

**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 14 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 concur 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 concur. 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 consent 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

DRAFT

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, August 26, 2014, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (co-chair), Dr. Vann Priest (co-chair), Henry Gee, Robert Bethel, Katie O'Brien, Dr. Kevin Smith, Sheila Lynch, John Frala, Dr. Adam Wetsman, Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad, Julius B. Thomas, Jeannie Liu, Sandra Rivera, René Tai, Joey Lujan (for Tiare Barrios), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Don Mason, Dr. Dyrell Foster

Members Absent: Kathy Pudelko, Suzanne Frederickson, Alex Ramirez (ASRHC), Tiare Barrios (ASRHC)

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

- I. Call to Order – Dr. Pierson called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m.
 - II. Acceptance of Minutes – June 26, 2014 – Consensus to table these minutes until September 9, 2014 to further review and make edits.
 - Co-Chair's Report – Dr. Pierson welcomed his new co-chair Dr. Vann Priest. Dr. Pierson also welcomed new and returning members to PFC. A lot has happened over the summer. Submission of the Accreditation Report was a big accomplishment, and the Chair of the visiting team will be visiting tomorrow to develop an itinerary for the team and to answer many of the questions that we have. This meeting will also help clarify what the team is expecting to see during the visit. We have a long list of questions lined up for tomorrow.
 - III. Introductions and Welcome

Dr. Priest said he forward to a productive year, asked for patience, and reported he has been educated throughout the summer on PFC function and processes.
 - IV. New Business
 - The new *2014-2015 PFC Manual* was distributed to all PFC members and support staff. Dr. Pierson reviewed the new *Manual*, specifically focusing on the committee make-up, inclusion of new graphs showing constituent relationships in regard to the governance process, and the inclusion of AP 2510, "Participation in Local Decision Making." Dr. Pierson reported that he and Dr. Priest finalized the *Manual* on Friday after extensive effort from Reneé. Last year, the PFC leadership team had prepared a manual for the 2012-2013 year. However, BP 2510 was going through the review process, so we opted to wait on printing until the BP was finalized.
 - PFC Membership/Meetings dates are calendared as of August 21, 2014 via Outlook invitation.
 - Ground rules for PFC were reviewed with the membership. The members reviewed the *Manual*, focusing on the purpose and charge of PFC.
-

Dr. Priest reported that a common complaint that he has heard about PFC is that there is limited focus on budget development. He reported that President Dreyfuss is willing to have a conversation on PFC's role in budget development. She is looking for continuous improvement. Members were asked to forward to the co-chairs any suggestions they would like to see in regards to budget development.

- Achieving Consensus – Dr. Pierson read directly from the *PFC Manual* on the definition of “consensus,” specifically citing BP 2510, Item I.B. that speaks to this. PFC is a recommending body among which open and respectful dialogue is valued.

Dr. Pierson asked Jeannie Liu, who is new to PFC, what consensus means to her? She replied, “A majority.” She also asked how PFC has reached consensus in the past?

Dr. Priest gave a brief on Quaker consensus. When one person disagrees with the group, one has to decide if the issue being discussed is at the level that it might imperil the institution. If this is the case, then consensus stops. If one simply disagrees and it does not imperil the institution, then the Quakers stand aside with their objection. You must voice your objection, and members of the body should be respectful. Speaking out is a shared responsibility. While PFC does not operate under Quaker consensus, we all have a responsibility here.

Dr. Pierson responded that past practice at PFC has been that no consensus is reached if one person who can't live with something. He reminded the group that PFC always has the option to write a report. There has been further clarity on this process, now that the BPs and APs have been revised. Also, PFC's “Decision Making Method” was revised in 2012. To his knowledge, PFC has never completed this step in the process because items with objections have typically gone back to sub-committee.

The body felt that there are processes in place and there are other pressing matters to deal with. We can revisit “consensus” in the future.

Dr. Spieler requested that PFC material be distributed earlier. There have been times when materials are received the day before and that does not allow for sufficient time to read. The co-chairs will be meeting one week prior to PFC on Tuesdays to build an agenda. Both committed to a deadline of Thursday prior to the meeting to distribute materials.

Dr. Pierson announced that materials can also now be found on the College website. While it is still in production, you can find the last year of materials. A demonstration was provided on accessing agendas, minutes, and supporting documentation. It can be found under the “Academic Affairs” web page.

Dr. Pierson referenced pages 17 and 18, which display two diagrams, are descriptive in nature. They do not replace BPs and APs but demonstrate the relationships among constituent groups when reviewing BPs and APs. Dr. Wetsman developed early versions of these charts, and they are an attempt to show the process. There were many scenarios to display, so we chose the generic versions. Dr. Priest used the word “relationships” and that stuck. We developed the disclaimer at the top of the page, above the charts, with regard to BP adoption and AP implementation: “The chart below is not intended as a representation of the review process. It attempts to show, as simply as possible, the relationships between various governance organizations at our campus.” These charts can be a work-in-progress, and we want to make note on how to improve in future versions. The attempt was to tie them as much as possible back to the language in BP 2410.

Katie O'Brien reported that in Academic Senate there was discussion of the communication breakdown once the Board approves BPs and reviews APs.

Dr. Pierson clarified that the Board does not approve policies, they adopt them, and they implement APs. Language in the charts has been crafted very carefully to that effect. Reneé also clarified that the President's Office notifies the campus community via email on Board actions regarding any revisions to Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. District Administrators are charged with making the necessary changes and implementing the policy/procedure.

Julius B. Thomas reported that in the past, there has been a breakdown in the Counseling Office in regards to communicating changes to staff. With this in mind, Dr. Pierson reiterated that PFC members must renew our obligation here today to return to our constituent groups and communicate information received at PFC to our respective groups. That is part of the responsibility of serving on this committee.

- AP & BP Review
Attached are Board Policies / Administrative Procedures that have been revised (2 items):

- BP 3050 – Institutional Code of Ethics - [Consensus reached with one edit:](#)

Dr. Priest reported that the sub-committee made up of himself, Dr. Foster, Robert Bethel (who sat in for Kathy Pudelko), President Dreyfuss, Yolanda Emerson, Sandra Rivera, and Trustees Pacheco and Santana met during the summer. At the conclusion of this meeting, the Trustees were onboard with the proposed language. They agreed with the sentiments in section V.

