

SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Via Zoom Videoconferencing

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES' MEETING
January 23, 2021

PRESENT

Members of the Board of Trustees:

Marcia Milchiker, President
Timothy Jemal, Vice President
Terri Whitt Rydell, Clerk
Carolyn Inmon, Member
Barbara J. Jay, Member
T.J. Prendergast, III, Member
James R. Wright, Member

Administrative Officers:

Kathleen F. Burke, Chancellor
Ann-Marie Gabel, Vice Chancellor, Business Services
Cindy Vyskocil, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Bob Bramucci, Vice Chancellor, Technology and Learning Services
Elliot Stern, Saddleback College
John Hernandez, President, Irvine Valley College

Also present at the meeting were:

District Staff and Consultants:

Denice Inciong, District Director, Research, Planning and Data Management
Letitia Clark, District Director of Public Affairs and Government Relations
Paul Mitchell, Owner, Redistricting Partners
Sophia Garcia, Outreach Director, Redistricting Partners

CALL TO ORDER: 9:00 A.M.

1.0 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1 Call To Order – Establishment of Quorum

Trustee Marcia Milchiker, Board President
Trustee Tim Jemal, Vice President
Trustee Terri Whitt Rydell, Clerk of the Board
Trustee Carolyn Inmon, Member
Trustee Barbara Jay, Member
Trustee T.J. Prendergast, Member
Trustee James Wright, Member

1.2 Public Comments

*Members of the public may address the Board on items listed on the agenda. **Speakers are limited to two minutes each.***

There were no public comments

1.3 Invocation

Led by Trustee Barbara Jay

1.4 Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Trustee Tim Jemal

Board President Marcia Milchiker opened the meeting and turned over the workshop to Chancellor Burke.

2.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS - Board of Trustees Self-Evaluation Workshop and Retreat

1. Introduction of the Redistricting Process

Every decade the District undertakes the process of defining the seven trustee areas following the results of the national census. This presentation introduces the process requirements for discussion and planning purposes.

a. Presentation by Redistricting Partners (Paul Mitchell – Demographer)

The redistricting presentation covered the following topics to facilitate the process of public education and involvement in a transparent and fair districting process.

- The California Voting Rights Act (CVRA)
- Districting vs. Redistricting vs. Gerrymandering
- Traditional Districting/Redistricting Principles
- Population and Composition
- Mapping of the South Orange CCD Trustee Areas

Mr. Paul Mitchell from Redistricting Partners has been working for the past decade assisting dozens of municipalities with conversion to districted election systems under the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA).

The CVRA sets a structure for public engagement which includes five public hearings: two conducted prior to line drawing, two more held for public input and changes after maps have been made public, and one final hearing for adoption of a map that has been made public for 7 days prior to adoption. Redistricting Partners will work with SOCCCD in conducting these presentations, gathering and documenting public input, and utilizing these hearings as a means for determining initial criteria for draft maps and amending maps that have been produced.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the timeline for converting to true districted elections will have to take place from April 15 to June 7, 2022. The county will need the final map by the June 7th deadline. Mr. Mitchell suggested having outreach hearings anytime in 2021 and map hearings in January and February 2022 and a final vote in March or April 2022 to approve the actual lines before the next general election. The Board discussed approving the map at the April 2022 board meeting in order to meet the deadline.

The Redistricting PowerPoint presentation is attached as Exhibit D.

2. Board Procedural and Professional Development Items

a. Discussion of Board Members' Role in Decision Making

Chancellor Burke reviewed Board Policy 2022 – Duties and Responsibilities of the Board of Trustees.

In the context of the responsibilities listed under BP 2022, Dr. Burke offered the board members the opportunity to revisit the discussion of the gaucho mascot. She provided two examples of higher education institutions that allowed the students to vote on their mascots. Dr. Burke also provided the research on existing documents to understand how Saddleback and Irvine Valley Colleges' mascots were selected. She asked the Board how they would like to handle the current discussion of the gaucho mascot. Board members were asked if the students/college should take this on or if the Board would like to approve a recommendation. The board members unanimously decided to allow the college to make the decision. Dr. Elliot Stern will report the outcome in his written report to the Board.

