

**San Jacinto College District Board Workshop  
March 6, 2017  
District Administration Building, Suite 201**

**MINUTES**

	<b>Board Workshop Attendees:</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> Marie Flickinger, Brad Hance, Dan Mims, John Moon, Jr., Keith Sinor, Dr. Ruede Wheeler, Larry Wilson <b>Chancellor:</b> Brenda Hellyer <b>Others:</b> Bruce Caldwell, Teri Crawford, Chet Lewis, Mandi Reiland
	<b>Agenda Item:</b>	<b>Discussion/Information</b>
<b>I.</b>	<b>Call the Meeting to Order</b>	<b>Workshop began at 4:46 p.m.</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Roll Call of Board Members</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> Dan Mims, Marie Flickinger, Brad Hance, John Moon, Jr., Keith Sinor, Dr. Ruede Wheeler, Larry Wilson
<b>III.</b>	<b>Adjournment to closed or executive session pursuant to Texas Government Code Section 551.072 of the Texas Open Meetings Act, for the following purposes: Real Estate</b>	Adjourned to closed session at 4:48 p.m.  Chet Lewis and Mandi Reiland were present for the executive session.  a. Real Estate - For the purpose of discussing the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property.
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Reconvene in Open Meeting</b>	Reconvened in open meeting at 5:24 p.m.
<b>V.</b>	<b>Update on Campus Carry Task Force Progress &amp; Policy/Procedure Review</b>	Chief Caldwell and Teri Crawford were present for this item.  Chet Lewis explained the background of the license to carry facts for Texas Senate Bill 11, which was enacted in 2015. He clarified the difference between open carry and concealed carry. Chet stated that the law allows colleges to designate specific locations on campus where handguns will not be allowed. The intent is that colleges will be as permissive and accessible as possible to handgun license holders. The law does not allow colleges to “generally prohibit” campus carry. Based

		<p>on the statements made by sponsors of the law, faculty offices, libraries and classrooms are not areas that were intended as gun exclusion zones.</p> <p>Chet gave an overview of the required signage. If the College places limits on certain areas, the College must give notice as described under Penal Code section 30.06.</p> <p>Brenda Hellyer explained that the law requires the governing board, no later than 90 days after the establishment of rules, to review, and the Board may amend or approve with 2/3 vote. Rules adopted must be widely distributed to students, staff, and faculty including prominently publishing the provisions on the College's website. The proposed reasonable rules, regulations, and other provisions were developed based on consultation with faculty, staff, students, and stakeholders.</p> <p>Chet explained that the Campus Carry Taskforce was led by Bruce Caldwell, Chief of Police. Chet Lewis, Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Affairs was the Strategic Leadership Team sponsor. The taskforce currently consists of 33 members which includes faculty, staff, administrators, and students.</p> <p>Dan Mims asked if every exclusion zone has to have justification. Chet said they all have to be justifiable.</p> <p>Larry Wilson shared his concern about placement and removal of signage. Based on the proposed procedures, temporary signage will need to be put up and taken down quickly. Chet answered that the proposed procedures allow for a verbal communication of temporary exclusion zones. Several Board members expressed their concerns about allowing verbal communications.</p> <p>Chet emphasized that any items the Board would like included in the policy need to be incorporated so the Board has total authority over those items. If the Board allows the Chancellor authority over certain items, those need to be included in the procedures, which the Board does not approve. Dan stated that he thinks that more of the details need to be in the policy to put the decision on the Board, rather than the Chancellor.</p> <p>Keith Sinor asked about the difference between the UT Austin and Texas A&amp;M policy and procedures. He has heard that UT Austin is stricter and Texas A&amp;M is not as strict. Chet</p>
--	--	--