Sandra Rivera reported that, in the discussion, the Board members agreed that the Code of Ethics should not be used for the purposes of discipline but is intended as a philosophical approach. In the discussion, the two Trustees agreed. One of the board members was very clear that there were behaviors that could not be captured in policy due to culture and individual beliefs. Language would need to be added to the "Workplace Violence" Board Policy to detail behaviors that were not acceptable, leaving this policy as a policy of philosophical aspirations. The "Workplace Violence" plan will address specific behaviors.

Paragraph V was proposed to read as follows:

"As a further demonstration of commitment to high ethical standards, employees of Rio Hondo College aspire to be guided by the following values statements. ~~They~~ ~~These~~ are ~~intended as~~ guidelines and aspirations to be used for educational ~~rather than and not enforcement disciplinary~~ (PFC) purposes, with our own conscience as the first and most salient means of evaluation: (Board subcommittee 7/11/14)."

- BP 1500 – Special Rio Hondo Awards - [Consensus reached.](#)

V. Unfinished Business

- Accreditation Update – Dr. Pierson reported that The Accreditation Team Chair will be on campus tomorrow for a pre-meeting. We will keep this body informed of plans as they are developed. There is discussion on the next accreditation visit beyond this one. Dr. Priest, Dr. Pierson, and President Dreyfuss will bring this topic up at the next ALT meeting on Thursday. We may decide that the configuration of the ALT Team will be comprised of a different configuration. While it was a good idea to have lots of faculty involvement, the last two years have been very intense for the faculty members involved. Dr. Pierson is not sure that anyone would want to commit at this point in time as faculty members involved for six more years. We should definitely continue to gather evidence. Certainly this group will have input.
- EMP Update – Dr. Pierson reported that the Educational Master Plan (EMP) was adopted by the Board on July 11, 2014. The Board also took action on the Information Technology Plan and the Facilities Master Plan. The EMP is a living document that will be revisited in increments of years 1, 3, and 5. Any program or unit plans should align with the EMP. The document is available online on the College web site. The Academic Dean will focus on tying their unit plans to the EMP at a retreat in late September.

Dr. Spieler reported that the search box function on the website does not easily locate the EMP. We will follow up with Gary Van Voorhis.

Robert Bethel discussed the topic of the one-year timeline. When will that work begin? Howard responded that we had a conversation with President Dreyfuss on this very topic, as well as at the first IEC meeting. Essentially, we are targeting spring for the work to show up. IEC is reviewing the strategic goals and objectives.

Dr. Pierson reminded PFC members that PFC originally had a sub-committee comprised from members of this body overseeing work on the EMP. Very little was produced, as a result of this sub-committee's work.

Robert replied that is the point he is making. Should the changes originate at PFC? If so, then we should be tasked with this now so we will be ready in the spring. Speaking on the topic of plans, this body should be involved in all of the master plans. It seems that they were all developed separately, and at least from his viewpoint, none are connected to each other.

Howard responded that the EMP and the IT plans are connected in the way in which Gary Van Voorhis wrote the IT document. There was input from the academic divisions in crafting that document. The Facilities Master plan was an update from the previous one and probably did not have the connection we desire.

Dr. Pierson responded that things could have been done better. We were limited on time, and the PFC sub-committee did not perform what they were tasked to do. Dean Green, Gary Van Voorhis, and the Distance Education Committee met a few times and looked at how strategic directions impacted the Master Plan. However, there was not enough time to have enough meetings. That is partly why we made a commitment to have the 1, 3, and 5 year review of the plans. The EMP should be the foundation for all the other plans.

Robert requested that these plans all be reviewed at the same time.

VP Gee agreed, but noted we are also required to send the Facilities plan update to the state on a set schedule, so that does impact the timeline. This time around we will have more eyes involved with reviewing the plans.

VI. Committee Reports – No reports, except from IEC and Staff Development, which were the only committees that had met.

- Basic Skills
- Facilities – Sheila Lynch voiced her concerns about those areas that do not fall into a specific program or unit plan. At the last meeting we discussed the possibility for the need of a sub-committee? Do we need to place this item on the next agenda? Who would chair such a committee?
- IEC – Howard reported that IEC held their first meeting and is implementing 2014-15 plans. At the same time, we IEC is reviewing the past plans and reviewing how we will update. Institutional Set Standards are important to the Federal requirement for Financial Aid purposes, as well as SSI and other state mandates. Howard announced that the Institutional Planning Retreat is tentatively scheduled for April 17th. Please let Howard know if there are conflicts.
- Program Review
- Safety
- SLOs
- Accreditation
- Staff Development – Katie announced that the half-day, all-staff retreat will be held on November 7th from 11 a.m. to the late afternoon at the Clarke Estate. Now that FLEX Day is over, the Committee will focus on this event.
- Staffing
- Information Technology
- Technology

VII. Announcements – No announcements.

VIII. Public Comment- No comments.

IX. Adjournment – Dr. Pierson adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m. The next meeting is September 9, 2014, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, September 9, 2014, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (Co-chair and VPAA), Dr. Vann Priest (Co-Chair and President AS), Henry Gee (VPSS), Robert Bethel(1st VP, AS), Katie O'Brien (2nd VP, AS), Dr. Kevin Smith (Secretary, AS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian, AS), John Frala (ASCCC Rep, AS), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Kathy Pudelko (President, RHCFA), Jeannie Liu, Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Joey Lujan (for Tiare Barrios, ASRHC), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Dr. Dyrell Foster (Mgmt., SS)

Members Absent: Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad (AS), Julius B. Thomas (AS), Suzanne Frederickson(CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Alex Ramirez (President, ASRHC), Tiare Barrios (ASRHC), Don Mason, (Mgmt., AA)

Staff Members Present: Howard Kummerman, Ruthie Retaña, Reneé Gallegos (Recorder), Michelle Yriarte (observer)

- I. Call to Order – Kenn called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m. He welcomed Ruthie as a visitor.
- II. Acceptance of Minutes – June 24, 2014 and August 26, 2014 - Kenn announced that that both sets of minutes will be returned to PFC on September 23, 2014 after editing.
- III. Co-Chair's Report
- IV. New Business
 - Using Names and Professional Titles

The PFC discussed using informal names in recorded minutes to remove barriers. All were in agreement that formal names and titles will be at the top of the minutes and first names only will be used in the body of the minutes.

