

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, June 24, 2014, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (co-chair), Dr. Vann Priest, Henry Gee, Sheila Lynch, John Frala, Dianna Reyes, Dr. Adam Wetsman, Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad, Suzanne Frederickson, René Tai, Kathy Pudelko, Julius B. Thomas, Katie O'Brien

Members Absent: Phil Luebben, Robert Bethel, Brian Brutlag, Don Mason, Sandra Rivera

Staff Members Present: Howard Kummerman, Reneé Gallegos (Recorder)

- I. Call to Order – Dr. Pierson called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.
- II. Co-Chair's Report – Dr. Pierson reported that this is a transitional meeting this summer. Dr. Vann Priest is taking over as President of Academic Senate and co-chair of PFC. We have some of the new members from Senate Exec present, and a few guests, including Jim Poper and Gary Van Voorhis, who will present on Facilities and IT Resource Requests. An update on Classified Staffing will also be presented on behalf of President Dreyfuss, who is unable to attend today. Dr. Pierson thanked everyone for being here.

Dr. Priest stated that this is his first time on PFC. He has never had the opportunity to serve because of his teaching schedule. He is looking forward to a productive year.

Dr. Pierson reported that there are two sets of minutes presented for acceptance. He also reported that PFC reviewed two APs that were sent out electronically on June 3 and 4, 2014. We digitally reviewed AP 7345, "Catastrophic Leave" and AP 5040, "Student Records." We want to have a mechanism in place for the purposes of recording that activity. Today's minutes will reflect that we consensed upon both APs electronically. These two will be added to the list of PFC accomplishments for the 2014-15 year.

- **BP & AP Review**

Listed below are the Administrative Procedures reviewed:

AP 7345, "Catastrophic Leave" – [Consensus reached electronically and reported out June 24, 2014.](#)

AP 5040, "Student Records" – [Consensus reached electronically and reported out June 24, 2014.](#)

- III. Acceptance of Minutes – May 6 and May 13, 2014
(2 items) **[click link below to access documents:](#)**

May 6, 2014 – Consensus reached.
http://www.flipdocs.com/showbook.aspx?ID=10006268_218834

May 13, 2014 – Consensus reached.
http://www.flipdocs.com/showbook.aspx?ID=10006268_956166

- IV. Superintendent/President's Report – Dr. Pierson will report on the Classified Staffing on behalf of President Dreyfuss who is off campus this afternoon.
- V. New Business
 - Review of Institutional Goals & Objectives

(1 item) **click link below to access documents:**
http://www.flipdocs.com/showbook.aspx?ID=10006268_221622

Howard Kummerman gave an overview of the changes on institutional goals and objectives that are noted in red on the attached document. Howard and Lydia Gonzalez worked to clarify portions within the document from comments received at the Leadership Retreat in April and the Summer IEC meeting. "Owners" of ideas were identified within the document, so we know who is responsible for work that needs to be done on each objective/goal.

Discussion ensued regarding I.c and the work of the Distance Education Committee (DEC). It was clarified that the DEC will research best practices. Institutional Research and Planning will conduct requested research.

Goal 1.a. - It was suggested to remove Goal 1.a because the institution has reached that goal (increasing the number of AD-T degrees to 17 degrees, since 19 have been created). Howard reported that the Board of Trustees asked for a list that shows the goals and accomplishments and which ones we have reached. He will create a separate document for this purpose.

Goal I.f - Service Learning and Grants - Members suggested revision to the language about using data to develop the program, specifically to use the word "incorporate" instead of "develop."

Goal II.e – The question was asked, "How do we track CTE students?" Howard clarified that we are being pressed to provide more information and data by the Department of Education. It is difficult to track students after they leave us, as we have no mechanism in place to track students unless they tell us where they end up. There is a clearinghouse tracker, but that data is not reliable, nor is it shared with the College.

Goal VI – John Frala questioned the statement, "The College will respond to workforce needs." John asked where the data is being pulled from because the WIBs have changed. Howard responded that data will be pulled from participating partners, occupational needs survey data, and the process for evaluating activities. None of the questions ask for specific workforce data.

Goal VII.d and e – Howard reported that we removed the two lines about the RHC Foundation. Both are related to goals that the College wants to charge the Foundation with. In fact, the Foundation is its own entity with its own goals and objectives, so it is really not appropriate to have this goal in the document. Howard reported that the IEC talked about how the College supports the Foundation. Howard will come up with language to plug in here.

