A. Open Session

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Adoption of Closed Session Agenda
   The Board of Trustees of the Marin Community College District met for a regularly scheduled Board meeting in Room 100 of Building 17 on the Indian Valley Campus, all members having received notice as required by law. Board President Namnath called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m. Trustees Namnath, O’Brien, Long and Treanor were present. Trustees Conti, Dolan and Kranenburg were not present. Also present were Superintendent/President Coon, Vice Presidents Eldridge and Harrison, and Executive Director Combs.
   M/s (O’Brien/Long) to adopt the Closed Session Agenda. Motion carried 4-0-3.

2. Public Comment – There was no public comment.

3. Recess to Closed Session – Trustees recessed to Closed Session at 5:42 p.m.

B. Closed Session

1. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION (Government Code §54956.9 (b))
   Number of Potential Cases – 2
   Attorney: Glen Gould, Dannis Woliver Kelley

C. Open Session

1. Call to Order, Roll Call and Adoption of Agenda
   Board President Namnath called the regular meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. and asked the Clerk to call roll. Trustees Long, Treanor, Namnath, O’Brien were present. Trustees Conti, Dolan, Kranenburg and Student Trustee Blood were not present. M/s (O’Brien/Long) to approve the regular meeting agenda. President Coon noted revisions to items C.10.B., C.10.C. and C.11.I.1. He also noted that he was pulling item C.11.G., which will be heard at
the Board Retreat on March 29, 2013. **Motion to adopt the agenda as amended carried 4-0-3.**

2. **Report from Closed Session** – There was no action taken in closed session.

3. **Public Comment**
   A. **Comments regarding items not on the Agenda (3 minutes per speaker)**
      John Gudmundsson spoke about the tree that will now be saved and the historic negotiations related to the equity study.
   B. **Comments regarding items on the Agenda - to be heard immediately before the Board of Trustees’ consideration of the item**

4. **Chief Executive Officer’s Report**
   A. **Accreditation** – Dr. Coon referred Trustees to the handout of a Draft Midterm Report Schedule (3/18/2013) noting that we are required to review and report on the original 9 recommendations from 2010 and to respond to the 26 areas in our action plan of that time. He noted that teams are beginning to meet and that a Board Retreat will be scheduled during the summer to keep us on track for an appropriate response in October.

      Trustee Kranenburg arrived at 6:45 p.m.

   B. **Citizen’s Oversight Committee** – Laura McCarty briefed the Board on the Citizens’ Oversight Committee Annual Report that was included in the Board packet.
   C. **Strategic Plan** - Dr. Coon referred Trustees to a handout of our Strategic Plan Progress Summary and noted that we are making good progress on 57 action steps. Trustees discussed the review schedule of the various plans, the need for presentations on plan updates, and the need to be proactive and stay ahead of the schedule to allow enough time for review and Trustee involvement. The Educational Master and Facilities Plans will be reviewed at a future retreat or meeting. There was a request to add review of the Strategic Plan to the Governance calendar on a quarterly basis.
   D. **Legislative Advocacy** - Trustee O’Brien spoke about information that was recently provided to the Board from Strategic Education Services. She noted that she has worked with Kerry Mazzoni to review a series of newly presented bills that relate to the College of Marin relative to Prop 39, facilities or bonds, funding, fees, education in general and Trustees/District leadership. She will provide more concise reports as information becomes available. Dr. Coon informed Trustees that the contract with Strategic Education Services for legislative services ended in February and asked the Board for their input about whether to continue this agreement or to look at other options. The cost was $36,000 for the year. Trustees discussed consolidation options, including using CCLC assessments and sharing resources with other basic aid districts. There were comments that the services should have focused on legislation that affects our specific
needs, demographics and budget restraints, that we consider using those funds to educate the Board directly, that we should find out the results of the lobbying efforts and whether SES was able to enlist the democratic districts. There was also a request for a year-end report from SES.