- 45% New Classified Audio/Visual Position

VPAA reported that an additional 45% Audio Visual position will be recruited in the near future. PFC discussed the ongoing need to have additional staff to assist the Audio/Visual Technician. Members of PFC brought up the fact that not having additional staff is a recurring health and safety issue for the employee who presently has difficulty utilizing vacation and sick leave. It was suggested that there should be an area in the planning process where items that impact the institution as a whole can be placed and ranked. Such items are not necessarily encompassed by any one division during the planning process. For sake of reference, these items were referred to as "No Man's Land" requests.

The following Policies and Procedures are going through the review process (4 items):

http://www.flipdocs.com/showbook.aspx?ID=10006268_197356

- AP & BP Review

Attached are Board Policies that have been revised (4 items):

BP 2350 Speakers at Board Meetings – [Consensus reached.](#)

BP 2716 Political Activity - [Consensus reached with the following edits to paragraph I](#) that followed discussion regarding use of District facilities:

Members of the Board **of Trustees** shall not use District funds, services, supplies ~~or~~, **or any other District assets**, to urge the passage or defeat of any ballot measure or candidate, including but not limited to, any candidate for election to the governing Board.

AP 3560 Alcoholic Beverages – Discussion ensued regarding inclusion of permission being granted by the Superintendent/President or designee. [PFC consensed on the following revised language in Paragraph II:](#)

Alcoholic beverages on campus are permitted **with approval by the Superintendent/President, or designee**, if:

AP 5530 Student Rights and Grievances - [Consensus reached.](#)

V. Unfinished Business

- Accreditation Update – At the last PFC meeting, Kenn briefed the council on the pre-visit by Accreditation Chair Dr. Willard Lewallen. As a follow-up to that visit Kenn, Vann, and Rebecca Green met to develop a list of online classes to submit for the visit. The classes represent a variety of departments. Academic Affairs is also developing a schedule of activities during the week the team is on-site.

Jeannie voiced her concerns as one of the online classes that was selected for a visit . She suggested that some guidelines to assist faculty in preparing for the visit would be helpful. Vann will be sending out an email to those faculty selected. (9/11/14 email from Vann attached.)

Kenn reminded all that the team is looking at the College as a whole, not at individual faculty. They will be looking for regular and substantive contact, which is what should already be happening in our online classes. The team will be looking to see if instructors are communicating with students regularly. Is the Course Expectation Letter posted on the Virtual College website? Is the course content outlined in the syllabus? Is dialogue occurring similar to an on-ground class. Since Kevin was co-chair of Standard II, he will forward the guidelines for what the team will be seeking, should they go into an online course.

Kathy reported that faculty members need to remember that the ACCJC visit will not be used for evaluation purposes. The faculty have a lot of support, and she hopes there is access granted to the team.

Adam reiterated that the team can't access classrooms without instructor approval. Kenn reported that, in years past, accreditation teams would frequently visit classrooms. Now with time at a premium, classroom visits are much less frequent.

Howard reported that ACCJC's stance on the matter is that they do not accredit unions, they accredit colleges. Therefore, they can have access to classrooms. The team completes much of their investigation prior to the visit. A draft report is constructed, and the time they are with us is the verification stage. During this time, the team fills in the gaps. We retrieve final evidence, and the team writes the final report.

VI. Committee Reports

- Basic Skills – No report.
- Facilities – No report.
- IEC – Howard reported that the IEC met, and the planning process was reviewed. The IEC is starting to review planning software to consider making a change and what the options will be. Howard also suggested that we place the Scorecard results on a future PFC agenda. This would explain the cohorts and what encompasses the terms “completion,” “remedial,” etc.
- Program Review – Howard reported that program review orientations have begun being scheduled. They will occur on the last Fridays of October, November and December. IRP is recruiting volunteers to be on the committees. It is strongly recommended that program review chairs sign up for an orientation session. IEC is also retooling the six-year planning cycle and will disseminate the schedule next month.

Howard, along with members of the IEC, will take up the charge of devising a plan for those areas that are not represented by a specific area. Since Howard has a wider oversight of the planning process, there is a specific area in the planning software that is not utilized that could cover situations such as the hallway of the 2nd floor Administration building needing to be painted, the need for greater Audio Visual support across campus, and copy room staffing, for example. These areas would be for those items that impact the institution as a whole.

- Safety – No report.
- SLOs – Kenn reported that Adam Wetsman is the new SLO Coordinator. However, during the Accreditation visit, Matt Koutroulis will remain on hand to meet with accreditation team members, and Adam will be there as support. Kenn requested that an SLO meeting be held prior to the September 28 visit. Adam was provided a list of members and will attempt to convene a meeting.
- Accreditation – Reported on earlier in the meeting.
- Staff Development – Katie reported that Staff Development is crafting a “Save the Date” for the All Staff Retreat. This will be held at the Clarke Estate and will include a “Rio’s Got Talent” segment.
- Staffing – No report.
- Information Technology – No report.
- Technology – No report.

VII. Announcements – No announcements.

VIII. Public Comment – No public comments

IX. Adjournment – Next meeting September 23, 2014, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room.

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, September 23, 2014, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (Co-Chair and VPAA), Dr. Vann Priest (Co-Chair and President AS), Henry Gee (VPSS), Robert Bethel(1st VP, AS), Katie O'Brien (2nd VP, AS), Dr. Kevin Smith (Secretary, AS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian, AS), John Frala (ASCCC Rep, AS), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Kathy Pudelko (President, RHCFA), Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Alex Ramirez (President, ASRHC), Andrew Carpeña (ASRHC), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Dr. Dyrrell Foster (Mgmt., SS)

Members Absent: Julius B. Thomas (AS), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Suzanne Frederickson(CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Don Mason, (Mgmt., AA)

Staff Members Present: Howard Kummerman, Reneé Gallegos (Recorder), Michelle Yriarte (observer), Rebecca Green (Dean, Behavioral & Social Science), Mike Javanmard (Faculty)