Chancellor Burke reviewed Board Policy 2510.1 – Delegation of Authority to Academic Senate, with the board members. She reminded the trustees that the policy states that the Board will rely primarily upon the advice and counsel of the Academic Senate for the 10 plus 1 items, among other items. Primary reliance means that the Board and/or its designees will accept the recommendations of the academic senate regarding academic or professional matters and will act otherwise only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. If a recommendation of the senate is not accepted, the Board will promptly communicate the substantive reasons in writing on a board agenda.

b. Excellence in Trusteeship Program (ETP) —Community College League of California (CCLC)

Board President Milchiker requested this item and suggested that all seven trustees participate in the Excellence in Trusteeship Program as a unified board. The program takes approximately two years to complete. Trustee Milchiker stated that she has completed the program and received a certificate of completion. Board President Milchiker indicated that Ventura Community College District successfully completed the ETP program as a board. Board President Milchiker said the program may also be completed individually. A few board members expressed interest in the program as individuals, but there was not currently agreement to undertake the training as a full Board via scheduled meetings.

c. Policy Positions taken by the Board/District

Trustee Jemal introduced this item. Discussion took place on the process the District takes on policy positions such as legislation or on the expression of the District on an issue of public discourse, such as the insurrection at the Capitol. Trustee Jemal stated that the current practice on legislative matters (local, state or federal) is that the District drafts a letter or news release on its position and the chancellor forwards the

communication to the current board president for his/her review. The board president decides if the matter is routine and something the board would support and then agrees to support the publication of the letter. It would be up to the discretion of the board president to decide if all board members would approve. If the board president is not 100% certain of the decision to move forward, there should be a mechanism in place to provide for board member input.

Regarding the public statement on the issue of the insurrection at the Capitol, or any other similar issue, Trustee Jemal suggested that these types of statements should be reviewed by the Board before they are released to the district community. When it involves an expression of the District to the community, Trustee Jemal deems it is important to involve the trustees in what is being communicated.

Trustee Prendergast cautioned the Board that when they receive communications from the Chancellor regarding position letters, board members should refrain from replying to all because that action is considered a serial meeting and it is regarded as a violation of the Brown Act.

d. Communications with the Board

Trustee Jemal wants to make sure that trustees are being communicated to regularly and individually as necessary on issues that involve the strategic direction of the District or any other matters that may be anticipated to come up in the future that are important to the District and colleges.

e. Rotation of Board Officers

Trustee Prendergast stated that some years ago the Grand Jury report recommended a rotation of board officers. The recommendation allowed for the rotation to be either an understanding of past practice versus an actual policy. Trustee Prendergast would like to know if a board policy on rotation of board officers should be adopted or be kept as unofficial.

Trustee Prendergast offered a suggestion on the election of board officers. He recommended that the senior most member, in time served on the board, should start the rotation. Trustee Milchiker is the senior board member with the most time served and would have the first right of refusal to be president. If Trustee Milchiker refuses the role, then the next person in line would take the president's role. The next person in line is Trustee Prendergast followed by Trustee Wright. The following year, the roles would shift up one; Trustee Wright would be president, Trustee Jemal would be vice president and Trustee Jay would be clerk. Trustee Prendergast said that having this kind of rotation would provide less lobbying for a spot and allows for someone like a new trustee to get experience on the board before becoming an officer. This process would also satisfy the Grand Jury's recommendation and gives everyone an equal opportunity to be a board officer. He stated that this process can start next year if all board members are in agreement. Trustee Prendergast indicated that the development of this rotation would be fair, equitable and is based on an established process in higher levels of government.

After further discussion, board members decided to consider this item at a separate special board meeting or board retreat.

Morning Break

The Board took a 10 minute break.

3. Accreditation Requirements and Processes

a. Peer Review Team Process for Comprehensive Evaluation

Chancellor Burke stated that a discussion of the peer review team process for comprehensive evaluation is part of the Board's professional development and meets one of the accreditation standards. Dr. Burke informed the Board that the accreditation cycle has been extended from six (6) to seven (7) years. Dr. Burke explained that an important part of accreditation is to have a well-organized and thorough self-evaluation report. An important purpose of the Institutional Self-evaluation Report (ISER) is to provide a written analysis of strengths and weaknesses of educational quality and institutional effectiveness based on the institution's continuous evaluation and quality improvement activities that have been considered in the self-evaluation process. Dr. Burke noted that the process to develop an ISER is a significant undertaking. It takes a couple of years to put together. Without the ISER, the colleges will not be accredited or eligible for Title IV Financial Aid and in the state of California, we would be ineligible to be a college because we would not be able to collect any apportionment.