Goal VII.c – It was suggested that this goal should be rewritten to say, "The College will ensure the annual restricted general funds, including grants and categorical funds, have a balanced budget."

Goal VII.d - The language regarding the Office of Grant Management and Development is that Grants should have a goal of \$10 million per year. We have submitted 12 grants this past year, according to Dr. Pierson. There is a challenge if we put a dollar amount as a range. It is an

ongoing aspiration; without a goal, it would be a meaningless statement. We can strike the wording if that is the desire of the group. It was suggested that we should at least reference an amount perhaps in relation to what the average the Grants Office is producing each year. Dr. Pierson responded that it is difficult to guesstimate a number and would need to confer with the interim Director of Grants. Howard recommends and consensus was received to strike the language and revisit it next year in the form of a new, well thought out objective.

Goal VIII – It was stated that we don't train and support the classified staff, they are just evaluated. Howard reported that the notes from the table group felt that there was too much language, so they minimized it. Katie O'Brien was asked if she could recall the conversation. Katie stated that this was speaking to the training for faculty. Training for classified is a little different than for faculty. "RHC will recruit, hire, develop, retain, train and support highly qualified and diverse administrators, faculty, and classified staff" is the way the goal should read.

Howard will construct some language after hearing the feedback from today's discussion regarding a representative sample of those surveyed in regards to Staff Development activities.

Goal X.f – To be consistent, it was recommended to increase the number of remote day parking permit dispensers. We currently have three. Jim Poper reported that there is discussion about adding one more unit. The question was asked, "Will one achieve this objective?" Jim responded that the dispensers are expensive. "What is the return on investment?" John Frala responded that within the first four weeks of operation, we collected \$3,000 in fees. There was also a reduction in the line at the parking booth. It is more convenient and efficient to have parking permit dispensers.

- Resource Allocations 2014-1015 Planning Year
- Classified Staffing – There were 11 classified positions ranked this year through the planning process. Dr. Pierson reported for President Dreyfuss, that we plan to hire the number one ranked classified position, which is a full-time Custodian. No further comments were made.
- Facilities Requests – Jim Poper provided a brief overview on the Facilities resource requests and provided a handout. Many items were funded by the Bond, and some will be addressed as part of deferred maintenance. Classroom upgrades will be taken into consideration as building modernizations occur in future planning processes, specifically with the Administration building.

The group questioned Dr. Pierson regarding maintenance of buildings, especially with the Accreditation site team visit coming this fall. It was suggested to have a "spruce up" of the campus prior to the Site Team visit.

Suzanne Frederickson questioned how long it was going to be before the water fountains in the Student Service Building were repaired. We were told there was a leaky pipe. Jim Poper was not aware and will investigate this item.

Dr. Wetsman stated that he would like to double down on what René Tai stated that the paint situation is horrible. The Science and the Administration building hallway walls are in terrible shape, and these are key learning environments. If we have facilities that are clean, that leads to a conducive learning environment for students. Adam knows it costs money and presents special difficulty in maintaining restrooms, etc. Adam conducted a peer review in the fall and sat in a classroom. He thought to himself that this place is a dump. In his division, they have gotten rid of some old equipment and the aesthetics have improved. We need to do maintenance painting that would greatly improve the look of the campus. A fresh coat of paint goes a long way.

Kathy Pudelko reported if a hallway is considered “No man’s land,” do we need a small committee to come up with suggestions that need sprucing up in general? Adam is correct in saying the difference in how our students behave in a new environment (such as in the new P.E. Complex) is amazing. You can visibly see the change in KDA students. Jim Poper will bring this idea forward to President Dreyfuss.

The question was posed, “If there is an automatic renewal for computers why don’t we have this for facilities maintenance like painting and carpeting?” Jim Poper responded that there is only so much in the budget. The Facilities budget is decimated yearly because of unexpected emergency repairs.

Dr. Pierson reported that the list developed by a “No man’s land” committee should be cross-referenced with program plans. Faculty who are involved in program planning can certainly be more specific and include these types of general requests throughout the process. Dianna Reyes stated that if there is a committee that is neutral, they can find the worst areas and rank accordingly.

John Frala reported that before the last Accreditation visit the campus sponsored a contest for appearance and safety issues, and a pizza lunch was the prize. Howard Kummerman stated that the Facilities Committee could take up this charge since that is an existing committee. Jim Poper was to report back at the August 26th PFC meeting.

