CALL TO ORDER  9:00 a.m.

Members Present:  JoAnn Busenbark, Charles Meng, Steve Reinbolt, Tom Andrews, Brenda Knight, Michael Baldini, Bruce Ketron

Members Absent:  Student Trustee Chris Hagerman

Staff Present:  Dr. Chris McCarthy, Laura Ecklin, Susan Callahan

BOARD SELF-EVALUATION

Board policy B 2745: Board Self-Evaluation states that the “board is committed to assessing its own performance as a board in order to identify its strengths and areas in which it may improve its functioning.” Laura Ecklin, Dean, Human Resources was the facilitator of the retreat.

Laura Ecklin began the retreat by establishing ground rules for the day, including:

• One person speaks at a time
• Avoid and call repetition
• Stay on task
• Focus on issues, not personalities
• Listen with respect
• Seek to understand
• Avoid positions; stay open
• Avoid favorite solution
• Value all ideas
• Take breaks and timeouts
• Use the parking lot technique

The board adopted the ground rules developed at today’s session for all meetings of the board. These ground rules will be written up and distributed to board members.

Laura Ecklin also reviewed what the board agreed upon at its last retreat. The board re-committed to the following protocol from the 2006 retreat, with slight revision to use Robert’s Rules of Orders.

• Use appropriate elements of Robert’s Rules of Order (use a summary sheet for guidance and get appropriate training)
• Respect decisions the board reaches as a whole, even if you disagree or are in a minority
• It is a board member’s obligation to raise an issue or concern by bringing it to the attention of the board chair or college president
• Board members’ requests for agenda items should go to the college president or board chair
• College president or board chair will communicate to the board that an issue has been raised for discussion
• If trustees need more information to make a decision, they should move to table
• The board should agree as a whole when they will seek advice from the president
• Agreement that a subcommittee would work on this process.

2.1 Interest-Based Problem Solving Training
Laura Ecklin said that she completed her training in interest-based problem-solving at the Center for Collaborative Solutions. The board had expressed its interest in integrating the principles of interest-based problem-solving into its self-evaluation process, so prior to the self-evaluation, Ms. Ecklin presented the principles of interest-based problem-solving.

She explained that interest-based problem-solving is a process that includes: telling the story, identifying constituents and their interests, identifying the presenting problem/issue, brainstorming options, evaluating options, and committing to and evaluating a plan of action.

The benefits of the approach are that it identifies common interests, promotes trust, builds relationships. It is non-adversarial, and it produces more creative solutions. There is no commitment to a solution until everyone agrees. Agreement comes when you can support the solution, because it was reached fairly and openly. She said the process is effective in collective bargaining, problem-solving, conflict resolution, and goal-setting and action planning.

Guidelines for using consensus include: pay close attention to others; encourage participation; share information; don’t agree too quickly; don’t trade support; don’t vote; don’t seek to coerce; treat differences as a strength and an opportunity for greater understanding.

2.2 Identification of Accomplishments and Goals
Laura Ecklin shared some concepts for developing goals, objectives and action plans. Using materials for board self-evaluation as suggested by the California Community College League Trustee Handbook, the board reviewed nine areas of the board’s functioning (see below). The board evaluated its performance in light of the 2009 – 2010 Planning Priorities.

• Board Priorities and Planning
• Institutional Achievements
• Board Organization and Dynamics
• Board/Community Relations
• Board Agendas
• Board/CEO Relations
• Board/College Relations
• Decision-Making Processes
• Trustee Education and Development

The board discussed its strengths and weaknesses in each of the above areas. Focusing on the “challenges,” various themes emerged, as well as some plans to address the themes by further training and workshops, as noted below.
2.3 **Review of Board of Trustees Responsibilities Set Forth in Accreditation Standard IV. B.1** (from addendum to the meeting)

Charles Meng conducted a review of Accreditation Standard IV.B.1 for compliance, including compliance with each sub-standard.

Mr. Meng explained that the accreditation standards need to be part of the board’s self-evaluation. He said that accreditation standard IV B.1 that concerns the board has been drafted and will be posted on the website. He said that, if there are any deficiencies, based on the board’s discussion, the board would address them during the spring semester.

Mr. Meng walked the board through Accreditation Standard IV B.1, noting where the board meets the standard as well as any areas that the board needed to address. He stated that the board’s by-laws have been reviewed and met the standard, based on some revisions and updates the board made at its October meeting. He said there were a small number of additions/changes that would be made this spring that are currently in progress including:

- a) the board Self-Evaluation policy (BP 2745) should be revised to reflect an evaluation interval;
- b) the administrative regulations for the Board Self-Evaluation process (AP 2745) should more clearly define the process;
- c) the Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice Policy should have the bullets that were part of the old policy included in the new policy to add specificity, as there is no duplication in the policy the board adopted in October, 2008; and
- d) the CEO Evaluation process should be added (AP 2435) to clearly spell out in more detail the process that is used to evaluate the CEO.

All of the above four items will be addressed this spring, probably at the April board meeting.

The board also discussed the use of Robert’s Rules of Order for its meetings, noting that the board is using a slightly modified version of Robert’s Rules of Order (discussion of an agenda item precedes the motions). Mr. Meng stressed the importance of the board’s focusing on educational quality and ways to strengthen its involvement in that area. He noted the board’s involvement in program and course changes and additions and program review as examples of the board’s involvement.

In a “check-out” at the end of the meeting, the board noted its appreciation of the facilitation provided by Laura Ecklin and the participation by Dr. McCarthy. Sticking to the ground
rules also worked well, as did the willingness of the entire board to participate and the opportunity to prepare for the meeting. Trustees suggested adding time limits for discussion to improve the process.

3.0  REVISION OF BOARD POLICY 2715:  CODE OF ETHICS/STANDARDS OF PRACTICE
The board adopted this policy from our Policy and Procedure Service and subsequently added a required statement regarding violations of the code of ethics. A number of board members have expressed interest in retaining a portion of the former Napa Valley College policy. The board will address this revision at the April board meeting.