

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

**Minutes of Special Meeting of
February 5, 2002
(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 Liberal Arts Campus, Board Room, on Tuesday, February 5, 2002.

CALL TO ORDER

President Clark called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Clark led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present: President Clark, Vice President Uranga,
Member McNinch, Member Polsky, Member Thorpe,
and Student Trustee Torres

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 was no response.

Member Polsky joined the meeting at 5:12 p.m.

Results of Noel-Levitz Survey

Dr. Fred Trapp, Facilitator

The following presentation was made:

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

Vice President Byrd: What you have before you is a work in progress. This is the first step in essentially taking a look at the recommendations. We have a set of recommendations based upon the observations of the consultant. We don't think it's appropriate to simply go out and implement the recommendations. What we've done is a first step, because this was a priority project funded by the Budget Committee and determined a priority project by the Educational Master Planning Committee. That body, the Educational Master Planning Committee, has endorsed this as a move toward investigating the recommendations. What you have here is the first step, first, taking a look at the recommendations, identifying those areas, whether it is a task force of some type or a department, those areas responsible. What will occur now is those areas will take a look at the recommendation to review the recommendation, analyze the recommendation, and determine the feasibility of implementing the recommendation, and give a report. Those bodies will identify what actions they're going to take in order to complete that analysis and recommendations. The Educational Master Planning Committee has also organized a task force from that committee, a subcommittee, if you will, to assist in ensuring that we have included all of the responsible departments or offices there. This is also a work in progress.

We have not established, as you see, action plans or specific timelines, because those bodies will be the ones who are more equipped and knowledgeable about those areas in order to establish the various timelines. What we're trying to do is integrate our review of the recommendations into our existing planning process. We have an excellent planning process and we're trying to take full advantage of that process. I'll be happy to respond to your questions.

President Clark: Let me just ask Art, we have, on an ongoing basis, we have students' reactions, or students' surveys - outside of Noel-Levitz - we have, I understand, an ongoing survey process.

Vice President Byrd: There are a number of surveys and Dr. Trapp can give you more specifics. But, they're not specifically surveys of this nature. Our surveys are internal and they're not surveys that we can compare with other colleges or nationally. This is a different type of survey. There are surveys for program review, primarily, and some others. We had a presentation a few months ago on the different ones, but Dr. Trapp could address this.

President Clark: Let me also ask - when was the last time we did a survey of this nature, or in depth?

Fred Trapp: We've done something like this across the campus with the community college student experiences questionnaire about four years ago. One of our departments last fall used that same instrument in context of their program review; but otherwise, our surveys have been targeted to our alumni, when they graduate within six months or so or every other year to our students who transfer to universities. Departments like the Counseling department do what we call a "point of contact" survey, when a student comes in for a service, they're given a short questionnaire and asked to respond to that

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

service. That represents some of the kinds of surveys that we've done of our student population. We've never done a Noel-Levitz instrument in our past.

Student Trustee Torres: So the 2100 students that were selected in October were alumni or ...

Fred Trapp: No, they're currently enrolled students...

Student Trustee Torres: Those are currently enrolled students? And, randomly selected on both campuses, in different classes?

Fred Trapp: Yes. The instrument was administered in the classes and what we kept doing was drawing groups of classes at random and looking at the nature of the students in the classes, comparing that to the nature of the student population as a whole. So we're trying to get students in terms of their goals and purposes for coming to the college that match the general set of goals against students in terms of gender, ethnicity, that match the general population.

President Clark: It was a good study. The results were very encouraging. Thank you very much. Now, at some point, we'll have a report coming back to the Board?

Fred Trapp: On the action plan.

President Clark: On the action plan. Very good. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to respond to this? (There was no response.)

Report of the Liaison to the Accreditation Steering Committee

President Clark: Trustee Uranga has a report from the Accreditation Steering Committee and is asking for comments from the Board.

Vice President Uranga: I just want to first of all commend the committee for the fine work that they've been doing. It's been a lot of work. It's a major big document, as you can see here and it's been a lot of effort and these two individuals here, Dr. Linda Umbdenstock and Dr. Julian Del Gaudio, have done an excellent job on this and I think that they deserve kudos for the fine work that they've done on this.

