you're doing in your retirement, Darwin.

Member Thorpe: Oh, my God, yes. I get a chance to read the *Viking*.

Member Polsky: You're wasting so much paper - this is a tree you've wasted.

Member Thorpe: This is a lot of trees, I guess. You'll have to tell the environmentalists on me. But, at any rate, the last two issues brought up the student body problem, which was discussed, and I brought up yesterday at the Budget Advisory Committee. We can borrow money from the student body. As you know, the Legislative Analyst's Office was accusing us of hoarding money and, Member Clark, I'll give you this copy. It will save you going through these.

President Clark: Well, I look at the *Viking*. I don't need copies of it.

Member Thorpe: I know we all have these. But those came from the *Viking* on the issue. Let me just show you this. I think we should meet with the editorial board of the *Press-Telegram*. I know people say don't fight with the people that have the 900-pound gorilla, or the ink, but I'm really tired of the *Press-Telegram* insulting this college and placing the good things next to ads and I'm not a prude passing these out - placing these ads next

to the sports section, next to the most formidable publicity - pornographic publicity - that the *Press-Telegram* has offered. I don't know why they put that on the sport page - oh, I'm sorry. You're probably wondering about what I gave you, I'm sorry.

Member Polsky: Is it the Fantasy Ranch you're talking about.

Member Thorpe: Isn't that disgusting?

Member Polsky: What's that got to do with us?

Member Thorpe: I passed out the wrong one.

Member Polsky: I didn't even see that when I read the article.

Member Polsky: Darwin, you read these ads?

Member Thorpe: I'm sorry. I passed out the wrong one? I'm sorry. I passed out the wrong one.

Member Polsky: You read Fantasy Ranch?

Member Thorpe: As a male, I read that in 30 seconds.

Member McNinch: I'll bet you've developed a great talent for that.

Member Thorpe: We had a sports team in volleyball and I've got the right one now. "Long Beach City College Players Decide Future." I'm tired of the *Press-Telegram* doing this.

President Clark: What has this got to do with study sessions?

Member Thorpe: What does this have to do with our communication and monitoring our policies? This is both success and monitoring. These students, half of them got scholarships to four-year colleges and this is what the *Press-Telegram* did with it. I think we should all look at this as disgustedly as I am sure the women coaches did. I just simply think we need to sit down and talk with him and say, "Ian Lamont..." Is the point made?

President Clark: The point's made, yes. OK, number five.

Linda Umbdenstock: Number five, if you recall last time that we combined a number of things that we wanted to continue to be able to say that we are in support of. One is the Superintendent-President's goals. The other is the efforts of staff and administration to increase the competitiveness of the college by creating greater flexibility of class scheduling; to continue to support recruitment of new students, especially through the college's high school and early outreach programs; and to continue to support diversity in all areas of college life. Some of the things that we have found on that is that you made

the Superintendent-President's goals public. You also received the attached accomplishments from her, in which they outline the college goals and the annual priorities that they relate to. To support efforts to increase flexibility of classes, you received a number of updates and reports about how that was done. You asked for them. You received them, on economic development, distance ed. You supported the new alternative scheduling of the Ace program. For recruitment of new students, you supported the new middle college at PCC. You supported the grant-funded Upward Bound program. You heard a School-to-Career grant report. You also, and it's not here, supported one of the annual priorities regarding outreach, which is, this year, supporting additional outreach to our high school students, was one of the priorities that was funded in the last budget. In terms of diversity, you heard an update on the major Title V grant, which talks about our development of programs to assist students in their success, especially the new Latino program with this wonderful learning communities and so forth there. Are there any others that you wish to add here?

Vice President Uranga: I think I asked last week for a report on Women in the Trades.

Assistant Secretary Bradshaw: That's coming up on November 13. It's on the agenda for November 13.

Linda Umbdenstock: That would go on next year's reports.

Vice President Uranga: I'd like an update on the HIS, as well. Title V, and to continue that on a yearly basis.

Linda Umbdenstock: Now, think about that when we talk about goals, if you'd like that on an annual basis. You might state it in that way.

Vice President Uranga: Is that a VICA grant?

Linda Umbdenstock: Yes.

Vice President Uranga: That's why I would like to see that.

Linda Umbdenstock: It's very major.

President Clark: Anything else?

Linda Umbdenstock: Number 6. "Continue support, communication and alliance with the Long Beach City College Foundation." This year you worked together on the potential bond, you attended their quarterly meetings, and continued the Board liaison with the Foundation Executive Committee. Anything else?

President Clark: We are very fortunate to have the Foundation and Ginny Baxter.

Member Polsky: That's for sure.

President Clark: Excellent support group for us.