Additional Public Comment:
Gloria Kopshever spoke representing the swimmers at IVC to ask when they can expect to have hot water in the showers at the IVC Locker/Shower Building.

5. Academic Senate Report (5 minutes) - Sara McKinnon reported that the Senate is working on normal business and setting up for the next round of elections.

6. Classified Senate Report (5 minutes) – There was no Classified Senate Report

7. Student Association Report (5 minutes) – There was no Student Association Report

8. Board Study Session – None

9. Trustee Request (O’Brien)

   Board Benefits/Total Compensation
   Trustee O’Brien requested that this item be brought back to the full Board to allow the entire board to have a detailed conversation about the Trustee compensation packet. Trustee Treanor handed out a copy of an investigative report (attached) relative to community colleges and noted that it spoke to benefits for Trustees and was important to review. There was a recommendation that this be discussed at an upcoming retreat. If Trustees want specific information they are to notify President Coon in advance so he can have the material available for review. (Trustee O’Brien’s e-mail request of March 4th (1:46 p.m.) is attached to these minutes.)

10. Consent Calendar Items (Roll Call Vote)

    President Namnath requested that items C.10.O. Board Policy 2340 and 2210 be pulled from consent for separate consideration. M/s (Treanor/O’Brien) to approve the Consent Calendar items as amended. Motion carried by roll call vote 5-0-2. Trustees Conti and Dolan were not present.

    A. Calendar of Upcoming Meetings
       - March 29, 2013, Board Retreat, 9:00 – 3:00 p.m., Staff Lounge, Student Services Building, Kentfield Campus
       - April 16, 2013, Cafeteria, Student Services Building, Kentfield Campus
       - April 20, 2013, Board Retreat, Location TBA

    B. Approve Classified Personnel Recommendations
       1. Appointment of Classified Personnel
       2. Appointment of Hourly Personnel
       3. Resignation/Retirement of Classified Personnel

    C. Approve Academic Personnel Recommendations
1. Approval of Continued Employment of Contract Faculty
2. Approval of Phased-In Early Retirement

D. Approve Administrative Appointments

E. Approve Short-Term Hourly Positions

F. Approve Budget Transfers – Month of February 2013

G. Approve Warrants - Month of February 2013

H. Approve Declaration of Surplus Property – Miscellaneous Equipment

I. Approve New AS-T Degree, Early Childhood Education

J. Approve Revisions to AA Degree, Dance

K. Approve Revisions to AS Degrees and Certificates of Achievement

L. Approve Credit Course Deletions

M. Approve Credit and Non-Credit Course Additions

N. Approve Credit Course Revisions

O. Second Reading and Approval of Board Policies
   - BP 2015 Student Trustee
   - BP 2100 Board Elections
   - BP 2105 Election of Student Trustee
   - BP 2365 Recordings
   - BP 2716 Political Activity
   - BP 2750 Board Member Absence from State
   - BP 2340 Agendas (Trustee Treanor) – Pulled for separate discussion
   - BP 2210 Officers (Trustee Treanor) – Pulled for separate discussion

P. Modernization (Measure C)
   1. Ratify/Approve Modernization Contracts, Changes, Amendments ($126,987.83)
   2. Declaration of Surplus Disposal, New Academic Center Relocation (850J)

M/s (Long/O'Brien) to approve BP 2340 Agendas and BP 2210 Officers. After Trustee discussion, M/s (Treanor/O'Brien) to table this item until the next meeting. Motion to table the item did not carry by a vote of 3-2-2, with Trustees Treanor, O'Brien and Kranenburg voting yes and Trustees Namnath and Long voting no. Trustees Conti and Dolan were not present. President Namnath clarified that a vote of 4 was required to carry the motion per Board Policy 2330. Motion to approve BP 2340 Agendas and BP 2210 Officers failed by a roll call vote of 3-2-2, with Trustees Kranenburg, O'Brien and Treanor voting yes and Trustees Namnath and Long voting no. Trustees Conti and Dolan were not present.

