City College of San Francisco

5. Approval of the Meeting Minutes for February 23, 2022: There was a motion to approve the minutes as presented (Richardson/Hanson).

Public comment on this item was made by the following:

1. Harry Bernstein – Questioned lack of detail for public comment sections in prior minutes.

Member Hanson agreed that for public comments, the minutes should state what the person has said.

Chair Thomas said he would reach out to staff to ensure we have a more robust accounting of public comment for future meetings.

Ms. Kennedy noted Brown Act does not require a certain level of detail. That is left up to the direction of the committee. If the committee would like to see more detail, the minutes can reflect that.

Chair Thomas opened the floor to the committee to dialog on the level of detail for public comments in the meeting minutes.

Member Richardson said she would like Chair Thomas to meet with staff.

Member Hanson said she would like to see some reference to the content of what the public is speaking to in the minutes.

Member Tang said he would like to see the committee minutes be in line with the standard of other public meetings such as the Board of Trustees.

Chair Thomas would like this committee's minutes to be in line with what the District is doing, as well. So, moving forward, the committee will align the minutes to reflect the District standard practice. He will come back to the next meeting with a summary on that.

There was a motion to adopt the minutes as presented (Tang/Hanson). The minutes were approved via roll call vote.

Ayes: Thomas, Gallegos, Galvez, Hanson, Kelly, Lampkins-Jones, Richardson, Tang, Zou (9)

Nays: 0
Abstentions: 0

- **6. Updates from the Chair:** Chair Thomas thanked the committee for attending today.
 - a. Communications Received via Website Portal Mr. Scogin read a comment submitted on the website. Written comment submitted by Ms. Leslie Simon:

"My concern with the recent draft report from the bond oversight committee is that it shows the Gough Street Relocation, and the police and Dean's move are being paid for by the bond when they weren't on the project list. It even names those expenses as projects. Also, the report completely leaves out the audit finding of \$136,000 of bond spending going for illegitimate administrator salaries. Is City College misusing bond money? Will the Performing Arts & E

issue.

Vice Chancellor al-Amin agreed and went on to state that the only reason why it's reflected in the 2020-2021 report is because the auditor reports point out any prior year findings to verify whether they are carry-over findings, or if they have been resolved, and so in this year's report for 2020-2021 the item has been noted as

9. Review & Approval of the Draft Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Annual Report:

Chair Thomas thanked Vice Chair Kelly, Member Tang and the chair of this working group, Member Zou. Member Zou thanked the team for their work on getting the first draft of the report ready, noting there were already edits and additions to include. He explained the process the working group took in the development of the draft report. He then reviewed the draft report with the committee through page 19. Mr. Scogin then took over to highlight the financial section. He noted the data for the expenditures page came directly from the 2020 audit. He reviewed the expenditures page, noting the Prop A 2001 \$76K showing overspent was corrected in 2021. He also reviewed the Project List, noting it mirrored the past omnibus report. Member Zou resumed the review of the rest of the report. Chair Thomas thanked them and opened the floor for member comments.

Member Richardson stated that the report was easy to read and was a thorough and clean report. She would like to have hard copies sent to the members once finalized.

Member Hanson thanked the working group. She would like to see the compliance opinion come as a standalone page. Addressing the Projects page, she found it confusing. She would like it to be broken up and changed, like was done on the last 3-year report.

Member Gallegos stated that the report was beautiful. He pointed out a missing dash in the red banner on page 23, between the 19 and the 20, so it doesn't look like 1920.

Chair Thomas thanked everyone for their comm2.7 (r6 Twe2.7s8onf (e)TJha)4.4 (i)2.3 (r)2.7 (T)2 (ts7 (see t)-1.7 m)1.1 (

Ms. Kennedy c

Member Richardson indicated the reports should be accepted and any discussion can be had at the next meeting.

Member Hanson agreed that it would be good to read the reports and be prepared for updates at the next meeting.

There was a motion to receive and file Items 10 and 11 without presentation. (Richardson/Lampkins-Jones). The motion was approved via roll call vote.

Ayes: Thomas, Kelly, Gallegos, Galvez, Hanson, Lampkins-Jones, Richardson, Tang, Zou (9) Nays: 0