Member Thorpe: The Foundation, Member Clark, is, I think, one of the secret weapons of Long Beach City College. It's been said in different ways, but it's one of the finest foundations in America. I hope it stays capitalized so it can continue to serve us as well as it has in the past.

Linda Umbdenstock: Number Seven. "Strengthen support of the communication with the community." One of the main ways in which you do this is by your visibility at many, many community functions. Is there anything else?

Member Thorpe: I'd like to bring up one thing on that number seven.... I passed out earlier the budget cuts perspective and Member Clark, of course, authored a letter to the *Press-Telegram* on this, which the *Press-Telegram* then followed up with "Skimping on Community Colleges," and then "City College Negotiations." Someone on campus communicated to the *Press-Telegram* some very sensitive information on negotiations.

Lastly, this thing. We go to meetings; I go to meetings; and we all talk to politicians; and we're somewhat of a politician. But I was embarrassed to go to one meeting and find out that this college took a position against Assembly Bill 649 on the option to provide part-time retirements benefits for retired teachers. I don't recall the Board ever discussing that item, that bill, or any other bill and I think we're remiss as a Board if we don't try to decide, and I don't want to micromanage, and this is very important, but we should decide who the public information officer or officer(s) is/are. I want to go through channels, because I can bite you through channels just as I can any other way. But I think to go to a meeting and find out that the college has taken a position against its own unions without discussion. I don't mind doing that. I think the unions are wrong, sometimes, as I think any agency, myself, are wrong...

President Clark: I don't think the college has taken a position unless the Board has taken a position.

Member Thorpe: I agree, but the college did, Member Clark....

President Clark: Well, I don't know who the college was that did that.

Member Thorpe: The name on the sheet was Dr. Kehoe. Now, maybe some committee took a position and gave it to Dr. Kehoe, but there it is, it's on the internet and they asked me, "Why are you guys against this?" I said, "I don't know. I've never heard of this."

Member McNinch: Who asked you?

Member Thorpe: I don't think that's any of your business with all due respect.

President Clark: Wait a minute, now; let's be civil.

Member Thorpe: Yes. Well, why don't you look to this member and say the same thing.

Linda Umbdenstock: I think the item here is about the Board's communication with the community.

Member Thorpe: And the community extends where?

Linda Umbdenstock: What I'm saying is that the point of this one is what the Board does.

Member Thorpe: That's right, but how can the Board communicate with the community, Ms. Umbdenstock, and it's not your fault, if we're being spoken for in our name. To me that's embarrassing. I just want to be able to discuss it. We used to do that. We used to have a committee and we discussed all kinds of things, and we'd take a position, we were proud of it and we'd take it to Sacramento.

President Clark: OK, how about number eight?

Linda Umbdenstock: Number eight is study the feasibility of two issues - one, the bond election to improve our college facilities. The second is a two-college district. With respect to the bond election, we have heard an update of a possible general obligation bond approximately a year ago and you have scheduled a workshop and decision for today. Regarding the two-college district, you requested that a study be initiated. You heard a report on that at the September meeting and you requested that the task force bring back some recommendations regarding options for proceeding at today's meeting.

President Clark: Let me just say, on the workshop on the bond issue, we will not make a decision today. It'll just be a workshop. We have to do that at a Board meeting.

Linda Umbdenstock: Schedule the workshop, OK.

President Clark: Any questions about those? Any questions of Linda about anything else?

Linda Umbdenstock: I think in answer to the question Trudy raised earlier, "So what's next? This is last year's. This is a review of last year. Roberto suggested that one change would be to request, on a routine basis, under item five, an annual report on Title V. So, it would be maybe comma, "including an annual report on Title V."

Review of Board Self-Evaluation Instrument

Linda Umbdenstock, Facilitator

Linda Umbdenstock: This is another packet in your folders.

President Clark: There have been some suggested modifications to this and these are all italicized. It's for the Board to review this, if you want to make those changes. These are just suggested changes and we'll see if there are any other possible changes or thoughts that you have in regard to our self-evaluation form. Linda.

Linda Umbdenstock: Let me give you a little bit of orientation for the visitors.

Linda Umbdenstock: Where did this come from? After your meeting in which you last time asked if there was a different way of looking at the response sets which have basically been "strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree" and so forth. But there was some feeling of discomfort with that and so forth. Again, with Joan's help, we went scurrying through the Board of Trustees organizations or their recommendations and so forth. Many, many options, many alternatives in terms of the kinds of statements in response patterns and so forth. Using what you already had as a basis, I divided each section into two parts. One which is a time-related response; in other words we do this from rarely to all the time, instead of agree/disagree. But some things don't lend themselves - you either do them or you don't, so I put those under a category called "Board basics," "yes/no." They are like the fundamentals - we do this, we're there, we just routinely review or check on them and say that. Also, based on some of those things, I made some suggested word changes, which, as we go part by part, I will comment as to why I am making those suggestions. It's up to you whatever you think about them. But that's where they came from. I take responsibility for that.