- IT Requests – Gary Van Voorhis reported on the technology items that came out of the annual Planning process. On the spreadsheet, the “Y” represents “yes” for those requests that were funded, and the second line explains the funding source. Gary also explained that there is a funding source for the Learning Resource Center that can be used for the purchase of technology prior to December 2014. The list is organized by the least expensive to most expensive items.

Howard added that these requests came through the planning process and shared at the Institutional Planning Retreat in April. The Facilities and Technology Committees met and decided what requests to move forward.

Dr. Wetsman asked whether the new state budget has been signed yet? He believes there is \$100 million budgeted for technology. Gary was asked whether he knew what that is earmarked for. Gary is not aware of those funds and, to his knowledge, the budget was not yet signed. Dr. Munoz stated that some of that \$100 million may be tied to statewide initiatives, which is not funding that is necessarily coming to community college campuses.

Sheila Lynch questioned the differences in costs. Who reviews the actuals costs of purchases? Some are estimates. Are those numbers verified when they go through the purchasing process?

Dr. Pierson elaborated on the planning process. Research should be done on costs and included in the plans, all the way down to the program plan level. It slows the VPAA, as area plan manager, when there are ballpark estimates and cost estimates are not concise. A case in point was with the equipment request for new wrestling mats. Dean Hebert did the leg work right down to the vendor and included shipping costs. This expedited the resource request. The better job that you can do at the program level, the better it assists everyone throughout the process as plans move forward. There are various other constraints in the purchasing process that Dr. Pierson did not go into. No further comments were made.

- AP & BP Review

Attached are Board Policies / Administrative Procedures that have been revised (1 item) [click link below to access documents](#).

- AP 3435 Discrimination and Harassment*
http://www.flipdocs.com/showbook.aspx?ID=10006268_790562
- AP 3435 Discrimination and Harassment (CCLC's version)
http://www.flipdocs.com/showbook.aspx?ID=10006268_449492

VPAA reviewed the history and read this paragraph.

*AP ~~7353~~ 3435 was reviewed at PFC on February 4 25, 2014. It was returned after incorporating VPAA's edits and adding "ethnicity" in the paragraphs. Dr. Pierson reported that Drs. Foster, Wetsman and he subsequently collaborated as a subcommittee and noted vast changes to this AP, which had been recommended by Academic Senate. VPAA wanted to take more time to review this AP with Drs. Foster and Wetsman, so the sub-committee on AP 3435 reconvened. The attached AP was reviewed by the PFC subcommittee.

Dr. Pierson reported that "Veteran status" that should be placed in all the APs for consistency. The AP document was relatively short in the beginning but then grew to become very expansive after Academic Senate reviewed the AP. There was some consideration from the subcommittee to look at section XX on Academic Freedom (new language highlighted in purple). Section XX is a longer proposed paragraph that summarizes Rio Hondo's tenets of Academic Freedom. Drs. Foster, Wetsman, and Pierson met, and, instead of repeating all existing language about Academic Freedom, decided to provide a brief statement within section XX that says simply that the College reaffirms Academic Freedom, with a direct reference to BP 4030. That way AP 3435 would not be held up as a result of BP 4030.

The new AP 3435 document lists all sources, proposed Senate language, recommendations from CCLC which we subscribe to, and language from the Office of Civil Rights, which has a model policy on discrimination and harassment. That is a separate document that we incorporated language into the final document before PFC today. It was a challenge pulling information from three references and trying to be true to our original document. Pierson stated he believes that it spells out the definitions and specific language and helps to clarify some of the language that was ambiguous. It's not perfect, but a vast improvement over the document that was presented to PFC in February.

Dr. Wetsman reported that he is not comfortable with the Academic Freedom section (XX) as it is right now because he was a victim of the unlawful application of this process in the past. The charge that was leveled against him for unlawful discrimination was based upon comments that were made on a web site in regard to the College's governance structure, budget, and other related matters. He would like to see some explicit protections in this AP that says that Academic Freedom covers those kinds of things, as well, so that in the future this can't be used as a device to go after union faculty and staff leaders. He would like to see more explicit topics covered in the Academic Freedom section. He knows we have a reference to BP 4030 but thinks we need to go a little further because of what has happened in the past.

Dr. Pierson stated that he was more than a little perplexed by Dr. Wetsman's statement because Dr. Wetsman had sat on the sub-committee, which had agreed to return the revised language to PFC. It was Dr. Pierson's understanding that Dr. Wetsman was in agreement with the proposed revisions.