- I. **Call to Order** – Vann called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.
 - II. **Acceptance of Minutes** – Vann announced that all 3 sets of minutes (August 26, September 9 and September 23) will be returned to PFC on October 14, 2014 after editing. We request your understanding as there have been other matters that have been on the forefront.
 - III. **Co-Chair's Report** – Kenn wanted to remind all parties that the planning process is underway. Approximately 27 of 105 program plans have been opened by planning teams. Howard reported that the due date for program plans is October 25. Kenn reported that some faculty members in Nursing were hard at work on their plans the day he attended their recent division meeting. Kenn also gave condolences to Sandra Rivera on the passing of her mother.
 - IV. **Superintendent's Report** – President Dreyfuss reviewed the budget assumptions for 2014-2015:
 - A. Revenue includes 0.85% COLA and 3.5% access (restoration) from State general apportionment.
 - B. Projected 2014-2015 FTES will be at the level of 13,050 FTES for both Credit and Non-Credit combined. Non-credit is already over cap.
 - C. Projected budget revenue addition from state categorical SSSP fund is approximately \$1,000,000.00. However, neither revenue nor expenditures reflect the Student Equity fund pending negotiation.
 - D. Expenditures include projected step, column increases, and salary increases of 0.553% to faculty, management and confidential, but does not reflect salary increase to classified staff.
-

President Dreyfuss reported that if we do not generate enough FTES we will not be able to capture access (growth) dollars from the state. This is the reason for the Think Tank series of meetings as well as a variety of sub-committees that are working on implementing new strategies to boost enrollment.

President Dreyfuss indicated that STRS and PERS increase costs have to be built into the budget. Also, the District contribution of SUI, Worker's Compensation and part time retirement benefits has to be built into the budget. For Classified we also have to budget costs for Social Security, Medicare, medical, dental, and vision plans.

President Dreyfuss tasked PFC to come up with a plan of action with line items up to \$425,000 on one-time instructional equipment funds this fiscal year. A deadline of two months was proposed with the due date being November 23, 2014. These funds are in addition to the budgeted amount that the Board of Trustees approved in December 2013 and June, 2014 regarding instructional equipment, computer software/hardware, and facility maintenance items. Those items went through the annual planning process. Out of the half million dollars that PFC can work with, \$50-\$75,000 is earmarked for Library materials.

President Dreyfuss fielded the following questions:

1. Does the salary schedule include the negotiated increases? How about step and column, PERS and STRS increase included in the adopted budget? President Dreyfuss responded yes. She further explained the adopted budget is a rollover budget with some minor increases under object codes 4000 Supplies, 5000 operations, and 6000's equipment. For example, there is a minor increase in the Accreditation budget in preparation of the visit.

The personnel requests of one custodian that went through the planning process in 2014-2015 were also included in the budget. The additional budget augmentation under Oct. 8 board agenda of 45% Audio Visual Multi-Media repair technician for the classified position is not included in the adopted budget.

Increases to the minimum wage which affects student workers is also built into the budget along with equipment, facilities, and IT requests that went through the process with the Board of Trustees approval of the Budget augmentations in December 2013 and July 2014. Once the Board approves these requests, they are incorporated into the budget.

Adam asked when the Proposition 30 funding is going to end? What portion of the budget is subject to the 50% law?

President Dreyfuss responded that funding will end in 2017. Last Saturday she went to an event hosted by Assemblywoman Christine Garcia who emphasized to her community members to start to campaign and advocate for Prop 30 continuances. She also elaborated that the 50% law applies only to unrestricted general fund. As the dollar amount applied to 50% law spent last year (2013/14), President Dreyfuss reported that she will have a better idea in mid-October after all the calculations are completed. President Dreyfuss departed at this point of the meeting.

A discussion followed on how to proceed with recommendations for the \$425,000

Vann clarified that the President would like to see the dollar allocations not to exceed \$425,000 for instructional equipment.

Kathy reported that PFC needs to consider furniture again. There are many classrooms that are not in good shape. We have students that sit in chairs that are not up to par. This would be another example of a “No man’s land issue” because these things are not on a replacement schedule. Unexpected breakdowns in classroom equipment are another example, and we have to wait for long periods of time to get things replaced.

Howard reported that he can separate the planning request reports for Academic and Student Services. While not an official member of PFC, he can assist from a process standpoint. There were definitely items that were not funded. That way, PFC can get an idea of what people are asking for.

It was the consensus of the group to review planning documents from 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. Specifically, requests that relate to technology and equipment include furniture. The group also needs to be mindful of items that are not on these lists that have popped up. There is a two-month window of time to review the previous two years of requests and develop a recommendation using these one-time funds. Past reports will allow for cross checking of items that have already been funded and allow for ordering before the end of this year (2014).

Vann reported that he believes this is a good starting point because President Dreyfuss is demonstrating that she would like to have PFC involved in this area of the budget.

V. New Business

- AP & BP Review

Attached are Board Policies that have been revised (3 items):

BP 4030 Academic Freedom – Kenn printed out for clarification purposes and explained items in red font. Just to clarify, Roman numeral IV references the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges’ “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.” That source was the genesis of this BP but not acknowledged as a source in the BP, so that was one change in red. We are adding the source to review now, but language from that statement is already incorporated into the document.

Other changes in red are a bit misleading, consequently, because they did not come from AAUP’s 1940 Statement. Kenn clarified that other changes in red font were suggested by Rio Hondo’s Academic Senate. It may be prudent to document the source of the recommendations next to those proposed by Academic Senate.

Adam recommended to include “Administration” in paragraph three, which mentions the Board, faculty, staff and students. This would be more inclusive.

Henry voiced his concern with Roman numeral I.F. The last sentence in paragraph F is derived from the 1940 Statement but does not include all the following language from the original 1940 Statement: “[faculty members] should at all times attempt to be accurate, should exercise appropriate

restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.” The corresponding sentence in paragraph F of the existing BP on Academic Freedom reads as follows: “faculty members should at all times attempt to be accurate and should indicate when they are not speaking for the College.”

Vann asked members to take a look at Section III, paragraph B. The sense of the clause of the 1940 Statement is already there in the language, which underscores “an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right without institutional censorship or disciplinary action, and to express differing inquiry, instruction, and free expression.” With this language, we have an obligation to respect each other.