If you look at the sections, they are still the same. We have not changed those basic headings that you've used in the past. The very last page, I'm going to make a suggestion for a slightly different approach there in terms of the open-endedness.

Ready for Part 1A?

This is about Institutional Mission and Educational Policy. It previously said, "The Board as a whole understands the mission of the college" and this says in order to answer that you understand or you don't, you agree or you disagree, but if you say you "manifest" an understanding of the mission of the college by your goal setting and decision making -- you're making decisions every single meeting, all the time - then you can get a scaled kind of response to it.

Steve Wallech: Linda, would "demonstrates" be better? The Board "demonstrates" an understanding?

Linda Umbdenstock: That's a possibility as well.

(There was a general consensus for "demonstrates")

Linda Umbdenstock: OK. And exactly how. It's not some abstract way. It's in the goals that you set and the decisions you make.

2. The Board avails itself of information that is collected as a result of, simply say from the district's ongoing community assessment process which we have discussed has many, many layers of degrees and complexity and so on, in its policy directions and decision making. So, you use information for, again, the role of the Board in setting policy direction/decision making.

3. The Board weighs each decision - all decisions, you do or you don't - but each decision, is all the time or rarely.

The reason I crossed out "The Board prioritizes its goals," was because in the past we have not made these into a sequenced order of priorities. We said we want to do all of these. We're committed to doing all of them. I crossed it out. That's why I did that.

Member Thorpe: One thing we have to stay away from is priorities. I want to tell you what the Budget Advisory Committee thought of that yesterday. They were speaking just the opposite. Every meeting I go to, you've got to get your priorities. I wish we would do that sometime. I fought for those for years and lost, but you're right. That doesn't belong here because we don't have any.

Linda Umbdenstock: The college absolutely has priorities. Every single year the planning process has a list that eventually gets to you in the form of the budget. The assumptions page references the prioritization process that the entire planning committee has done.

Member Thorpe: Oh, then we should leave this in here. I don't understand what you're saying.

Linda Umbdenstock: We're saying that happens at the operational level. The Board blesses it in terms of its decisions regarding its budget authority.

Member Thorpe: We're not supposed to have anything to do with the development of priorities. Is that true?

Linda Umbdenstock: You have your own Board goals.

Member Thorpe: I'm simply saying that the Board doesn't have any priorities.

Linda Umbdenstock: The Board has its goals that it says all of these will be done.

Member Thorpe: But they're not in priority or sequential form, as you've said. I just want to be clear on this because we keep dodging this issue...

Member Polsky: Wait a minute. We've got a lot of priorities and we're working on a lot of them at the same time.

Member Thorpe: Everything's priority one. OK. I just want to know. Just asking.

Member Polsky: If you're working on number one, does that mean you're not working on two, three, I mean, we're doing a lot of things at the same time, so... I think the rest of the Board understands what we're doing.

Member Thorpe: A kind of a secret understanding of the priorities.

Vice President Uranga: I think that the bottom line is if we start going into a discussion of priorities, then we're getting into an area that we really don't belong in and I think that Member McNinch said earlier, we don't want to be micromanaging. And it's not our goal and it's not our purpose. We are policy makers here and for us to set priorities for staff or for ourselves would be contrary to why we're here in the first place. So let's get away from this discussion and let's move on.

Member Thorpe: Member Uranga, I'd like to say that I agree with you 100%, but our job is to macro manage and when you macro manage in any trustees' jargon in this country, you look at district priorities. I told the Budget Advisory Committee yesterday that it is not the job of the Board to set priorities. Member Uranga, I agree with you 100%, but it's the job of someone to set priorities, based on the mission. I'm simply sorry that they're not here.

Member McNinch: Can we go on to Board Basics?

Linda Umbdenstock: Which says, exactly, number 5, "the Board understands how college policy is recommended and established," - yes or no.

Under Section B, Institutional Strategic Planning, Financing and Assessment, the Board added, "by its official actions and support roles, works to help achieve the mission and goals of the institution."

Two is simply adding the different scaling on it.

Number 3, "The Board appropriately evaluates and approves needed policies which govern the program of the institution." That was picked off of some other example that was recommended.

Here again, "The Board reviews the college budget." Because the budget is what caps what the priorities are that have been submitted. It doesn't review the priorities and discuss them independently. It approves the budget for the work that the college has submitted.

Number 5, "The Board members participate actively in community affairs," and so forth that's unchanged, except for the scaling.

