

**Minutes of the Board of Trustees Retreat
San Mateo County Community College District
November 16, 2013, San Mateo, CA
Half Moon Bay, CA**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present: President Karen Schwarz, Vice President Patricia Miljanich, Trustee Richard Holober, Trustee Dave Mandelkern

Others Present: Chancellor Ron Galatolo

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

BOARD AND CEO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Dr. Jerome Hunter, retreat facilitator, discussed the ground rules, anticipated outcomes and the role of the facilitator.

A discussion of the Board role and the Board and CEO partnership was held utilizing the Community College League of California Trustee Handbook and *Different Jobs, Different Tasks: Board and CEO Roles and Responsibilities*. A variety of other sources were also used to discuss characteristics of successful teams. The discussion then moved to identifying areas of strength and areas for improvement with respect to the Board/CEO partnership. It was pointed out that a review of the Board Self-Evaluation, all three College accreditation self-studies and interviews with each Board member identified no significant areas for improvement.

Some modifications to current practices which were thought to have the potential to improve communications between Board members, between the Chancellor and the Board, and between the Board and the staff are identified below:

1. "Unique issues" which are brought forward for Board approval should be accompanied by greater supporting documentation and increased time for review when possible.
2. Consideration should be given to structuring the Board discussion of items in such a way that the Board can deliberate without interference while allowing for responses, corrections, and clarification from the Chancellor or all constituents at an appropriate time.
3. In order to insure that all Board members have access to the same information, the Chancellor, at his discretion, will consider "reply all" when responding to questions or inquiries from individual Board members.
4. Request for responses to inquiries from constituents to Board members, i.e. parking issues, will continue to be directed to the Chancellor. The Chancellor, at his discretion, may choose to involve appropriate staff in a direct response to the Board.
5. Communication to constituents that result from a Board member inquiry will acknowledge the role of the Board member in the response.
6. The District may wish to consider a protocol for campus and staff presentations to the Board. The protocol would focus on brevity and allowing the Board an opportunity for questions and comments, especially for Board study sessions.
7. The Board may wish to clarify the policy or practice that requires a majority of the Board to give direction to staff.
8. The Board also discussed the benefits of a workshop on the "Brown Act".
9. With respect to responding to inquiries from the press, the policy or practice requires further clarification.
10. Board members discussed the possibility of altering the nature of their "comments" and "study sessions" to focus on issues of greater substance.

Two specific prior actions of the Board – the process for establishing district elections and the process for selection of a Board member replacement – were discussed.

Referring to the resource documents and discussions with the trustee organization consultants, Dr. Hunter suggested that any actions of the Board that will require direct contact with vendors and directions to staff should include the Chancellor. If a Board member believes that the Chancellor should not be involved, he/she should be able to provide a reasonable response about why he should not be involved.

In anticipation of the need to establish a process for moving to the election of Board members by districts, the possibility of establishing a new committee of the Board to work with the Chancellor was discussed. A review of best practices used by other community colleges was mentioned as also being of benefit to the new committee.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at approximately 2:00 p.m.