11. Other Action Items

A. M/s (Treanor/Long) to Approve Resolution in Support of Women’s History Month. (Roll Call Vote)
Student Trustee Blood arrived at 7:22 p.m.

M/s (Treonor/Long) to revise the resolution by adding the following language “and celebrates local, state, national women and aspiring women of College of Marin students and staff to actualize their dreams and hopes for the future.” to the paragraph that starts with Now, therefore, be it resolved. Motion to approve the motion as revised passed by a roll call vote of 5-0-2. Trustees Conti and Dolan were not present. Student Trustee Blood abstained. Clerk O’Brien read the Resolution in Support of Women’s History Month.

M/s (O’Brien/Long) to incorporate C.11.B. – C.11.F. into one vote for approval those items. Motion carried with a vote of 5-0-2, with Trustees Conti and Dolan not present. Student Trustees Blood cast an advisory aye vote.

B. Approve/Ratify Clinical Agreement with Marin Specialty Surgery Center

C. Approve/Ratify Clinical Agreement with The Tamalpais

D. Approve Addendum #3 to License Agreement with Community Action Marin for Marin Head Start - IVC Toddler’s Center

E. Approve Transfer of ASCOM Funds for Scholarships

F. Approved Revised California School Employees Association Salary Schedule

G. Approve Memorandum of Understanding between Marin Community College District and California School Employees Association, Chapter 196 – This item was pulled.

H. Election of Board Vice President

Trustee Treanor nominated Trustee Kranenburg for the position of Vice President. There were three aye votes by Trustees Treanor, O’Brien and Kranenburg, plus an advisory aye vote by Student Trustee Blood. Motion did not carry as 4 votes are required. There were no other nominations and the item will be carried over to the next meeting.

I. Modernization (Measure C)

M/s (Treonor/O’Brien) to merge and approve Items C.11.I 1 & 2. Motion carried 5-0-2, plus an advisory aye vote by Student Trustee Blood.

1. Approve Amendment #5 to Professional Services Agreement
   Noll & Tam Architects ($14,550), New Academic Center Relocation (850J)

2. Approve Contract Amendment #1
   Jacobs Project Management Co. ($140,000)
   Measure C Construction Management (Program 825C and Project & Construction Management 301B, 303B, 309A)

12. Board Policy Review (1st Reading) – Trustees referred to packet for review. President Coon answered a question about the fiscal impact of this policy and the effect on students.
   - BP 5030 Fees

13. Future Agenda Items

Minutes March 19, 2013 – Approved 4/16/2013
A. California Community College Trustees (CCCT) Election – 2013 (April). Trustees Treanor and O’Brien volunteered to review the information and bring back a recommendation for nominees.

B. COM Foundation Update

C. Bond Spending Plan

14. Board Reports and/or Requests (15 minutes)

A. Committee Chair Reports

B. Legislative Report

C. Individual Reports/or Requests – Trustee O’Brien provided a summary report (attached) on the Effective Trustee Workshop she attended in January. She also has copies of the power point presentations which she is happy to provide upon request. Trustee Treanor reminded Trustees about the CCCT Conference in May noting that it will be very informative, particularly in the area of accreditation, with important and well-organized information and presentations. Trustee Kranenburg encouraged Trustees to improve and work on level of expertise and knowledge of governing processes. Trustee Long requested a report on the use of funds to date, to determine if there are funds to accommodate attendance at the conference. She also thanked Trustee O’Brien for her workshop report, noting this was an important tool for Trustees. Trustee Long shared a copy of a photo (attached) showing Joe Martin helping Mr. Austin saw the “Junior” out of the Marin Junior College sign. Trustee Treanor referred to the letter from Jim Dunn regarding the Big River Gala event noting that it was a fabulous the event and thanked staff.