		<p>explained that UT Austin puts less in the policy and more in the procedures. Texas A&amp;M include more in the policy and less in the procedures. Overall, they are similar.</p> <p>Dr. Ruede Wheeler asked about penalty for violators. Chief Caldwell explained the penalties are mandated by the State under the State Penal Code 30.06. Chet explained there could be additional disciplinary actions which will be included in the student and employee handbooks.</p> <p>Keith asked what the penalty is for a person carrying that does not have a license to carry. Chief Caldwell explained that the penalty would be a third degree felony.</p> <p>Chet stated that there will be training for employees that explains how to handle situations. An individual cannot be questioned about carrying except by a police officer. If a gun is seen on campus, campus police should be notified.</p> <p>Chet presented the proposed gun exclusion zones that are included in the proposed policy and procedures that were distributed to the Board.</p> <p>Dan Mims and John Moon, Jr. think there are so many exclusions that it may not meet the requirements of the legislature.</p> <p>Larry and John explained that the point of carrying is for a licensed carrier to be able to protect themselves. These procedures are limiting this significantly.</p> <p>Chet is concerned that there could be the possibility of discrimination for verbal notifications.</p> <p>Chairman Mims went through each procedure with the Board members. The following items are procedures they had comments and changes on.</p> <p>Several members were not comfortable with the verbal warning. John expressed concern that this would potentially result in legal issues. They all agreed that signage/written notice is needed for exclusion zones.</p> <p>Procedure No. 6: They would like the first reading presented without this procedure.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Procedure No. 13 regarding individual offices: They agree that verbal notification should not be allowed and signage is needed.</p> <p>Chet suggests the College have an application process for individual offices.</p> <p>Brenda asked if this is how the Board prefers that be handled.</p> <p>John asked if the College can have designated rooms reserved for meetings with students if there is cause for concern.</p> <p>Chet does not believe we can achieve this from a facilities standpoint.</p> <p>Brenda asked who on the task force had concerns about Procedure No. 13 regarding individual offices.</p> <p>Chet stated there were some concern from each of the staff, faculty, and administrator groups.</p> <p>Chet covered what other colleges are doing in regards to individual offices. UT Austin, Texas A&amp;M, Texas Southern University, and Lone Star College are allowing discretion. University of Houston is operating under demonstrated risk. Texas State, Texas Tech, and North Texas are not excluding.</p> <p>Procedure No. 15: Dan had issues with the wording use of “significant” in this procedure. The Board members would like this specified and defined throughout Procedure No. 15.</p> <p>Procedure No. 20: The members agreed this number be removed from the procedures.</p> <p>Procedure No. 22. They recommend that this should include appointed by Chancellor, chaired by the Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Affairs and the San Jac Police Chief. They recommend a two year term.</p> <p>The Board would like the majority of these procedures moved into the policy.</p> <p>The next steps are for the policy and procedures to be distributed to the College community for feedback prior to an anticipated first reading of the Campus Carry Policy at the April 10, 2017 Board of Trustees Meeting with an anticipated second reading in May 2017.</p>
--	--	--

<b>VI.</b>	<b>Review Policy on Policy and Procedure Development, Review, and Revisions</b>	<p>Brenda Hellyer covered the current foreword with the Board and explained that it is outdated. The purpose of the Policy on Policy and Procedure Development, Review, and Revisions is to define the process of policy and procedure development, review, revision, and rescission at San Jacinto College. Implementation of the process revisions will provide and clarify steps by providing a method by which employees or students may request changes to College policies. The intent is that the changes in process will improve transparency, encourage input, create a consistent and timely review cycle, and enhance user friendliness.</p> <p>The Board members had no questions or concerns on this item.</p>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Review of Board of Trustees Bylaws</b>	<p>Brenda Hellyer explained that she is working though the bylaws with legal counsel and will bring back updated bylaws for first and second readings in the next few months.</p> <p>Brenda specifically pointed out section 12 and 13 on hearing of citizens. Members discussed the time limits for citizens to speak and the best ways to ensure citizens are allowed to be heard without having the meeting agenda disrupted.</p> <p>Brenda recommended asking legal counsel on the best practices for community colleges and get recommendations from her.</p>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Review Chancellor’s Job Description</b>	This item was tabled.
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Update on May 2017 Board Election</b>	Brenda Hellyer gave an update on the candidates that will appear on the ballot for the 2017 Board of Trustees election. Rick Guerrero and Erica Davis Rouse are candidates for Position 1. Dr. Ruede Wheeler is the incumbent for Position 2.
<b>X.</b>	<b>Update on 85<sup>th</sup> Legislative Session</b>	This item was tabled.
<b>XI.</b>	<b>Review of Calendar</b>	Brenda Hellyer reviewed the calendar with the Board.
<b>XII.</b>	<b>General Discussion of Meeting Items</b>	There were no additional items discussed.
<b>XIII.</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>	Workshop adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