The copies of the draft report have been made available across the campus to all units from classified, faculty, administrators, and it's available on the Internet. They can download some of that information. Comments, I understand, have been coming in. There's a follow-up meeting that's going to be taking place on February 12 to incorporate some of those comments that are coming in from across the campus in terms of all the various different standards. The steering committee is doing its job. It's meeting with its particular groups, getting the different perspectives of what the standards should look like and what they should address and this draft that you have that you received earlier in the week is a result of that. Being that we are reviewing this today, I think it would be our best point of departure if we could look at standard ten, which deals with governance, and that's our section, the Board, and those pages begin at about the last 20 pages it starts with standard ten. I did have an opportunity to meet with Linda. We talked about some

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

of the minor grammatical types of things and questions that I had in there as well as talking about some comments that, in my view, we should include as part of this. But, I'll open that up to questions at this point, unless you want to hear what I have to say, but I'll open it up for discussion at this point.

President Clark: Does anyone have anything they would like to bring up, language or anything on the standard ten? (no response) Ok, Roberto, why don't you give us your revisions?

Vice President Uranga: Page 10.1, which is right at the beginning, the second paragraph after it says the "Descriptive Summary." "All Board meetings are open to the public." I also brought up the question there about televising our Board meetings and there are some issues regarding budget as far as putting those on the cable channel and I think that we're going to be or we should at least authorize some investigation into the budget as far as being able to determine whether we should televise or we can televise and what the cost would be. If it's prohibitive, it's prohibitive, but if it's not, we should look into that.

Member McNinch: I think that's an excellent idea.

Member Polsky: That's a really good idea, as long as it isn't too expensive.

Vice President Uranga: Well, that's what I'm saying. If it's prohibitive, we probably might not want to do it then. At minimum, we could put our agendas on there.

Member Polsky: Absolutely.

President Clark: They're actually filming the meeting currently?

Member McNinch: But not with broadcast quality.

President Clark: Not with broadcast quality. So, we have to make it broadcast...so there is an expense factor if you make it broadcast quality.

Cindy Hanks: We would have to look into upgrading the quality of camera and the costs involved. We could do a cost analysis and get back to you.

President Clark: But then if you have the film you simply put it on our station don't you?

Cindy Hanks: We could do that. Are you talking about wanting to go live?

President Clark: It wouldn't necessarily have to be. If it could be, but it wouldn't have to be if the cost would be...

Cindy Hanks: It would be considerably less.

President Clark: Less if you just put it on and then have certain days that you identify that you're going to have it on. Ok.

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

Member McNinch: Should we request of Dr. Kehoe to request of Ms. Hanks a report to come back to us on that?

Member Polsky: A cost analysis.

Superintendent-President Kehoe: We could do a cost analysis and I think we probably need to look at the schedule of televised programs because we do have consortia that we work with and offer the Board some options as to times.

President Clark: Prime time.

Member McNinch: Two in the morning.

Superintendent-President Kehoe: Prime time - that will cost you more.

President Clark: Two in the morning. Three.

Superintendent-President Kehoe: I can bring that back to you.

Member Polsky: I think that's a nice idea.

Member McNinch: Do we have a consensus?

President Clark: Sure.

Vice President Uranga: One thing I forgot to mention is that this has been an ongoing study that started about 16-18 months ago. We hope to have a semifinal draft around April and, therefore, a final draft in May. The accrediting board will be coming down in October. Correct? And I'm looking at them because I need verification that I'm on track.

Turn over to Page 10.8. That will be Item A5, "The size, duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, structure and operating procedures and processes for assessing the performance of the governing board are clearly defined and published in board policies or by-laws. The board acts in a manner consistent with them." Page 10.8. This would raise some discussion on my part as far as perhaps having us revisit or, every now and then renew, so to speak, the Board's statement of ethics, as far as how we conduct our business, things that we need to keep in mind when we meet. It's a document that's fairly new to me - I know I can use it as an excuse only so far. I've been here a year and a half now, but, as far as getting more familiar with what that statement is and what it does and its purpose and what its intention is for the Board. I think that every now and then, revisiting that statement would be healthy for the Board so that we all know that we're on the same page and we are on the same track. That's just a comment that I'm making and putting it out there for discussion so the Board can decide how we want to address that issue. Or maybe even revise it if we need to, adding some things or deleting some things. Page 10.9 is a continuation of that discussion.