15. Approval of Meeting Minutes (2 minutes)

 February 26, 2013 Minutes will be presented for approval at the 3/29/13 Board Retreat

16. Information Items (see written reports)

A. Contracts and Agreements for Services – February 2013

B. Modernization Update

1. Director’s Report
2. Contract Milestones Report
3. Program Schedule

C. Administrative Procedures

 AP 3420 Equal Opportunity Employment
 AP 5030 Fees
 AP 5530 Student Grievances
 AP 7280 Unrepresented Employee Complaints
 AP 7380 Retiree Health Benefits

D. Calendar of Special Events

 CCLC Trustees Conference, May 3 – 5, 2013, Lake Tahoe
 Grand Opening Math Science Nursing Building, May 10, 2013
Retiree Reception, May 15, 2013
Commencement, May 24, 2013

17. Correspondence

18. Board Meeting Evaluation – Hard when not all trustees here.

19. Adjournment
   M/s (O’Brien/Treanor) to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.
Community college boards lose power, stature as system changes

Trustees shape districts’ goals and review policies, but don’t have control over revenues
by Erica Perez and Kendall Taggart — March 18, 2013, 12:00 a.m

The local community college district structure is in some ways a vestige of a different California.

The Little Hoover Commission, an independent state oversight agency, noted in a February 2012 report that the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 transferred control over revenues from local elected community college boards of trustees to the state, stripping governing boards of what some say was their essential power.

Local districts don’t set student fees; the Legislature does.

And while students used to need a permit to attend a community college in another district, since 1988, they’ve been free to attend any college in the state they choose, raising questions about the need for district boundaries at all.

A quarter of community college students attended colleges outside of their district in fall 2010, and more than 100,000 — about 7 percent — attended classes in multiple districts at the same time, according to state data.

Community college trustees are entrusted with making sure the districts meet the needs of the community. They help shape the district’s goals, and they review policies, sometimes updating or changing them — all in consultation with stakeholders such as faculty, staff and students.

Perhaps the most significant power local trustees hold is to hire — or fire — the district chancellor, who in turn is entrusted with recommending district policies. Trustees have the authority to approve or reject these proposed policies.

Most districts hold elections every two years for contested trustee positions. They also ask local voters to approve bond measures for construction or parcel taxes for additional services or classes. The districts must reimburse counties for the cost of these races. From 2006 to 2011, districts paid more than $30 million to reimburse counties for the cost of trustee elections alone.

Election results show voters care less about community college board races than they do about other contests. In November 2010, the Contra Costa Community College District’s Governing Board had two contested seats. But in both races, more than a quarter of eligible voters — nearly 35,000 — who cast ballots in the election chose not to vote at all on a trustee.

In September, the Field Poll surveyed 1,183 registered voters at the request of California Watch and found that 78 percent had little or no knowledge about district board elections. And while 46 percent of respondents said they think there is some value in having locally elected boards overseeing college districts, 63 percent said the districts should be consolidated if it saves money.

Pomona resident Dane Griffith, 48, one of the respondents to the Field Poll, said the number of districts should be reduced. He wondered what power boards have to help someone like his 18-year-old daughter, who couldn’t get into a single class this fall at Mt. San Antonio College.

“If you (have) more boards, is it going to be more effective, or is it going to add more gridlock or more expense?” Griffith said.
In all but a handful of districts, governing board members receive a small stipend for their service, ranging from $100 per month at the Mendocino-Lake Community College District to $2,000 per month at the Los Angeles Community College District.

The better perks are the district-paid health and welfare benefits offered to trustees. In some cases, just the trustees are covered; in other cases, they get coverage for dependents.

All but two of the state’s 72 community college districts – Cabrillo and Feather River – offer such benefits, and 84 percent of eligible trustees accept them. And it adds up. In 2011, districts paid more than $7 million in stipends and benefits for trustees.

In some cases, trustees opt in to the district-paid benefits even though they have jobs in the private sector. California Watch reviewed 16 community college districts and found that 41 of the 88 trustees receiving district-paid benefits in 2011 had jobs elsewhere.