Under "Board Basics," it "ensures that short- and long-range educational planning is occurring." It does that through its monitoring program. We get the annual report in February each year of that.

Number 7, "The Board ensures that provisions for long-range planning for acquisition of sites, facilities and maintenance are made." Again, through the budget process for those kinds of items is how that is done.

Page 3, on Board Operations. "The Board operates ethically," is the same, except for the scaling.

Board meetings comply with state laws, the same.

Number 3, "The Board, in its dealings with the community, works to enhance the public image." That was the phrasing recommended by one of those things that we looked at. I was looking for things that didn't change intent, but might help clarify it a little bit.

Four, five, and six are the same, with the exception of the scaling, as to what you have had there.

President Clark: OK, any more?

Linda Umbdenstock: This was a long section. Now we get to a few yes and nos, under Board Basics - it annually assesses its own performance and uses that information; is involved in and understands the budget process, and approves the budget; understands the collective bargaining process and its role in it; understands and implements its legal responsibilities; the Board and Superintendent-President provide an orientation program for new Board members; and ensures that the physical plant is adequately maintained - basics.

Member Thorpe: Let me ask about that No. 12: The Board ensures. Are we not micro-managing with that word?

Linda Umbdenstock: We could say "oversees"?

In order to make the sentence correct, it was agreed to change to "oversees the adequate maintenance of the physical plant."

Linda Umbdenstock: Under D. Board/Superintendent-President Relationships. Some things have been repeated several times in different items, so I separated them. So, the first one stays the same: "The Board appropriately supports the Superintendent-President." The reason I crossed out "defines its expectations" and the second one is because it's down in No. 5 - it's already there. So, this one has to do with "delegates" and you define once, but you delegate in some ongoing manner, and that's why it's up here with the scaling of time. No. 3 - "The Board and Superintendent-President work cooperatively to maintain a total District perspective." I picked this one up from I think it was the national ACCT one, that really emphasizes that perspective role on it. The reason I crossed out "members" in No. 4 is because all of this is about the Board as a whole, so it is "the Board works with..." And then No. 5 is where you have a clear statement of expectations against which is periodically measured, by the contract. No. 6 is "evaluates in accordance with the contract."

Member Thorpe: I'd like to propose, and you probably won't care, I've been doing it for a couple of years ... I think an addition needs to be there and that the Board oversees the maintenance of a positive employee/employer relationship on the campus.

Linda Umbdenstock: That's not under Superintendent-President. That would be under staff.

Member Thorpe: Yes. It probably is better in staff.

Linda Umbdenstock: Wait until we get there, please. E. Staff Relations. The first one remains the same. "The Board directs fair and responsible negotiations and meetings. " No. 2 - In order to get a scaling, it's "by its actions, the Board assures that all employees are treated in a professional manner and are evaluated..."

Linda Umbdenstock: So, are we OK with Section E?

Member Thorpe: I'd like to, again, just simply say, I already said it, I think that should be added under E. "The Board oversees the maintenance of a positive employee/employer environment, relationships," however you want to word that.

Linda Umbdenstock: How is that different from No. 2?

President Clark: No. 2, I think...

Member Polsky: "a professional manner"

Member Thorpe: I think it's different. Those are two different things.

Linda Umbdenstock: In what way?

Member Thorpe: Professional manner would be one where you'd say a civil manner. We could treat all of the staff with civility, but there could be a very bad environment on campus because of a perception of a great number of people on campus that they're not being treated professionally, and we could come back, as we always do and say we've treated you with the utmost professionalism, and I agree with that. But, if there's a perception that we have some real problems in the environment on the employer/employee relationships...

Member McNinch: That's subjective.

Member Polsky: We can't guarantee perceptions. That's all subjective.

Member Thorpe: And, by the way, there's nothing in this that we can guarantee, Member Polsky, if you read this, but, when we advertised for a Superintendent, that statement was right in the advertisement, that we wanted someone to come here and do this. We've long since forgotten this. But it was right in there.

Member McNinch: Do what?

Member Thorpe: The statement I just made was put out throughout the United States.

Member Polsky: What was that statement?

Vice President Uranga: But a Board goal and a Board.....

Linda Umbdenstock: Self-Evaluation. This is the Board's Self-Evaluation.

Vice President Uranga: What you're talking about is...

Member Polsky: You're talking about perceptions.

Member Thorpe: That's all right. I quite expected those replies.

Vice President Uranga: I just don't see where it fits on a Board goal...

Member Thorpe: That's like campus maintenance, Member Uranga. We don't sweep the floors, but we're going to oversee it.

Vice President Uranga: We don't oversee it....

Member Thorpe: We just said we did.

Member McNinch: Can we go on to page 7?

President Clark: OK. Let's go on.... one more page here ...