Henry reported that he wanted to be collaborative but sees a mixing up of the tenets of Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom in the proposed new language.

Dyrell suggested that, based on the language that Henry is proposing, to remove the words “exercise appropriate restraint” but include language to “show respect for the opinions of others,” which is a reasonable and fair expectation. This is what we already practice.

Sheila felt strongly that this consideration is important enough to bring back to Senate. Who gets to decide what is respectful? It comes back to a question of judgment that is not up to us to make that decision for the entire Academic Senate.

Vann reported that this is something that we aspire to that is philosophical and is not in any way meant to be punitive. In the spirit of others we are respectful and treat others with dignity, acting in an adult manner and showing restraint. Doesn't our AP 3435 on “Discrimination and Harassment” give us that same sense?

Adam suggested that “Administrators” be added in to the AP 3435, “Discrimination and Harassment.” What we should do is pass this right now with the term “Administrators” added in and bring it back to Senate for further review. It will take a few weeks to make revisions. The next Academic Senate meeting is October 7. It would probably be feasible to have it to the Board in November.

Kenn reported that the October deadline for movement on AP 3435, established by PFC in June 2014, may need to be extended for a consideration of BP 4030 to work its way through the review process. It would not be the first time PFC has taken longer on deadlines.

Sandra asked that paragraph G is meant primarily for faculty. Can we broaden this to include all members of the campus community?

Vann responded that when this AP was being edited, they refrained from changing too much language in that respect. He referenced the University

of Oregon's Academic Freedom policy which does cover all parties, and he was hoping we could follow a similar model.

Henry reported that members of the community have the right to address the public. It goes back to using the phrase – constitutional protection of Freedom of Speech.

Vann, Henry, Dyrell, Sandra, and Alex will meet before October 7, 2014. Then BP 4030 will be forwarded to Academic Senate for review.

AP 7217 Faculty – Employment of Contract – [Consensus reached with the following edits.](#)

Faculty: Employment of Contract – Apologies that the draft of Oct. 12 is not the current AP on the website. There are three corrections that Vann reported in terms of edits:

- Line 1: Board of Trustee's.
- Section II, paragraph C: Senate language.
- Section III, paragraph C. BP7211 replaces CP 5165, BP 7210.

The order of paragraph C needs rearranging.

Dyrell has concerns about using consultants that serve on committees. Will they expect compensation? This practice may open the gate to that question. At Mt. SAC they were not voting members of the committee.

AP 7346 Employees Called to Military Duty – Kenn read aloud an email received earlier from Sandra: "I believe that AP7346 is a negotiable matter and should be referred to the collective bargaining teams. We have time, in my opinion, because this is a legally advisable AP and not a legally required. I have a call in to our Labor Relations Representative to confirm and the CCLC language itself makes mention of the negotiability of certain aspects of this AP. May we pull this item for now? CSEA could not consent to this at this time because we could be waiving our right to negotiate."

Sandra reported that CSEA will review this AP this week and also has negotiations schedule on 10/6/14. So it may be resolved before the end of October.

VI. Information Item

BP 1400 Kenn reported that this Board Policy is outdated and is slated for deletion. This policy was created prior to the College having bargaining teams. More research was done by the President's Office and the BP is deemed obsolete. We are not bringing this forward today for action, only for informational purposes.

Sheila and Sandra requested if additional language regarding encumbering faculty could be added to this policy and also what the process is for deleting

policies? It was recommended that this BP be returned to the October 14th meeting.

- CAI Update – Mike Munoz, Marie Eckstrom, Mark Littrell – The scheduled update was postponed since Marie’s meeting regarding English assessment had not yet taken place.
- OEI Update – Rebecca Green, Mike Javanmard

Online Education Initiative (OEI)

Rebecca Green, Dean of Behavioral and Social Science and Virtual College supervisor, and Mike Javanmard, Instructor of Economics and faculty Distance Education Coordinator, gave an update on the OEI. RHC is one of 8 colleges selected in the state to participate in this important pilot that may redefine how online courses are delivered throughout the California Community College system.

Rio Hondo has been selected as a pilot college to assist with the implementation of the Online Student Readiness component of the new California OEI. A meeting is scheduled with Mike Muñoz, Gary Van Voorhis, Mike Javanmard, Virtual College Staff, Kenn Pierson, and Bonnie Peters, the Chief Student Services Officer for the OEI.

During Spring 2015, a few courses will be offered on the OEI “Exchange.” Our courses for Spring will be offered in our current Blackboard platform. Each of the 8 pilot colleges has been asked to submit, for consideration, five online classes ranging from AJ to Anthropology, English to Political Science, and others. The faculty members who are teaching an online class this spring from the identified list of courses have each been contacted to see if they would like to submit their course for consideration. A committee of peer reviewers will look over the course, not for content or curriculum, but for design and to ensure the standards published by @one, which are considered industry standards for high quality online education. For the Spring classes, only Rio Hondo students will be able to enroll in the Rio Hondo taught classes.

Kenn reported that we received very short notice on this but views it as an opportunity to try something new and help shape its direction.

The following questions were asked:

- Will we be taking seats away from our students?
- How many faculty members have shown interest in this project?
- How does a student apply to this exchange?
- How does the recording of transcripts works?
- Does this help with Student Success?
- What happens if a student fails a class 3 times?

Rebecca asked questions during her webinar and the answers she received are listed below:

- Class caps for individual colleges will be maintained
- Do faculty association rights cover my faculty in the OEI? Yes. Additional discussions will be held once the OEI is up and running more fully.
- What about Rio Hondo policies? Do students have one year to challenge a grade? Yes, for the most part. The OEI may ask for some flexibility on a case-by-case basis.