The Mt. San Antonio Community College District paid $30,000 for board member Fred Chyr’s benefits in 2011, even though he has a full-time job as an associate vice president and chief marketing officer at the University of La Verne, a private four-year university. Chyr declined to comment for this story.

In Gary L. Woods’ case, the professor at Pasadena City College doubles as a board member for the Citrus Community College District. Woods gets health benefits from both districts. Pasadena paid about $16,000 last year, and Citrus paid about $17,000.

People with two health benefits policies can coordinate them so they pay less for their co-pays, deductibles and other out-of-pocket expenses. Both college districts pay 100 percent of premiums, so the extra coverage does not cost Woods anything.

Woods, who earned $148,000 at Pasadena City College last year, could have turned down one of the policies to save one of the districts money, but he didn’t consider that.

"Why would I?" he said. "We put a lot of time in. I don’t see what’s wrong with the practice."

An orientation guide for new trustees published by the Community College League of California estimates that trustees spend between two and 10 hours per week on trustee duties, such as reading materials and attending meetings. The league is a nonprofit advocacy organization whose members include district trustees and CEOs.

At Pasadena City College, board members and employees who opt out of the district-paid benefits can receive cash instead. Trustees Linda Wah and Anthony Fellow received $3,500 and $5,500 in cash, respectively, on top of their stipends in 2011 instead of certain health insurance benefits.

The district’s general counsel, Gail S. Cooper, said the district has to offer the same benefits to all participants. And all district employees have the option to receive cash instead of benefits if they show proof of insurance elsewhere.

She said district officials do not believe, however, that they have to offer health benefits to attract qualified trustees.

"Our trustees serve because they are dedicated to public higher education and student success," she said in an email. "The dedication of the members of our Board of Trustees is not motivated by receipt of this modest benefit."
Until the 1990s, community college board members could receive lifetime district-paid benefits after they left the board. California law now prohibits this for board members elected after January 1995, but some districts still are paying benefits to a few retired board members who were grandfathered in.

In its February 2012 report, the Little Hoover Commission said it ultimately saw great value in the role of local boards to advocate for their communities, despite the erosion of local control over the years.

The commission advocated keeping local boards while creating a stronger, more independent California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to set priorities for the system. However, the commission also said college districts -- especially small ones -- could be more efficient if they combined administrative functions and coordinated more class offerings.

Advocates of local governing boards say the amount spent on trustee elections and salaries represents a tiny line item in the system's $10 billion budget. They also question whether a district could cater to its local communities as aptly without a board of trustees in that area.

Bill Elliott, president of the board of trustees for the Feather River Community College District in Quincy, wondered whether a Sacramento-based board of trustees would have seen the value in establishing the college's equine studies program.

"It's easier for us, I think, for us to do it and say this program makes sense for the mountain area. We have the right person, let's do it," Elliott said.

But Assemblyman Das Williams, D-Santa Barbara, chairman of the Assembly Higher Education Committee, said it's possible to have local decision-making even in a large area with diverse communities. He cited his local district, the Ventura County Community College District, as an example.

That district serves the majority of Ventura County -- roughly 1,900 square miles -- and includes very different communities, from Oxnard to Moorpark.

"Even though that's a very populous district, with three campuses and a couple satellite campuses, it is still very local decision-making," Williams said.

Jack Scott, former chancellor of the California Community Colleges, said it's unlikely the Legislature would ever eliminate locally elected boards. People would believe they were losing their right to elect local officials.

"Politically, if you were starting from scratch, how you would organize the governance of community colleges might be an open question," Scott said. "But to completely uproot the present system seems unlikely."

This story was edited by Mark Katches. It was copy edited by Nikki Frick and Christine Lee.
Thank you, David. This figure is large but as a portion of our overall budget it seems reasonable. However, with the cost of overall benefits impacting the District so profoundly over the next few years, it might be prudent to explore all viable options at the board level sooner than later.