Linda Umbdenstock: On Part II is where we have some open-ended responses. The shift here is from things we like and don't like, to what do we consider our accomplishments as a Board, and the areas that we would like to improve in, as a Board. This is a Board self-evaluation, and, "As a trustee, I would like to see the following changes in how the Board operates." So, it's up for your discussion.

President Clark: I think it's as it should be.... We're doing our own Board evaluation. I think it's much better.

Member Polsky: Sounds good to me.

Member Clark: Then we can express things, I think, in regard to the Board not in regards to the college.

Member Thorpe: Member Clark. Let me ask you something about the statements you just made. If we're discussing that one item on maintenance? How do you discuss that?

President Clark: What are we discussing now?

Member Thorpe: No. 12.

Linda Umbdenstock: 12 on page 4.

Member Thorpe: C. How do we discuss that? Maybe that should be stricken.

President Clark: Yes. I don't know that... it sort of sticks out as being somewhat different. We ensure a lot of things I guess as far as the overall - whether we pick out one particular act. I'm not wedded to this.

Member Thorpe: The point is, we're charged in law for a number of things and I think it's appropriate for this Board when it evaluates itself to discuss any member's discussion with regard to those things.

President Clark: What are we talking about right now?

Member Thorpe: How do we discuss this as a Board? I seem to hear that we can't do that because.....

Member Polsky: Discuss what?

President Clark: What are you asking? You want to delete this? How do you want to change this?

Member Thorpe: Not really. I think it should stay in there, but you said it stuck out.

President Clark: It stuck out because you raised the issue...

Member Thorpe: It's interesting, huh?

Linda Umbdenstock: One of the ways that you do this is...

Member Thorpe: That's all right, Member Clark. I've made the point I wanted to make.

Linda Umbdenstock: But the point is on how it's different has exactly to do with your goals and your goal, and when you're considering a bond election is a huge kind of direct vote that you have taken for a major project.

Member Thorpe: What has that got to do with C 12? That we were just discussing?

Linda Umbdenstock: That's ensuring the adequacy of the physical plant.

Member Thorpe: Yeah, what does this have to do with the bond issue, per se?

Linda Umbdenstock: You asked for an idea of how it relates to your responsibilities.

Member Thorpe: We're just talking about ten years down the line, the building burns down, are we responsible? It's very interesting.

President Clark: Why don't we take a break and get back about ten because we're ahead of schedule.

(BREAK at 9:40 a.m.)

(The Board reconvened at 10:10 a.m.)

Follow-Up on Two-College District Committee Report

Member Uranga: I think I'm going to go ahead and pass this out. Dr. Merry has done an excellent job on this. It's the follow-up on the Board meeting that we had back in October following up on the study. I just want to emphasize again that this is a study. It's not anything that is going to be voted on any time soon. We're looking at it. We're trying to determine as to whether it's feasible and I think that the study itself will determine what direction we will take on this. We have to keep an open mind about it. I think that there are some issues that would definitely need to be clarified, discussed and evaluated before we do anything. When I brought it up a year ago, almost exactly a year ago, it was to do that. To see where we're at, what it looks like. We're in the process of celebrating 75 years at the college, as a district, and it's the time to look at ourselves, to see where we're at, where we stand, and maybe grow. We are looking at growth. Every year we're growing. We're finding that City College is the No. 1 choice for a lot of students and that's why we're growing and we need to look at our campus situation to be able to handle that. With that, I'll pass it on to Dr. Merry.

Dr. Merry: I want to know if the Board members have any questions about any of the materials that Dr. Wallech and I distributed to you in September? I was particularly interested in whether you had any questions about this form.

President Clark: Pauline, let me ask you. The understanding I have is that you brought this as a preliminary report and you were asking us whether we wanted you to continue. Is that accurate?

Dr. Merry: That's correct.

Dr. Wallech: If you look at this chart, item No. 2, which is the Mission Statement, when we did the eligibility study we had to make an assumption and the assumption was that the Mission Statement we currently have would apply to both campuses which would have an impact on the Academic Senate, as well as the Curriculum Committee. Now, it's possible for you to change the Mission Statement. You could have two Mission Statements -- two different Mission Statements for two colleges, and if you did that, it would throw the entire chart off. So this chart reflects one window of looking at this issue. So if you wanted to proceed, one of the problems that you have to ask yourself is, "How many windows do you want to open up?" Every time you ask that question and answer it, it has a ripple effect down the entire structure of the inquiry.

President Clark: Looking at this, my analysis of setting up the committee to review this or study this, was that at some point, they would come back with some type of recommendation. In this preliminary report, obviously there's no recommendation.

Dr. Merry: That's correct. It's just Step 1.