- The teaching college gets all the FTES for the class taught, regardless of where a student's "home" college is.
- Could this hurt our late start online offerings? This is being discussed and nothing conclusive has been determined. This is not intended to hurt an individual college's enrollment.
- What's coming? Is it the plan to eventually do away with locally offered online classes, in our own CMS, and all online classes in California Community Colleges will be offered through the Exchange? Ms. Peters has responded at this point it is not the design to do away with local online courses. The OEI is to create another opportunity for students to take classes.
- What would motivate faculty to submit their course to the scrutiny of others? By participating, faculty will receive Professional Development funds if their class is selected for the Exchange and course structural changes are made. Any 508 compliance issues identified in their courses will be taken care of, at no charge, by the Exchange, including the captioning of all videos. Finally, it is an opportunity to gain satisfaction that your class meets industry standards for quality online classes, based on feedback from professional online course format reviewers

Rebecca Green stated that OEI is something you will start hearing a lot about. Think about "Travelocity." There are many flights offered there. That is what the OEI is—an online exchange for students to complete. They can go online click and see all the offerings. It requires students to go through a readiness model to be successful in an online environment. We have to design what we want our students to be able to handle online classes successfully. It was a decision to offer classes through the Exchange this Spring. Governor Brown is a huge supporter of this project.

Rebecca also reported that hybrid classes will not be included in this pilot. The ones on the list are general education courses.

Rebecca reported that two faculty members have expressed interest. If she only gets two, then that is all that will be offered to the Exchange. There will also be a new portal that is being developed for registering students. This is an attempt to make it easier for students to complete. The amount of work that has to come completed on the back side is mind boggling. She will report when she has more information.

Kenn left at this point of the meeting.

VII. Unfinished Business

VIII. Committee Reports

- Basic Skills – No report.
- Facilities – No report.
- IEC – No report.
- Program Review – No report.
- Safety – No report.
- SLOs – No report.
- Accreditation – No report.
- Staff Development – No report.
- Staffing – No report.
- Information Technology – No report.
- Technology – No report.

IX. Announcements – No announcements.

X. Public Comment – No public comments.

XI. Adjournment – Vann adjourned the meeting at 4:04 p.m. The next meeting will be held on October 14, 2014, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room.

DRAFT

1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure

with 1970 Interpretive Comments

In 1940, following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This restatement is known to the profession as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The 1940 Statement is printed below, followed by Interpretive Comments as developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1969. The governing bodies of the two associations, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole.¹ The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.^[1]

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

Academic Freedom

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.^[2] Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.^[3]
3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they

1. The word "teacher" as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties.

2. Boldface numbers in brackets refer to Interpretive Comments that follow.

should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.[4]

Academic Tenure

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

1. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.
2. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank,[5] the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years.[6] Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.[7]
3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.[8]
4. Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges and should have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. The teacher should be permitted to be accompanied by an advisor of his or her own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from the teacher's own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.[9]
5. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

1940 Interpretations

At the conference of representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges on November 7-8, 1940, the following interpretations of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* were agreed upon:

1. That its operation should not be retroactive.
2. That all tenure claims of teachers appointed prior to the endorsement should be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in the 1925 *Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.
3. If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph 3 of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph 4 of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges, the administration should remember that

teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

1970 Interpretive Comments

Following extensive discussions on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with leading educational associations and with individual faculty members and administrators, a joint committee of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges met during 1969 to reevaluate this key policy statement. On the basis of the comments received, and the discussions that ensued, the joint committee felt the preferable approach was to formulate interpretations of the Statement in terms of the experience gained in implementing and applying the Statement for over thirty years and of adapting it to current needs.

The committee submitted to the two associations for their consideration the following "Interpretive Comments." These interpretations were adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in April 1970 and endorsed by the Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting as Association policy.

In the thirty years since their promulgation, the principles of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* have undergone a substantial amount of refinement. This has evolved through a variety of processes, including customary acceptance, understandings mutually arrived at between institutions and professors or their representatives, investigations and reports by the American Association of University Professors, and formulations of statements by that association either alone or in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges. These comments represent the attempt of the two associations, as the original sponsors of the 1940 *Statement*, to formulate the most important of these refinements. Their incorporation here as Interpretive Comments is based upon the premise that the 1940 *Statement* is not a static code but a fundamental document designed to set a framework of norms to guide adaptations to changing times and circumstances.

Also, there have been relevant developments in the law itself reflecting a growing insistence by the courts on due process within the academic community which parallels the essential concepts of the 1940 *Statement*; particularly relevant is the identification by the Supreme Court of academic freedom as a right protected by the First Amendment. As the Supreme Court said in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, 385 U.S. 589 (1967), "Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."

The numbers refer to the designated portion of the 1940 *Statement* on which interpretive comment is made.

1. The Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors have long recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. Both associations either separately or jointly have consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in their utterances as citizens, in the exercise of their responsibilities to the institution and to students, and in their conduct when resigning from their institution or when undertaking government-sponsored research. Of particular relevance is the *Statement on Professional Ethics*, adopted in 1966 as Association policy. (A revision, adopted in 1987, may be found in AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 10th ed. [Washington, D.C., 2006], 171-72.)
2. The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is "controversial." Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.
3. Most church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the 1940 *Statement*, and we do not now endorse such a departure.

FACULTY: EMPLOYMENT OF CONTRACTAP No.
7217

Board Reviewed: 5/84, 5/91, DRAFT 10-9-12

Page 1 of 3
(Formerly CP
5070)

- I. Employment of faculty shall be in compliance with Board **of Trustees'** policies relating to ~~Affirmative Action Title V~~, Title IX, **AB 1725**, and other legal requirements and sound personnel practices. All applicants shall be treated identically whether they are current employees or off-campus applicants. ~~This procedure is in effect to implement Board Policy 5260.~~

II. PROCEDURE

- A. Open faculty positions shall be reviewed and approved for announcement of the vacancy by ~~Executive Council~~ with **after** budget verification from the Vice President of ~~Administrative Services~~ **Finance and Business**.