Dr. Wetsman responded after further consideration and reflection, he had changed his mind. He said he believes that there should be explicit protections about what is included under Academic Freedom because this really only references classroom time and those kinds of things. It does not reference the other things that involve Academic Freedom that appellate courts say constitute Academic Freedom. He would really like to see something in this AP related to that.

Dr. Foster responded that he didn't think this document was intended to define Academic Freedom. He thinks that is what BP 4030 was intended to do. He suggested that is where the specific definition and language should go, not specific to this document because Academic Freedom is defined by BP 4030.

Dr. Wetsman countered yes, he would agree with that under normal circumstances that would suffice, but in the past this was used against him in an unlawful manner supported by College Administration and the Board of Trustees, who went after union leaders for comments related to budget and governance structures. To have that added protection in there explicitly, he believes, would go a long way to making people feel comfortable about this procedure.

Dr. Foster stated that in our existing procedure, there is no language about Academic Freedom, so he believed this was an attempt to provide some clarity. Dr. Foster read directly from the paragraph aloud:

“When investigating unlawful discrimination or harassment complaints containing issues of academic freedom, the District will consult with a faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate with respect to contemporary practices and standards for course content and delivery.”

This language speaks to that and clarifies, which is helpful because we did not have this language previously. This tries to get at the missing pieces that were not spelled out before.

Kathy Pudelko stated that she believes that Dr. Wetsman has a valid point and we should also include the electronic age in this language as it is now part of our daily lives.

Dr. Foster reported that one thing he mentioned is that many of these changes reflect the Chancellor's Office Model Policy that we were actually asked to incorporate and approve as our new policy for the College by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR). In 2012, we received a notification from a student regarding a discrimination complaint filed with the OCR. That investigation determined that there was no violation on behalf of the institution. However, anytime the OCR is investigating, they have access to everything, including all of our policies, procedures, and practices. This has opened the door for the OCR to say they have looked over our policies and procedures and they need to change. There was a formal agreement by the College and the OCR that we would adopt the Chancellor's Office Model Policy on discrimination and harassment procedures. This was back in 2012 when we were supposed to do this. We are now in 2014 and, at some point, the OCR is going to draw the line. The College has had ample time to revise the policy and has not complied. Dr. Foster appreciates what Dr. Wetsman is saying but added, the revision is not perfect but it is much improved over what we had. Dr. Foster wanted to make sure that everyone in this room understood that there may be other implications here if we don't have an adopted policy in place to show the OCR, although he didn't know precisely what the repercussions may be.

Julius B. Thomas responded that it seems that if we have to comply with the OCR. However, speaking to Adam's point, the policy should be as inclusive as humanly possible so that when we take it back to OCR, we can explain that is what took so long—we wanted to be inclusive to ensure the procedure was comprehensive enough to cover everything.

Kathy Pudelko responded that Dr. Foster made the point that the OCR looked at everything on the planet, and this policy should include everything, including electronic means. With that in mind, should we include website, email, etc., because that is what we live and work in today?

Dr. Pierson asked if members are suggesting a language change?

Kathy responded it may be something along those lines, although she is not sure what. It looks like we need to add a little bit more language. She is not saying there has to be a complete rewrite.

Julius proposed that Dr. Foster have the OCR look at the AP and say we had discussion of our committee, that includes all of our constituents, and we want to include a comprehensive list that will allow us to be strong enough as an institution that would cover everything.

Dr. Foster responded that is a great point. He will speak to the OCR on that. However, through this whole process, the OCR has been reviewing our progress. The document before PFC has been reviewed by OCR, which has approved this language. The OCR also wants to ensure that the College does not approve something that is not accurate, causing us to come back and revise. Dr. Foster said the OCR is okay with the procedure as it is presented before us here today in AP 3435.

Dr. Munoz reported that he believes that Dr. Foster answered his point of clarification. Just like CCLC, which gives us model language, has that model language already been given to us and is that already included in this draft? If they have vetted and approved it, then we have met the threshold that we are required to meet by OCR standards. To speak to Dr. Wetsman's point, if there are still concerns about ambiguity in terms of what is or not included in Academic Freedom, we can address the BP separately so we don't hold up this AP. We can approve this one, which meets OCR's threshold. It would make the most sense to be able to move the AP forward.

Dr. Pierson stated that this had been the role of the sub-committee.