I don't think I have much else on that.

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

President Clark: I think it's pretty complete.

Vice President Uranga: The good addition is that we did have a change in our student trustee and how that trustee is elected for a one year term as opposed to one semester previously and it's been incorporated into this document. I'm very pleased with that - that we're on top of it. People are paying attention to this document here.

On Page 10.21, up on the top, the end of that continuing paragraph, on the top of that page, I suggested that, where it says, "negotiate committee membership on those bodies dealing with work rules or tenure as determined by faculty contracts," I think we should list these out, just to be more clear and specific as to what those are. Again, it's for clarification purposes so everybody understands what the committees are and the representation on each one of those committees. It's a suggestion. Again, we might want to visit that list, as far as some inclusion or some restructuring of some of those committees. I know there's a lot of them. Being academics, we can create a lot of committees, but we might want to incorporate some. Just a suggestion.

Also, on Page 10.26 - B9 - "Institution clearly states and publicizes the role of staff in institutional governments." We may need to update this whole section, being that there's been some changes in Sacramento in the Chancellor's Office. So we might want to visit this one again and make those necessary changes as they have transpired. That's basically my report. That's my suggestions.

President Clark: Does anyone else have any suggestions for language changes or additions? When will this come back to us again?

Vice President Uranga: April.

President Clark: Will that be the last draft or the final draft.

Linda Umbdenstock: And after that we will have a final report.

President Clark: That's the semifinal. And then there's the final.

Linda Umbdenstock: If you have any comments, we need to hear them now.

Member Thorpe: Dr. Umbdenstock, is that kind of like an executive summary that you're talking about, that the Board will get?

Julian Del Gaudio: Not an executive summary. It's the whole report. The Planning Agenda section is a summary of where we intend to go for the next six years. What are the big plans that we have. It will be a short list. There will not be a lot of items on it.

Member Thorpe: Will there eventually be a kind of an executive summary that takes this - I'm trying to figure how much the weight is here - and crystallizes them, and gives the highlights of the report.

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

Linda Umbdenstock: There's an abstract in the front. And what people are really looking for is the response to the standards. It's called the self-study because you're looking at where you are and what are the next steps in terms of addressing the standards. The next step is planning and it's what the visiting team will really be focusing on along with how well we are addressing the standards.

President Clark: Does that rest within these standards, or is that an extra piece?

Linda Umbdenstock: It's an extra chapter but it will depend on the discussions that come out of this analysis.

President Clark: Let me ask the question - on our last accreditation, did we have that particular document or plan that they will now come back and evaluate us on the plan as to how we did what we planned five or six years ago?

Linda Umbdenstock: In particular, pages one through six are the responses that we were obligated to make from what they said last time that we should focus on and we drew heavily on the mid-term visiting team's report.

Vice President Uranga: I just want to thank Linda and Julian.

Member Polsky: Excellent work.

President Clark: Anything else? (no response) Ok, this is just informational.

Annual Board Self-Evaluation

Dr. Linda Umbdenstock, Facilitator

President Clark: The purpose of this is to try to improve our functioning as a Board. I think we might go through and just look at the areas. In most cases, the responses were - we generally only had four responses. The responses we had were generally positive - either often or almost always - but we had one or two where we had somewhat less of that level. Maybe we can just look at those, where there might be some room for improvement. On Page 2, B5, "Board Members participate actively in community meetings, workshops, etc., study of written materials," we had a little bit less there - we were two "often" and two "almost always" so, although I think we do participate pretty well in the community activities, I'm not sure what we do with workshops.

Member McNinch: Well I think the midline on this is "sometimes," so we are still above the midline with "often" and "almost always." We're not on the yucky side.

President Clark: We were not quite as enthusiastic as we were on the others, but, unless someone has some thoughts about participation, I think we generally do pretty well on our participation in the community and workshops for the various organizational work.