~~The Director of Human Resources shall meet with the applicable Division to review requirements for the position prior to publishing the announcement of vacancy.~~

- B. Recruitment shall be in accord with ~~Affirmative Action principles~~ **applicable state laws**. Applications shall be screened for qualifications by the Office of Human Resources. The Director of Human Resources ~~as Affirmative Action Officer~~ shall be responsible for ~~certifying the pool~~ **analysis of job applicants to determine whether the group is significantly underrepresented**. If the **applicant pool demonstrates significant underrepresentation of monitored groups** cannot be certified, the position shall be reopened **the District shall implement additional measures as described in Title V §53006**.
- C. The division dean, together with a minimum of three ~~current~~ **Rio Hondo** faculty members, selected by the division faculty ~~without prejudice to Affirmative Action representation~~, shall constitute the Division Hiring **Selection Committee**. Two of the three faculty members should teach in the discipline, assuming there are two or more. The Committee shall elect a chair, evaluate the ~~remaining~~ applications, identify those to be interviewed, interview candidates, and provide a written recommendation. **The Division Selection Committee may, at its discretion, add additional committee members such as external experts or classified staff. The committee shall make a reasonable effort to forward at least three candidates but no more than five that, in its judgment, are qualified for the position and worthy of recommendations.**
- D. The division dean shall provide the written recommendation(s) of the **Division Selection Committee** ~~to the Division Hiring Committee to the~~ the Vice President of the applicable area.
- E. The Vice President of the applicable area, **along with the division dean and the committee chair (if applicable)**, may **will** interview the recommended applicants(s) and shall ~~recommend employment of~~ **forward** the best qualified candidate(s) from the name(s) recommended by the Committee to the Superintendent/President **for interview**.

FACULTY: EMPLOYMENT OF CONTRACTAP No.
7217

Board Reviewed: 5/84, 5/91, DRAFT 10-9-12

Page 2 of 3
(Formerly CP
5070)

F. The final evaluation and recommendation to employ shall rest with the Superintendent/President of the College. **Should none of the candidates forwarded by the Division Selection Committee be recommended for employment, the Superintendent /President will communicate to the Division Selection Committee Chair his/her justification.**

G. Notification of selection shall normally be from the Office of Human Resources.

III. CRITERIA

Criteria for selecting personnel for certificated positions shall include the following:

- A. Possession of the appropriate California community college instructor credential prior to employment by Rio Hondo Community College District, or
- B. Academic background: A Master's degree or its equivalent in the subject to be taught, or vocational background including professional preparation and demonstrated appropriate experience as may be applicable:
1. Possession of a Master's degree from an accredited institution in the discipline of assignment, or
 2. Possession of a Master's degree from an accredited institution in a discipline reasonably related to assignment and possession of a Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution in the discipline of assignment. (See attached list.)
 3. For faculty in disciplines where a Master's degree is not generally expected or available, either of the following:
 - a) Possession of a Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution in a discipline reasonably related to assignment plus two years of professional experience, plus appropriate certification to practice or licensure if available; or,
 - b) Possession of an associate degree from an accredited institution in a discipline reasonably related to the faculty member's assignment, plus six years of professional experience, plus appropriate certification to practice or licensure if available.
- C. "Equivalency" to either academic or vocational requirements shall be determined in accordance with **BP 7211**.
- D. Individual departments may add information on educational requirements placing emphasis on a specific area.
- E. Other departmental interests may be shown under "Desirable Qualifications." These are limited to ~~bona fide occupational qualifications~~ **job-related factors**.

FACULTY: EMPLOYMENT OF CONTRACT

AP No.
7217

Board Reviewed: 5/84, 5/91, DRAFT 10-9-12

Page 3 of 3

(Formerly CP
5070)

- F. All applicants selected for hire must show a sensitivity to an understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students.

EMPLOYEES CALLED TO MILITARY DUTYAP No.
7346Board Reviewed: **NEW (CCLC)**

Page 1 of 2

- I. The following applies to any District employee, academic or classified, who enters the active military service of the United States of America or of the State of California, including active service in any uniformed auxiliary of any branch of the military service, during any period of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or during any war in which the United States of America is engaged.
- II. **Leave**
Upon presentation of a copy of orders for active duty in the Armed Forces, the National Guard, or the Naval Militia, the District shall grant a military leave of absence for the period of active duty specified in the orders, but not to exceed five years for a permanent, probationary, or exempt employee, or for the remainder of a limited-term employee's appointment or a temporary employee's appointment.
- III. **Salary**
Any District employee called to active duty who has been in the service of the District for at least one year will continue to receive his/her salary for the first 30 calendar days of ordered military service. Employees who are members of the National Guard will continue to receive salary for the first 30 calendar days of active service, regardless of length of service with the District.

In addition, Rio Hondo may provide, on approval of the Governing Board, for not more than 180 calendar days as part of the employee's compensation all of the following:

- A. The difference between the amount of his/her military pay and allowances and the amount the employee would have received as an employee, including any merit raises that would otherwise have been granted during the time the individual was on active military duty. (Ed Code 87018)
 - B. All benefits that he/she would have received had he/she not been called to active military duty unless the benefits are prohibited or limited by vendor contracts. (Ed Code 87018)
 - C. Employees returning from military leave shall have their salary adjusted to reflect salary increases that are not based on merit. (Ed Code 87700)
- IV. **Health Benefits**
An employee on military leave for less than 31 days shall continue to receive health insurance benefits.

Employees on leave for longer than 30 days may elect to continue health care coverage for themselves and their eligible dependents for a maximum period of 18 months.

Returning veteran employees whose coverage was terminated because of military leave will not be subject to any exclusion or waiting period prior to reinstatement of health coverage.

EMPLOYEES CALLED TO MILITARY DUTYAP No.
7346Board Reviewed: **NEW (CCLC)**

Page 2 of 2

V. Vacation and Sick Leave

Employees on military leave accrue any benefits the District provides to other employees; e.g., if employees on other approved leaves are permitted to accrue vacation or sick leave, employees on military leave will do so as well.

Employees on military leave shall accrue any benefits afforded by any collective bargaining agreement negotiated during their absence.

Any employee on temporary military leave for training who has worked for the District for at least one year shall continue to accrue vacation, sick leave, and holiday privileges up to a maximum period of 180 days.

VI. Reinstatement

An employee on active duty military leave shall be entitled to return to the position held by him/her at the time of his/her entrance into the service within six months after the employee honorably leaves the service or is placed on inactive duty.

A person employed to take the place of any such employee shall not have any right to the position following the return of the employee to the position. (Ed Code 87700)

In the case of a contract academic employee, absence on military leave shall not count as part of the service required for the acquisition of tenure, but the absence shall not be construed as a break in the continuity of service. If the employee was employed by the District for more than one year, but had not yet become a regular academic employee of the District, he/she is entitled to return to the position for the period of time his/her contract of employment had to run at the time he/she entered military service. (Ed Code 87700)

In the case of an academic or classified employee, absence on military leave shall not be construed as a break in the continuity of service.