Dr. Burke stated that the midterm report is due in the fourth year of the cycle. The next comprehensive visits for the colleges will be in 2023-24 academic year. Dr. Burke said that the process of the comprehensive evaluation is changing. She explained that in the traditional comprehensive visits, the ISER is written, it is accepted by the Board and it is sent to the commission on a timeline, which will be in the Spring 2024. At the end of the process, a team of up to 10-12 evaluators will come to the campuses and will spend four (4) to five (5) days in the District and at the colleges to validate what was written in the ISER. Based on the peer review report, the ACCJC reviews the documentation to make its decision on the accredited status of the member agencies. There are 135 institutions that are credited by the commission.

The chancellor commented that the commission is piloting a formative and summative process for this final evaluation with some of the colleges that are going through comprehensive review this semester. A peer review team of 10-12 members will still review the ISER and determine which eligibility requirements, standards and commission policies the college meets. To facilitate this summative review, the college ISERs will now be due to the commission the semester prior to the site visit, which will be focused on a formative review with a deeper engagement on issues in which the college needs improvement or additional focus. The college will be notified that they are cleared on the summative items. The summative portion will be due in the semester before the formative visit. Dr. Burke indicated that the ISER will now be due 6 months before it used to be due. The formative visit, which for the District's colleges will be in Spring 2024, will be a more focused process on specific items on which the college will be notified in Fall 2023. The visit will be limited to one or two days rather than the prior process that required a full week, and the visiting team will be smaller and appropriate to the items identified by the peer review team for further review.

Dr. Burke spoke about the eligibility requirements in accreditation. She stated that there are 21 eligibility requirements, 127 micro standards, and 42 commission policies that have to be met in order to be accredited. Dr. Burke prepared an analysis represented in a graph on the PowerPoint presentation that illustrates the eligibility requirements, standards, policies and related District policies/regulations.

b. Board Policy and Administrative Regulations aligned to Eligibility Requirements, Standards, and Commission Policies

Vice Chancellor Ann-Marie Gabel stated that the district has established a five (5) year review cycle for board policies and administrative regulations. She added that we are currently on the third year of the five (5) year cycle.

Vice Chancellor Gabel stated that there are a total of 229 board policies and 165 administrative regulations. Out of the 229 policies, 117 are reviewed by the Board Policy Subcommittee. The subcommittee reviews the policies that cover four areas: the district, board of trustees, general institution and business services.

Vice Chancellor Gabel presented a graph that displayed a history of the board policies and administrative regulations that have been approved during the last three years. In last three (3) years, 78% of BPs and 85% of ARs have been reviewed and approved.

c. Overview of Board Policy and Administrative Regulations

Vice Chancellor Gabel presented a slide indicating three classifications of board policies. There are 229 policies under the function classification, 229 policies under the theme classification and 133 policies under the strategic plan goals classification.

Dr. Burke reminded the board that it is through board policies that the Board runs the District and their input is critical.

Vice Chancellor Gabel said the colleges are meeting the accreditation requirements where we have a cycle and are following the cycle. She reviewed the role of the Board Policy and Administrative Regulations Advisory Council (BPARC). The 24-member committee reviews the changes to the policies and regulations. Once approved by BPARC, the board policies and administrative regulations are forwarded to the Chancellor's Council for their approval. After approval at Chancellor's Council, the Chancellor submits the policies to the Board for review and study and the following month, the policies are submitted for final approval.

4. Annual Report Presentation and Brief Review

Letitia Clark, District Director of Public Affairs and Government Relations, announced that the 2020 District's Annual Report has been produced. Ms. Clark stated that it has been over 10 years since the District had an annual report. She added that despite the challenges we faced last year, there is a lot of information to share about the accomplishments and successes under each of the District's service areas. The annual report also highlights the colleges, and profiles staff and faculty. There is an editorial

piece that was republished from Trustee Milchiker regarding the Emeritus Program. The report also includes an outline of the actions that have been taken during the pandemic.

The annual report will be distributed both electronically and in hard copy to approximately 100 entities, including community college PIO's throughout the state, the county, surrounding cities, community partners, and public health care agencies.

Lunch Break

The Board took a 30 minute lunch break.

5. Board of Trustees' Self-Evaluation and Employee Evaluation

Denice Inciong, District Director, Research, Planning and Data Management reminded the Board that in November they completed their self-evaluation survey and the employees completed an evaluation on their perspective of the board. The survey instrument includes 20 questions, which are the same on both surveys.

Ms. Inciong presented the online Board of Trustees' Annual Evaluation Dashboard, which is found on the District's website, under the Board Self- Evaluation site. The Board was provided with handouts depicting information from the dashboard.