President Clark: If we were to ask you to study this further, then the end result of that would be a recommendation.

Dr. Merry: That's correct.

Dr. Wallech: What do you mean by recommendation, Tom?

President Clark: The feasibility.

Dr. Wallech: The feasibility. Actually, the way the report is structured we have an eligibility statement, a feasibility statement and a desirability statement. In each of those things, what we're trying to do is present objective information which neither cuts one way or the other, and then turn the decision over to you as the acting Board. What we're trying to do would be to mobilize the best information, because it would be inappropriate for us to recommend what should be done. After all, you're the empowered body to make that decision. We could probably present you with a number of options.

Member Uranga: I would prefer that, because that way at least it gives us some guidance and some direction as to where we can go and what the options are as opposed to drawing them ourselves.

Dr. Wallech: That's why we divided it into those three things. Eligibility has to do with the way we would fit within the WASC accrediting body and feasibility has to do with the impact it would have on the actual physical separation of the two colleges and desirability would have to consider the quality of issues.

Member Uranga: Just for clarification, I'm finding some difficulty with the term "separate"; it's more like "establish a campus," because it's a two-campus district and what we're doing is establishing a campus not separating a campus.

Dr. Wallech: You're establishing a college. A campus already exists. I'm looking at it as giving birth -- very positive.

Member Uranga: As opposed to "separate."

Dr. Wallech: Keep in mind though, when you give birth, you go through a process known as labor pains. (laughter)

Dr. Merry: What I have distributed now is for the benefit of your decisions today about whether to go ahead and there are several steps, choices that you have here, recommendations, that you might choose.

Dr. Pauline Merry, Co-chair of the Feasibility Task Force Committee distributed the following possible sequence of steps in the study that the Board of Trustees might consider as goals for the year are formulated:

1. Proceed to Step 2 with a report to the Board at its May 2002 meeting.

(Step 2

Conduct a cost/benefit analysis of implementing a District/College structure in various forms

- Identify alternatives
- Assess costs and benefits of each (hard dollars and non-quantifiable) including impacts on budget, space inventory, program offerings, student outcomes, District/college image, diversity, etc.
- Fiscally feasible?)

2. After completing Step 2, proceed and complete Step 3 with a report to the Board at its January 2003 meeting.

(Step 3

- Assess other conditions of becoming a college
- Board of Governor's acceptance
- Letters of support from surrounding colleges)

3. Proceed to Step 4, with a final report by June 2003.

(Step 4

- Decide whether it is desirable to proceed. If so
- Identify a geopolitical basis for and physical boundaries of the two colleges
- Establish distinctions in District/college functions
- Identify programs and staff for the District and each college
- Apply for WASC eligibility and BOG standing as two colleges)

4. Begin Step 2 **after** the Accreditation visit in Fall 2002 and proceed with all haste with a targeted completion date of June 2003 or shortly thereafter.

Items 2, 3 and 4 presume that the Board wishes to continue the exploration of a two-college district. Item 5 is of course another option.

5. Do no further study.

Dr. Merry: We've got lots of work to do and a lot of the people who are serving on this study committee are the same people who staff and work on the accreditation committee so you may want to say, "Put this on hold," maybe not in that language, and after the accreditation visit in the fall, continue with the study.

Member Uranga: I'd like to take that even a step further. I think we should probably put it on hold because we have other important pressing issues to deal with, as well, with a decision as to whether we're going to go with a bond. I perfectly agree with that in terms of maybe putting the timelines on these back maybe six months or so and just not overburden our staff with too many committees and reports. This is more of a long-term thing and we have more immediate issues to deal with.

Superintendent-President Kehoe: Member Uranga. I would just like to support what you said. We have an interim person who is very capable of working with us in fiscal things, but there is a burden on our fiscal offices for this next step and given that a lot of what we are going to do has to do with fiscal, including the bond, as well as accreditation and self-study and those kinds of things, this second step I see is pressure on the people who are already pretty burdened in the next few months. So if the timeline could be adjusted, I could support that.

Member Uranga: Let's say after the accreditation -- we'll put it off for a year.

Superintendent-President Kehoe: The accreditation comes in October.

Dr. Wallech: Could I ask another question then? As I said, when we put this chart together we made an assumption and that assumption was that the Mission Statement applies to both colleges the same way. We in our committee discussed that issue and that might not be the best way to go as far as resolving the question of eligibility in the first place. So, I don't know if we really answered the question of eligibility. So, as far as moving to the fiscal issue which is a feasibility question, what would be your direction in that regard? There are a number of options. There's a way in which you could make PCC into a second college faster or you could make it into a second college slower. It depends on what you want it to look like when you're finished with the process of giving birth to this new college.