Jim, please add this topic to the next Board agenda so that we can discuss what strategies we may wish to employ in the future should the need arise.

Thank you.

Stephanie O’Brien

m. 415.699.7041 f. 415.485.1192
THINKDOVETAIL.COM

Thinking That Moves Business Forward
CCLC 2013 Effective Trustee Workshop

January 25-27, 2013

Sacramento, CA

TRUSTEE REPORT

This annual event is an excellent environment in which to strengthen a person’s understanding of the complexities and importance of being a Community College Trustee. When I attended this conference last year, there was an enormous amount of information being provided, with little opportunity for digesting or putting in context. A year later, I came away from the conference with a renewed sense of purpose, deeper understanding of the various responsibilities, and ideas that may very well benefit our College.

The event began with an Introduction to Roles and Responsibilities session, specifically intended for new Trustees. Given this is my second year as a COM Trustee, I felt that I could benefit from attending this portion of the conference. However, with over fifty new Trustees participating in a rather small room, those of us who had already attended this segment of the training were asked to leave so the new Trustees could literally have a seat at the table!

The next morning was a session title Effective Trustee Workshop intended for all attendees (over 200 trustees, many Districts with their entire board present!) was a joint presentation by three teams of administrators, trustees and ACCJC staff. The key learning points were about what the Board is there to do for their District: define the WHAT, through effective board policy development, but not to DO. They reviewed the distinction of the “what”, through broad goals and expected outcomes, and the “how”, as developed by College staff and approved by the CEO. And the discussion regarding attention to the mission of the college, and making certain that the policies are moving the institution toward achieving the desired effectiveness to both achieve the mission and retain accreditation was pivotal to the presentation. By regularly asking ourselves “How effectively is our institution achieving its stated mission”, we will be able to consider plans for change in educational programs as we set institutional plans and goals, as well as annual and multiple year resources allocation plans (budgets).

I found it beneficial to review the importance of accreditation for our students and for the institution as a whole. The advice of making certain that the Trustees of a District focus on Mission-driven leadership, and set high expectations for performance of the Board and the institution was resonated with me. A Barbara Beno stated in her segment of the presentation, “Setting standards of excellent and measuring performance linked to the District’s goals will help meet both challenges. To perform well Trustees must be accountable as well as hold other accountable”.

Another key point was on Board Evaluation. This opportunity to establish goals and take corrective action is critical to the effectiveness of a Board. They reminded us that only the Board can regulate its members, and the critical nature of a code of ethics, with tangible policy to deal with dealing with
behaviors that violates the code. By recognizing and dealing with issues in a straightforward and ethical manner, the board can continually improve its ability to perform at the level that is expected by the community as a whole.

They also highlighted the importance of Trustee skill development on an on-going basis, which is a component of accreditation. Ongoing exposure to best practices within similar institutions can only help to improve our ability to serve. Accountability for effective stewardship in the areas of Educational Quality and Fiscal Stability resounded through the session.

The last presentation that I found to be of most value was the Role of Trustees and CEOs in Foundation Success. Fascinating statistics were presented on how to build a high performance organization, either within a College Advancement Program, or a separate Foundation, or (ideally) within a combination of the two. The most valuable take-away from the presentation was a comment by a CEO from a very high performing Foundation that noted “exciting programs begin with a strong and compelling vision laid out for the future, articulated in a way that engages the entire institution”.

I have copies of the session presentations for anyone who would like to receive them, along with some notes that I took during each session.
"Old" Joe Martin has other responsibilities besides his duties as president of the spring '48 student body. Yes, that's Joe helping Mr. Austin saw the "JUNIOR" out of our sign.

At our Rotary Club meeting, I mentioned our saving out the wood "JUNIOR" from our Marin Junior College sign in 1947. Here's a copy of that occasion.

Don Collie