Ms. Inciong presented the self-evaluation results, in particular, the scores on Roles and Responsibilities of the Board. Overall, trustees strongly agree (5) or agree (4) with their roles and responsibilities with most of the goals having an average ratings over 4.0.

As the dashboard does not include comments, only the ratings, Ms. Inciong provided a thematic analysis of the three questions where the board and employees provided comments. Board members' comments on their strengths and accomplishments include:

- Respectful – of each other (trustees) and district administrators, faculty, staff
- Care – about students and District
- Ethical – chose what is best for students and District
- Work well together as a board
- Hired excellent personnel

The areas where board members indicated the Board might improve included the following:

- Tackle problems early and more involvement in strategic directions
- Understand budget and funding - employee contract costs
- Learn and spend time on understanding colleges and developing ATEP

The Board's comments revealed what the Board's goals, priorities, or tasks should be for the coming year:

- COVID-19 environment:

- Commend employees on efforts
- Continue to support employees
- Evaluate the future of online instruction and strategic direction impacted by COVID-19
- Review, evaluate, and continue progress on the strategic directions (EMSP)
- Progress towards ATEP build-out
- Onboarding new trustees

Ms. Inciong stated that in the last three years, this year's evaluation had the most participation with 395 employees taking the survey. The dashboard screen shot on the presentation indicates the demographics of the current year as well as the demographic information on the survey participants.

Ms. Inciong explained that the dashboard shows the data comparison of the two surveys for the past three years, 2018, 2019 and 2020. The ratings appear under the *Board Member* column and the *Employee* ratings appear under a separate column. The arrows indicate a green or red arrow, which is the differential between the trustees' average scores and the employees' average scores. This year, there is less intensity on the red arrows, which means the differences between how the trustees rated themselves to how the employees rated the trustees is smaller than previous years. There is more intensity on the green arrows, which means the ratings between the Board and employees' perceptions of the Board are closer in rating.

In the thematic analysis Ms. Inciong noted for the Board that generally most employees (approximately 60%) do not provide comments, so the top themes are based on less than half of the employee participants. The following are the top themes from the comments on the employees' survey.

Strengths & accomplishments of the Board

- Trustees' Interactions (n=56)
 - Board Decision-Making (n=28)
 - District Fiscal Management (n=21)
- 143 employees provided a comment (36%)
252 employees skipped or said NA/Don't Know (64%)

According to the comments on the employee survey, the areas where the Board might improve include:

- Board Education (Variety of Topics) (n=69)
 - Employees' Perspectives (n=69)
- 147 employees provided a comment (37%)
248 employees skipped or said NA/Don't Know (63%)

The employees' comments top themes revealed what the Board's goals, priorities, or tasks should be for the coming year:

- COVID-19 Planning, Evaluation, and Recovery (n=55)
 - Teaching and Learning Priorities (n=47)
- 178 employees provided a comment (36%)

217 employees skipped or said NA/Don't Know (55%)

The trustees' priorities also revealed that their top Board's goals, priorities, or tasks should be for the coming year is also to focus on COVID-19 recovery.

Discussion ensued on employee perceptions and the need for more engagement and communication. In order for employees to be more familiar with the Board's involvement, board members made comments and suggested the possibility of attending city council meetings, K-12 board meetings and to be more visible in the community and on the campuses.

A comment was made that oral board reports should focus on more substantial and meaningful reports. It was noted that there is a lot of redundancy in the board reports. A suggestion was made to have board reports written and submitted on the agenda similar to the president's reports. A comment was made that board members should strive to adhere to the two-minute time limit. It was suggested that it should be up to the trustee's discretion what they would like to report in their oral reports. The reports should not be restrictive but should not include repetitive information. It was suggested that during the oral reports, board members should be able to adapt and not repeat what was mentioned in a previous report. Another comment encouraged board members to report on items that are related to advancing the District and as well as reporting on policies they feel are important to the District.

6. Progress on and Development of Annual Board Goals

District Director Inciong reviewed the trustees' self-evaluation ratings on the progress of board goals. Ms. Inciong stated that five (5) out of the eight (8) goals received an average rating over 4.0 (good/excellent). She added that three goals had slightly lower scores (neutral/good).

The Board was reminded that when they set their goals in 2018, they used the State Chancellor's Office Vision for Success goals as the framework to set their goals. The Vision for Success goals will be reviewed once again in 2022. Ms. Inciong stated that another aspect in the evaluation of the goals takes into account the established District-wide Strategic Plan. She explained that the establishment of the Board's goals have been imbedded in the newly approved District-wide Strategic Plan 2020-2025.