Member McNinch: And we're far more active than we were six years ago.

Member Polsky: Absolutely.

President Clark: Ok

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

Member Polsky: I think "often" and "almost always" are very close. Nothing is perfect. I think we do very well.

President Clark: We'll just look at those that are less than ... We had, on C5, on Page 3, "Board members refer individual complaints and concerns through the Superintendent-President" and we have three "often" and one "always," so apparently there's some feeling we don't do as well as... we might all have some guilt in that area. I don't want to point fingers. But apparently there is some feeling on the part of the Board that we don't do as well with that as we might. Is there any comment on that?

Member McNinch: I concur with you, President Clark.

President Clark: Other than those few, there wasn't much that generally wasn't pretty much either "always" or primarily "always" and then "often." Then, I think we need to look at areas of improvement, because that's the purpose of doing this and I think the ones that tend to be germane regarding further in-depth monitoring and evaluation of the progress and I think something like looking at the Noel-Levitz survey and other tools of that nature, where we can evaluate and get some feeling as a Board as to the progress, because I think we're maybe not the prime body, but certainly the representative of the community, to determine that the college is moving in the direction that it should move in serving the community the way we hope that it will serve it and as our constituents want us to do that. Are there any comments on that? (no response)

I think there's some concern about our ethics, and I think Roberto mentioned re-evaluating that particular section and looking at what we might do to improve on it and make sure that there is an understanding on the code of ethics. Any comments on that particular point? (no response)

Communications - we need to be on the same page. I think that's understandable. If there's any feeling that we're not, hopefully, working on the same page...

Moving on to what things the trustees would like to see - I think that trying to keep a balance between the business items on the Board and the non-business, such as sabbaticals - not that they're not important - but I think there is a point at which we want to allow time, but not spend an overly amount of time and it does cut down on the business items. I think there is concern about cohesiveness and I think that's a factor. I think that there's concern when the Board makes a decision that we do move as a single board which is what happens on a well-functioning board - that you may disagree, but you don't carry it beyond the board meetings. The board makes a decision, we all, hopefully, move in the same direction.

Member Thorpe: I had a question on the previous one. It says we need to keep sabbaticals and other non-business to reasonable amounts of time - I didn't understand that with sabbaticals.

President Clark: We get reports. We get the report on the sabbaticals.

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

Member Thorpe: Oh, the sabbaticals.

President Clark: Yes. Where they come in and report on what they...which are, I think, excellent, but I think to keep it to a ... Sometimes we spend more time on that than I think it's necessary at a meeting. I think one good sabbatical - but sometimes we get two or three.

Member McNinch: I find them absolutely educational. I know we have the best faculty anywhere, and the sabbatical reports continue to reinforce that.

Member Thorpe: They are.

Member Polsky: They're very interesting, actually.

President Clark: We will continue to have them.

Member Polsky: Maybe limit the time, but they're very interesting.

Member Thorpe: One more thing. You said that Trustee B would like to see the five-member board act as a cohesive unit. It seems like the last time I heard that was at the Nuremberg trials. But, not to be that harsh, I talked to a person who attended law school in California and passed the bar and is a very reputable attorney, who stated to me, "You know, the majority rules, but it does not oppress."

President Clark: I think we can totally agree with that. There's nothing that we would not agree with in that.

Member Polsky: Who's oppressed?

Member Thorpe: I thought that might be a useful comment for the group.

President Clark: Very good. I think, too, we have, in regards to sharing of district information, I think, again, going back that there is always a concern that all the information be shared and I think we generally do a pretty good job of that.

Does anyone have any other comments with regard to the self-evaluations? Or the audience has? Feel free. Ok, no other comments. That's the end of it. We're ready for a motion to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Member McNinch, seconded by Member Uranga, that the meeting be adjourned. President Clark adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

**Minutes, Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
February 5, 2002 (Study Session)**

The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held on February 19, 2002, at the Pacific Coast Campus, Building FF, Dyer Assembly Hall.

Assistant Secretary
(Lillian Wyant for
Joan M. Bradshaw)