Dr. Priest reported that last September, the Senate moved to revise BP 4030, "Academic Freedom," and sent revisions forward through the review process. He is not sure if PFC ever saw that revision, but there was suggested language for BP 4030. Being Senate President now, he feels it's fairly certain that this matter can be on the Senate agenda in September.

Sheila Lynch reported that Dr. Munoz's point is well taken. If we have met the threshold that Dr. Foster speaks to and we have done our due diligence, she is always amused at the reluctance to waste a little more ink. What is wrong with putting a little more verbiage in there if there is any question about ambiguity. Even a quote from BP 4030 or something to that effect which helps that from being so ambiguous. It's not like we are going to print out 100,000 copies, so there is no harm.

Dr. Pierson stated that he thinks it is common practice to reference a BP or an AP in the body of another. When you start trying to reiterate or synthesize what is in BP 4030, in this context and something does change, then we are at a point when conceivably we have BPs and APs that are not going through the same review cycle. If this was the purpose of this section to restate BP 4030 instead of reaffirming the language, then he would agree. Dr. Pierson made a point in sharing the previous version with Dr. Priest so he would be aware of the changes. It was summary, not a word for word quotation, so in Dr. Pierson's opinion that caused more confusion. We should have added a definition of the language, and then it would have avoided all the confusion.

Julius responded that if Academic Senate is taking up BP 4030, is there something that has to be written in it? It sounds like BP 4030 needs to be strengthened. If this BP is revised, is this AP still viable? That is the question he is asking.

Dr. Pierson responded that BP 4030 exists.

Kathy Pudelko reported that we have to get up to speed with being in the year 2014. The Internet is alive and well. As we are all aware, there are times when we put something up online or on a website. Sometimes these things can come back to haunt us. This needs to be considered as part of our protection, such as when we were young and may have done something that was dumb and it has gotten taken out of context. This is not going to be an end-all protection. Anything we put out there is there forever.

Dianna Reyes stated that she understands that the three subcommittee members have met. She knows there was an agreement. In looking at Adam, she is sure it was not easy to step back and have a change of heart. It makes perfect sense because he is looking at it through his experience, and any one of us could have gone through that experience. So that is not an easy thing to do and reintroduce.

Dr. Pierson reported that whatever revisions are made to the BP remain in the BP. Whatever becomes of BP 4030 is what is affirmed here in the AP. Any last comments?

Dr. Wetsman responded that he does not consent on this AP. Because of the lack of those key areas, because of the history, and because it was not included in BP 4030 then or now, he cannot in good conscience consent. Faculty need to have protections, especially in light of the Board revisiting ethics and policies again that will have disciplinary implications for that. He said he doesn't feel comfortable with this language. If we update BP 4030 to include some of the protections that were mentioned and we revisit this, it would make him feel more comfortable. Or if we put those protections into this AP, that would make him feel more comfortable. This was used once to go after faculty in an unlawful manner who were just making comments on governance and budget issues.

Dr. Pierson stated, "So, no consensus. What is your pleasure? Subcommittee? Or wait until BP 4030 is worked on?"

Dr. Foster stated just a note of caution that, until a new policy is approved, we are working under the existing procedure which has no reference to Academic Freedom at all. The OCR is still an issue for us. Again, the agreement was signed in January 2013, and the expectation was that we would have this completed in 60 days. Obviously, that did not occur. However, Dr. Foster has been very good in keeping the OCR informed and been very up front about where the District is in its progress. But he warned that, at some point, the OCR is going to say, "Hey what is going on here."

Dr. Munoz asked if there any way that we can do a conditional approval to say that because of the issues here that we face with OCR, we will go ahead and approve this AP pending Academic Senate taking up BP 4030 to address the issues that Dr. Wetsman brought forward. Dr. Munoz said he believes that Dr. Foster makes a good point, and by holding off on approving this, we are operating under the existing language that really has no protections at all. Even the OCR has said that the current language before us in this AP document meets the threshold.

John Frala reported that AP 3435 has not been updated since March 2006.

Dr. Pierson stated that he is not aware of any conditional use of approval. He does not think that has been done before.

Dr. Munoz responded that he is not sure if he phrased it correctly. Conditional approval with a clause or directive that says there would be follow-up.

Dr. Pierson reported that if we do not reach consensus on AP 3435, we have to determine what we want as our next step, so what will it be?

Dr. Munoz asked whether PFC was going to do a vote for consensus?