Chancellor Burke informed the Board that most of the recommendations on the goals will be to transition the board goals that were based on the California Community College Chancellor's Office Vision for Success goals and to endorse the related goals and objectives in the District-wide Strategic Plan. This year the District-wide Planning Council will be reviewing initial baseline data gathered to measure the objectives and colleges will review this data. The colleges need time review the data in order to establish the baseline. Dr. Burke added that the metric will be defined after the colleges establish their baseline.

Board members reviewed recommendations to revise the goals for 2021. The revised goals appear in bold as follows:

1. Increase degrees and certificates by 15% above the 2016-2017 base

number of 6,631 to 7,626.

- a. Establish the baseline to increase the number of students annually who earn associate degrees, certificates, or nine (9) units in a CTE program.**
2. Increase by 10% the number of transfer students from the 2016-2017 base number of 6,165 for a January 2021 goal of 6,812.
 - a. Establish baseline to increase the number of students transferring to a four-year university annually.**
3. Increase the percent of exiting CTE students who report being employed or advanced in their field above the 2016-2017 base of 67% at Irvine Valley College and 65% at Saddleback College.
 - a. Establish the baseline for students completing CTE Outcomes Survey.**
4. Decrease the average number of units accumulated by SOCCCD students earning their associate degree below the 2016-2017 base of 88 units district-wide.
 - a. Establish baseline to reduce average units accumulated by students who complete degrees.**
5. Decrease achievement gaps of 2017-2018 college identified groups by 10%.
 - a. Establish a baseline using Proportionality Index (PI) to decrease achievement gaps in college identified groups.**
6. Maintain life-long learning and the Emeritus Program enrollment, at a minimum, at the level of enrollments in the 2016-2017 academic year of 37,353.
 - a. Maintain enrollment and re-envision delivery of extended learning programs (community and adult education programs, and emeritus Institutes).**
7. Initiate student and employee housing feasibility studies for Irvine Valley College, Saddleback College and ATEP.
 - a. Provide enhanced student support with a student-centered design including commencement of student housing feasibility study.**
8. Continue to develop the ATEP campus in the following areas:
 - Increase enrollments at ATEP above the 2018-2019 base of 1,702.
 - Develop preliminary planning for the SC building(s) at ATEP.
 - Continue to identify and evaluate prospective tenants for ATEP.
 - a. Continue to develop the ATEP campus in the following areas:**
 - **Increase enrollments at ATEP above the 2018-2019 base of 1,702.**
 - **Finalize planning for Saddleback College building(s) at ATEP.**
 - **Continue to identify and evaluate prospective tenants for ATEP.**

The Board decided they will review and study the recommended revised board goals at the February board meeting and will adopt the goals at the March meeting.

Trustee Jemal suggested adding two additional goals for recommendation.

- 1. Maintain a balanced budget**
- 2. Evaluate adaption (fiscal and educational) of SOCCCD's COVID-19 environment**

Chancellor Burke stated that the Chancellor's Executive Council will work on the language of the two additional goals and will provide a recommendation to the Board for their review. The draft of the Board of Trustees Goals 2021 is attached as Exhibit E.

7. Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) Update Four-year Trend

Vice Chancellor Ann-Marie Gabel gave a brief update on the Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES). She stated that last week the district filed the CCFS 320 Period 1 report. She explained that we are on a downward trend in our FTES from the 2017-18 fiscal year. In 2017-18, the district generated 26,976 FTES. In 2018-19, there was a dip of 420 FTES for a total of 26,535 FTES. In 2019-20, there was another drop in FTES for a total of 26,530. In 2020-21, as of the first period reporting, the FTES is 25,312. Vice Chancellor Gabel indicated that is a 4.6% decline from last year's FTES.

Vice Chancellor Gabel stated that the 2020-21 numbers are projections and include the 2020 summer and fall data, and a projection of the spring data. She added that in 2019-20 we were up in the summer over 500 FTES.

Due to Covid-19, Vice Chancellor Gabel stated that the District will file an emergency waiver with the State Chancellor's office so the District can be funded at the 2019-20 level of 26,530 FTES.

The PowerPoint Presentation that was provided to the Board at the special meeting is attached as Exhibit C.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:53 p.m.



Kathleen F. Burke
Secretary, Board of Trustees