Dr. Merry: Well, I think that, with all due respect, what the Board might do right now is simply say that we will put the study off until after the visit and then go into those details that Steven has mentioned at that time.

Member Uranga: I support that.

President Clark: Also, in regards to this procedure, or whatever procedure you have, there is after Step 1, before you go to Step 2, the Board would have to decide to go on to Step 2, which is not automatic.

Dr. Merry: Well, actually, you could say, go on to Step 2 while we continue to complete the issues that have been raised by Step 1. It doesn't need to stop and then start the next step. That can be your direction to us to complete Step 1 as we go on to completing Step 2.

President Clark: In other words, if we go ahead, then that's a go ahead to through Step what?

Dr. Merry: To Step.... Was that a question?

President Clark: Well, you're going to complete Step 1, but how far are you going to go before the Board makes a decision?

Dr. Merry: All the way through Step 4. Eventually, we will get to Step 4 and then we will present several recommendations or options that you can select: To establish a college; don't establish a college.

President Clark: So this is all the way through Step 4.

Dr. Merry: Right. At the end of.

Dr. Wallech: All the way to Step 4. I haven't had a chance to see these steps and my recommendation...

Dr. Merry: You have too, Steve. These are the same steps that we outlined.

Dr. Wallech: My understanding was that when we finished a step we would report to the Board what we were doing and then receive indication as to whether to proceed at that point or not.

President Clark: Well that's a pretty critical decision. Whether we're doing this Step 4 automatically or whether we're looking at it as we receive it.

Member Thorpe: I tend to support kind of putting it on hold because I know the President's goal is that this thing would proceed based on what happens to the bond. If you have the money, it's a whole different, I think, different direction to the task force than if you don't. I was just wondering. Is there a short preamble and I probably saw it and didn't realize it, as to kind of the history. A little short page that you have that you could provide the Board with.

Linda Umdenstock: It was a Board goal.

Member Thorpe: I know that. Is there a piece of paper that says we'd like to study this because...

President Clark: No.

Dr. Wallech: But you chose to do it under the WASC criteria which threw it into eligibility. It's a little different than feasibility. That's why we set it up the way we did: Eligibility, feasibility. So we have to close the question of eligibility first and we have to follow that tree kind of structure and I think that requires a report to you so that you can figure out which option you want to choose and that would throw us into feasibility.

Member Uranga: I remember that discussion.

Dr. Wallech: And then you get into the fiscal questions and the fiscal questions would then tie into the issue of the bond. So I think that it really is kind of a gatekeeper decision you have to make when you move from eligibility to feasibility, after you've seen all the options.

Member Thorpe: I mean fiscally feasible. I don't know how you could work on that until after the bond.

Member Uranga: I don't want to tie this to the bond. It has nothing to do with the bond. This is totally separate and apart from it. The bond has nothing to do with the eligibility or the feasibility.

Dr. Wallech: One of the ways of looking at this and Linda tells us this all the time when we are setting our priority projects: Imagine you have a limitless amount of money. Set your priorities and then look at what you've got in your pocket and see whether or not you can buy it.

President Clark: In that you're not going to be doing anything on this for a period of time, are there still some issues that the committee has to resolve before you come back to us again?

Dr. Wallech: I think we just need to get started again and restructure and try to get some of the talent we have spread out on campus focused on this discussion again, because right now they're dispersed.

Linda Umbdenstock: After.

Dr. Merry: After the accreditation.

Dr. Wallech: After the accreditation. After the accreditation. That's what I meant.

President Clark: O.K. You'll come back to us again.

Superintendent-President Kehoe: Actually the committees will finish their work before the end of this year in May and then the visit will be in October, but the people who have been working on this will not be really involved next fall, so they could reconvene next fall.

Dr. Merry: If I may. I would like to see you somehow in your goals mention this. I don't know how you would.....

Member Thorpe: It's there.

President Clark: It's still a goal.

Dr. Wallech: If you put something on hold, that doesn't mean it goes away.

President Clark: One other thing. I talked to Linda at the interim and she had another thought in regards to Board goals -- some language that she thought might be helpful and I thought as long as we're here and we have the time to do it.... This is in, again, Board goals. Linda, you want to give us the language and the thought that you had.