Dr. Pierson responded that Dr. Wetsman has clearly stated that he does not consent.

Dr. Munoz thought that consensus does not require a unanimous agreement. It means that we reach consensus, and that was the purpose of the minority report. We have a group of people who disagree.

Dr. Pierson responded that the minority report is in relation to communicating to the Board through the Superintendent/President.

Dr. Munoz reported that consensus doesn't mean unanimous, it means that we agree to move forward with the majority.

Dr. Pierson read aloud page 6 of the 2011-2012 *PFC Handbook*.

“In the event PFC cannot reach consensus or cannot support a recommendation, PFC will generate a written report reflecting reason(s) for not reaching consensus. This report will be forwarded to the Superintendent/President and Board of Trustees.”

He said, this is the means to communicate if we cannot reach consensus. To date we have never done this.

Dr. Munoz responded that this is the recommendation that came out of subcommittee, so if we do not reach consensus, then we write a report and these are the reasons why. Is that what is happening, we write a report to the Board because we did not have consensus?

Sheila Lynch responded, “Yes, it is the minority.”

Dr. Wetsman reported that it is his understanding that there are several options here:

- a.) We can postpone until we revise BP 4030.
- b.) We can forward this AP to the Board showing the concerns on both sides and they make a decision, although he doesn't know how the Board makes a decision on an AP, so that in itself is kind of ambiguous.
- c.) Third option is to send the AP back to subcommittee for review.

Dr. Wetsman's recommendation was just to wait until we see what happens with BP 4030. It is only a couple of months away when Senate can meet, and then we can go forward with that. Any of these options or any others is fine with him.

Dr. Munoz posed the question to Dr. Foster, “What are the implications for us if we do not move this forward? Did the OCR give you any specific deadline?”

Dr. Foster read directly from the correspondence from the OCR:

“The College understands and acknowledges that OCR may initiate administrative enforcement or judicial proceedings to enforce the specific terms and obligations of this Agreement. Before initiating administrative enforcement (34 C.F.R. §§100.9, 100.10), or judicial proceedings to enforce this Agreement, OCR shall give the College written notice of the alleged breach and a minimum of sixty (60) calendar days to cure the alleged breach.”

We have not received any notice of a breach as of yet, but that doesn't mean we won't.

Dr. Pierson responded that this has been a lengthy work-in-progress. This has been a long standing document that we have been working on for almost two years, even behind the scenes even before it came forward to PFC. He couldn't speak for the actions the OCR might take.

Dianna Reyes responded that a person can sit on something and be a part of the process and now Adam had reflected and had the courage to say that he is not comfortable with this AP.

VP Gee offered a statement. He just wanted to say that the proposed AP is something that is right for our College. He is being respectful of Adam's reflection and perceptions of what happened in the past. There is more than one perception and perspective about what happened during that time since he was a person who was interviewed during that entire process. He would suggest that even though it is only a couple of months away and we have a meeting of Academic Senate, what if it doesn't happen right away? What if the Academic Senate meets in September and we go through the process and that takes awhile? Remember it was not faculty or staff that filed the grievance against the College. It was a student who went to the OCR. It's about students, college students first, and foremost their rights should be protected. And he does want to respect people's right to be protected. Our obligation is to protect students first, and right now the current procedure does not protect anybody. That is the key—faculty, staff, or students—so we have to pass something because it is imperative among this group, a governing group, to say we want to protect our students, faculty, and staff, and that is what this does. Having said that, what the caveat is moving forward is that we have an expectation that the Senate will take the Academic Senate BP forward and that this College will respect and respond to the Senate's recommendation. We have to. It's been a year and a half now, and although has been silent on the matter, he just can't be any longer. He appealed to all in the room now that we must move forward but also have a commitment from all of us here, himself included, that we will be respectful and supportive of the process.

Dr. Wetsman responded that the Senate did make a recommendation with respect to BP 4030 and it was not seen by PFC because it was halted in the governance process. We are talking about the same protections that he speaks to here today. He is not comfortable with this just because of how it was used in the past. He wants to see something in here that protects us, and waiting a few more months is not going to change the world. If the OCR comes and says now we are in big trouble, we can worry about it at that point, maybe even convene an emergency meeting. It's near the end of June. School picks up in eight weeks, and if the OCR says that this is a problem then, we can address it at the first PFC meeting on August 26, 2014.