VII. Sources:

CCLC

Education Code Sections 87018, 87700, and 87832;

Military and Veteran's Code Sections 389 et seq.; 38 U.S. Code Sections 4301 et seq.

AP 7346 Employees Called to Military Duty

References:

Education Code Sections 87018, 87700, 87832 and 88116;
Military and Veteran's Code Sections 389 et seq;
38 U.S. Code Sections 4301 et seq.

Note: *This procedure is **legally advised**. Some aspects of it may be subject to collective bargaining. The following illustrative example incorporates the minimum requirements of applicable law.*

The following applies to any District employee, academic or classified, who enters the active military service of the United States of America or of the State of California, including active service in any uniformed auxiliary of any branch of the military service, during any period of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or during any war in which the United States of America is engaged.

Leave

Upon presentation of a copy of orders for active duty in the Armed Forces, the National Guard, or the Naval Militia, the District shall grant a military leave of absence for the period of active duty specified in the orders, but not to exceed five years for a permanent, probationary, or exempt employee, or for the remainder of a limited-term employee's appointment or a temporary employee's appointment.

Salary

Any district employee called to active duty who has been in the service of the District for at least one year will continue to receive his or her salary for the first 30 calendar days of ordered military service. Employees who are members of the National Guard will continue to receive salary for the first 30 calendar days of active service regardless of length of service with the District.

In addition, the **[district]** may provide for not more than 180 calendar days as part of the employee's compensation all of the following:

- The difference between the amount of his/her military pay and allowances and the amount the employee would have received as an employee, including any merit raises that would otherwise have been granted during the time the individual was on active military duty.
- All benefits that he/she would have received had he/she not been called to active military duty unless the benefits are prohibited or limited by vendor contracts.
- Employees returning from military leave shall have their salary adjusted to reflect salary increases that are not based on merit.

Health Benefits

An employee on military leave for less than 31 days shall continue to receive health insurance benefits.

Employees on leave for longer than 30 days may elect to continue health care coverage for themselves and their eligible dependents for a maximum period of 18 months.

Returning veteran employees whose coverage was terminated because of military leave will not be subject to any exclusion or waiting period prior to reinstatement of health coverage.

Vacation and Sick Leave

Employees on military leave accrue any benefits the district provides to other employees, e.g. if employees on other approved leaves are permitted to accrue vacation or sick leave, employees on military leave will do so as well.

Employees on military leave shall accrue any benefits afforded by any collective bargaining agreement negotiated during their absence.

Any employee on temporary military leave for training who has worked for the District for at least one year shall continue to accrue vacation, sick leave and holiday privileges up to a maximum period of 180 days.

Reinstatement

An employee on active duty military leave shall be entitled to return to the position held by him/her at the time of his or her entrance into the service within six months after the employee honorably leaves the service or is placed on inactive duty.

In the case of a contract academic employee, absence on military leave shall not count as part of the service required for the acquisition of tenure, but the absence shall not be construed as a break in the continuity of service. If the employee was employed by the district for more than one year, but had not yet become a regular academic employee of the district, he/she is entitled to return to the position for the period of time his/her contract of employment had to run at the time he or she entered military service.

In the case of an academic employee, absence on military leave shall not be construed as a break in the continuity of service.

In the case of a classified employee, absence on military leave shall not be construed as a break in the continuity of service.

New 2/02, Revised 2/04, 2/06

ACKNOWLEDGED EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS RIGHTS

BP No. 1400

Board Adopted: 3/16/77; 1/11/78; 1/10/79; 3/13/02; 11/12/03

Page 1 of 1

- I. Employee organizations which have been properly acknowledged by the Board of Trustees shall have the right to represent their members on all matters not covered by Section 3543.2 of the Government Code. In the event an employee organization is recognized or certified as the exclusive representative, it shall have the additional right to meet and negotiate on all matters within scope and on behalf of all employees in the unit for which it is the exclusive bargaining agent.
- II. The Superintendent/President, as the chief executive officer of the Board, and/or any designee(s), shall represent the Board in all relations other than "meet and negotiate" matters, with officially acknowledged employee organizations, unless otherwise directed by action of the Board.
- III. Use of District facilities such as specific bulletin boards, and mailboxes is limited to items clearly designating the name of the employee organization authorizing the distribution of the information. Employee organizations shall not use District postage stamps or the District postage machine.
- IV. Employees shall not absent themselves from scheduled work activities to attend organization meetings.
- V. Source/Reference
Former Board Policy 1018

Summary of Flex Day Fall 2014 Evaluation & Survey

- Out of a total of 209 responses, 48% were full-time faculty, 48% were adjunct, 3% were staff .
- 97% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the configuration of our fall FLEX Day effectively met their needs. 1% disagreed and 2% had no opinion.
- 90 % agreed that the “Campus Updates” session provided valuable information, 82% thought it was engaging and productive, and 77% agreed that it would enhance their work for the college. 4% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the updates were engaging and productive and 19% had no opinion on whether it would enhance their work for the college.
- For the *Preparing for the Accreditation Visit* presentation
 - 91% agreed that this provided valuable information, .5% disagreed and 8.5% had no opinion.
 - 86% agreed that it was engaging and productive, 3% disagree and 11% had no opinion.
 - 80% agreed this would enhance their work for the college, 3% disagreed, and 17% had no opinion.
- Combining the responses for the two breakout sessions
 - 89-93% thought the session provided useful information
 - 89-94% thought the presenter was knowledgeable and engaging .
 - 71-79% would suggest a follow-up or advanced session
 - 80-90% said they could implement what they learned in their work
- over 90% agreed that department meetings were valuable and useful to their work.
- For our Spring 2015 FLEX Day, 19% of respondents would prefer a full day of department/work group time. 81% would prefer some combination of morning key note, breakouts, and/or departmental meetings.

10/1/14 FLEX Committee recommendations based on qualitative comments:

- Consider putting speakers in the Lobby of the Wray or have a feed in Café Rio as the theater cannot accommodate the entire campus.
- Continue to consolidate information to have as few speakers as possible.
- Make an effort to include entertaining and informative segments similar to Mike Javanmard’s piece to keep the audience engaged.
- Improve Power Points and presentations to promote effective communication