Linda Umbdenstock: What I'm hearing a little bit is a difference or confusion about what we mean by a monitoring program, because we have established a Board monitoring program which consists of three things: One is the annual college effectiveness report and discussion that happens in early Spring, approximately early February. Second, is the on-going appraisal program we have which primarily feeds into the operational areas, where at times we bring those big studies to the whole Board. And the third one is a quarterly fiscal report and annual budget workshop and a review of the fiscal activities of the Board itself. Those constitute the program. So, it's not like monitoring this smaller thing or that smaller thing or others. The emerging discussion over the last three years when we talked about implementing and enhancing a monitoring program is that effectiveness report on an annual basis in February that has all of these characteristics. That has all the student outcomes according to our mission as recommended by AACC. It has the student learning outcomes that we're working on and includes the workforce development program aspects. So those first three lines are really underneath of that process that this group has established. So my recommendation is to clarify right here what we mean to have under 1, three main bullets that say what that program is that we are committed to and then if you want you can put those other subbullets as another sub-sub underneath that. So it would look like:

1. Continue to implement and enhance a monitoring program including:
 - a. An annual college effectiveness report and discussion covering:
 - student success
 - workforce development
 - development of learning outcomes
 - b. An ongoing district-wide community needs appraisal program for use in program planning.
 - c. A quarterly fiscal report and annual budget workshop and a review of the fiscal activities of the Board.

This was the Board's fiscal activities, in particular, under the Board line item.

President Clark: Any response to that? This is new language and I think it would organize it in a more desirable fashion.

Member McNinch: I agree.

Member Thorpe: Where would Partnership for Excellence go? Would that come under that first bullet?

Linda Umbdenstock: Absolutely it does. Yes it does, because the Partnership for Excellence and the AACC ones have a very high degree of overlap and we use Partnership for Excellence as part of that reporting mechanism. If you wanted, we could add that as a sub-bullet.

President Clark: Linda, we have to report, and I can't keep track of all of the grants, the federal grants, as far as workforce employment, do we have those reports? Carl Perkins? Don't we have to report on our success also in the workforce?

Linda Umbdenstock: We do and it's also one of the elements in PFE and...

President Clark: They emphasize the academic end of.

Linda Umbdenstock: Yes.

Member Thorpe: There's overlap, but they're different.

Linda Umbdenstock: Yes.

Member Thorpe: Partnership for Excellence only asks about course finishing. As you know, they're not ready for Goal 5. He's talking about, I think something else.

Lou Anne Bynum: A component of Partnership for Excellence asks about how many people we train through contract education employees through business and industry, as well as income of workers as individuals. Separate from course completion, vocational education.

Member Thorpe: And they don't have any data. They say right on their report that they don't have the data yet for this. They haven't been able to get this.

Lou Anne Bynum: Actually, we do have data for that.

Member Thorpe: At the state level?

Lou Anne Bynum: Well, we have data that we plug into what Fred is collecting as a report from the Long Beach Community College District to our Chancellor's Office and so we established a process whereby we plug those numbers in on a quarterly basis and they are accumulated with the numbers that we report in through. Each one of those grants, funding areas, also has outcomes reporting requirements and so we have to keep track of those. They are not all imbedded into the PFE....

Member Thorpe: That's what he's talking about.

President Clark: If we have information on vocational programs which we probably have more than we have on the academic....

Linda Umbdenstock: So that's why we would keep workforce develop as a specific item.

President Clark: O.K. Yes.

Member Thorpe: Are we going to put PFE in there?

Linda Umbdenstock: Student success (including PFE measures).

Member Thorpe: It's the one thing that the Governor and the Legislative Analyst found fault with the community colleges system on. At least tell someone that we're interested.

Linda Umbdenstock: So you want to say student success (including PFE measures)?

Member Thorpe: Yes. We have to report them anyway. I don't think the Board's ever seen them.

Linda Umbdenstock: Yes, they have.

Member Thorpe: We've seen the PFE report?

Linda Umbdenstock: Yes. It's in the February report where we have our established goals for each of those areas and where we are.

Member Thorpe: And we've seen the graphs and everything?

Linda Umbdenstock: Yes.

Member Thorpe: Which Board meeting did I sleep through?

Linda Umbdenstock: February.

Linda Umbdenstock: The other one that you wanted to add to was No. 5 "diversity in all areas of the college, including an annual report on Title V."

And then we've kept No. 8, "study the feasibility of
- a bond election to improve our college facilities
- A two-college district"

10:30 - BREAK

The Board reconvened at 11:05

Training Session on Bond Issue
Larry Tramutola, Facilitator

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees (Study Session
November 3, 2001**

Larry Tramutola and Lynda Rife of Tramutola and Company, handed out and discussed the following materials:

1. Revised Long Beach Community College District Facilities Summary and Project Descriptions.
2. Recommendation on Tax Rate
3. Recommendation on ballot language
4. Recommendation on Campaign Structure and Campaign Budget

Larry Tramutola and Bill Flory, LBCC, continued discussion on various aspects of the bond issue.

President Clark said that a special meeting of the Board of Trustees will need to be held in late November or in early December, since we have to approve holding an election by December 7, 2001, if we choose to hold a bond election in March 2002.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Assistant Secretary