Rene Tai responded that she knows there has been a lot of work done on this AP and she respects and appreciates the effort by everyone. She would hate to move forward at this point because of all the concerns that we have heard here today. We were all here when our College went through this whole thing. Now, we are trying to rush through it because of an outside

agency, and she doesn't think that is what we should be doing. If we all have doubts, then we should step back, review, and move forward slowly.

Dr. Pierson responded that there were no doubts back in February when this was looked at by PFC. None of us made any mention of a problem. This language, and more, was included to the point of what we have before us now. He stated it is frustrating for him not to move forward, especially after going back to subcommittee and getting the subcommittee to make this recommendation to move forward. He asked, "So what is the recommendation now for moving forward?"

Dr. Wetsman suggested that we wait for the recommendations on BP 4030 in the fall.

Dr. Munoz responded that he is not comfortable with that. Again, we have an outdated harassment policy. We have a process that this has gone through for 16-18 months and we are not recommending anything? He would be more comfortable if we were consenting to a clear timeline as to when we would bring something back to this group. It appears to him that this has been an open-ended situation for quite some time and there needs to be some closure on the matter. Whether we say it will be prioritized/addressed by a certain time, such as the first part of the semester, or not—he said that he thinks it will be shameful for us to go into accreditation and have the team visit and not have a current harassment policy. OCR requires us to have this procedure, and it has been too many months. It makes it look like there is something wrong with our governance structure. If we are going to defer this, then there has to be some type of deadline, such as within the first half of the semester. When will it come back to PFC for approval? What is the expectation for completion? When is it going to be enough, since it has been 16 months already?

Rene Tai, Kathy Pudelko, and Julius B. Thomas all stated that when this procedure is right, that is when it will be finished. OCR can be notified that it is still under consultation by all the bodies involved, at which time after the first Academic Senate meeting we anticipate something being consensed upon. Several stated they understand the concerns that Dr. Munoz speaks to. This has been out of compliance much longer than any of us were aware of, since 2006. Prior to 2006, this procedure was last updated in 1979.

Dr. Pierson asked, in the interest of time, whether PFC was proposing another sub-committee.

Kathy Pudelko replied no, PFC was proposing a subcommittee from the Academic Senate level to put forth revised language on BP 4030. That would be placed on the agenda for the first Senate meeting to make recommendations to revise the language.

Dr. Munoz wanted a point of clarification: "When is the expectation that AP 3435 will come back to PFC? Will it be September or October? When? This can't turn into another 16 months."

Dr. Pierson asked members for their attention. The suggestion was to table AP 3435 until BP 4030 would be acted upon by Academic Senate at their first meeting and brought back to PFC, no later than October 2014.

Sheila Lynch stated that Senate can work towards that, but we have no control over what the Board does with it. So we can't promise a specific date.

VP Gee stated to his point the question, "What happens when you have a brand new BP 4030 written and what if the Board says no?" He said he was just throwing that scenario out there.

Kathy Pudelko stated then we (Academic Senate) would have to rewrite. The Board doesn't approve APs.

VP Gee stated he does not concur to this decision.

Discussion ceased at this point.

- Half Day All Staff Retreat – Katie O'Brien reported that President Dreyfuss has the desire to resurrect the all-staff retreat that includes the Board Members. She asked whether PFC likes the suggestion of a half-day retreat followed with a social hour in the fall. Should we create a sub-committee from this body or utilize the Staff Development Committee to work on developing this idea. Consensus was to have a retreat utilizing the Staff Development Committee because of the representation of 3-3-3, with all constituent groups represented.
- Common Initiative Assessment (CAI) Update – Dr. Pierson reported some good news. We applied for and were accepted as one of twelve colleges who will pilot the Common Initiative Assessment (CAI). There were 37 colleges that applied. What that means for Rio Hondo has yet to be fully realized, but there are work groups that are convening this summer. Some names of faculty members have been submitted with their knowledge about being involved in the work groups this summer. Dr. Munoz has attended one meeting already. The pilot will focus on Math, English, and Multiple Measures.

Unfinished Business – No reports.

- Accreditation Update – No report.
- EMP Update – No report.

Committee Reports – No reports.

- Basic Skills
- Facilities
- IEC
- Program Review
- Safety
- SLOs
- Accreditation
- Staff Development
- Staffing
- Information Technology
- Technology

Announcements- No announcements.

Public Comment – No comments.

Adjournment – Dr. Pierson adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m. The next PFC meeting will be held on August 26, 2014, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room