

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, February 24, 2015, 2:30 p.m., S121**

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (Co-Chair and VPAA), Dr. Vann Priest (Co-Chair and President, AS), Henry Gee (VPSS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), 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), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Don Mason (Mgmt., AA)

Members Absent: Dr. Gisela Spieler (Faculty), Alex Ramirez (ASRHC), Heba Griffiths (Mgmt. SS), Reneé Gallegos (Recorder), vacant position for ASRHC

Staff Members: Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), Michelle Yriarte (Recorder)

- I. **Call to Order** – Vann called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.
- II. **Acceptance of Minutes** – February 10, 2015 – After hearing no comments or corrections, [consensus to accept](#) as presented.
- III. **Co-Chair's Report** – Vann had no report. Kenn announced Reneé will be out for a while. Michelle will be backfilling so he would appreciate that everyone continue to cc: Reneé on all emails and Michelle will intercept.

Howard reported that there were errors on the initial ACCJC notification letter. A revised letter will be coming this week. The college has five delinquencies that have to be addresses in the follow up report. The majority involved SLO's and we will have to respond in order to satisfy ACCJC and to meet institutional effectiveness. Howard reported that the follow up team usually consists of one person who visits the campus during the follow up visit.

IV. New Business

- Program Review Summaries – Marie Eckstrom

Marie summarized the process in the past two years we have done program reviews on Fridays because it is hard to gather a group of people for one hour because we want to have some continuity We had three separate program review, peer review committees on three separate Fridays and divided the program reviews and went through them. Howard and I sat on all of them and some others sat on one or two. We talked to the program review writers and participants in the work review. We went through the documents, section by section starting with the mission statement and going through the goals and objectives. We dealt with them holistically. Over the years, Howard and I have been doing this we have evolved. We use to do it differently and it is better that we have a holistic approach throughout the entire process. Some program reviews are good and some are bad. Some programs take this seriously and other not so. As the Planning and Fiscal Council, the planning part of this council - the program review committee, we are a group of peers, and we are not judges or administrators. It is timely since we got a recommendation from WASC for us to look at this process and decide

what we are going to do with programs that do not take this as seriously as they should. Howard added that there is a sub-committee Vann, Kevin, Howard, Lydia and Gina Bove who will be looking at upgrading the institutional planning process overall and as part of that we will have this component of discussion to.

Marie asked if there were any questions. Adam suggested rather than having program review on a six year cycle. In some instances programs should come back in shorter periods of time. One year or two years, based upon the recommendations of either IEC or the Program Review Committee. As faculty members, we do not need to do all that much in planning because this is done once every six years. You start with what you've done before and tweak it. The first time he did the Anthropology program it was a lot of work. Fast forward twelve years later and it's not as bad as before because the basics are there. This is my recommendation to Program Review and IEC.

Kevin shared that he read and looked through a lot of the programs for evidence for Accreditation and they were horrid. Marie shared that Program Plans are getting better. In the beginning six years or seven years ago, we started from scratch. As the years go by, most programs do get better and reports get longer. There are those stragglers that just roll over plans from year to year and don't change the content. We reply to them to refer to the help desk and revise the content. We cannot be mean or insulting. We have to do this in a diplomatic way.

Howard suggested that we have more specific expectations and that we ask people to report in more details. If they don't provide us with some of the specific data and other outcomes, including goals and objectives then we need to ask them to come back and write a summary and make corrections. Sometimes, they do and sometimes they don't. We have no way to have an additional review after they have gone back into the plan.

Robert asked what would be needed to give PFC, IEC or the Program Review Committee some enforcement power so staff can actually give specific recommendations at the end of Program Review. To say, you must do this by this date? If we are saying that, Program Review is a process for planning and it is important for accreditation. If we are saying there is a significant number of these that fall short of expectations, it seems logical that this committee should have the power to enforce a rewrite and in a timely manner.

Kathy does not disagree with this but suggested that we take a different approach. We need to be a little more creative because what she is hearing is that a person may think they have done a really great report. In reality it may not be and now you are going to start penalizing or something along those lines. We have to be very careful because she does not wish to see this become a negotiations issue or a problem in the contract.

Sandra suggested that members of the Program Review Committee can team up with those needing some assistance. Sandra asked how do you forward a program review that does not have measurable goals and objectives? It is almost irresponsible on our part to allow a plan to go forward. Couldn't we help see them through the process?

Marie agreed and also let the group know that she and Howard offer orientation sessions. Howard has a dedicated help line during the planning season. Marie is available to sit down one on one to go through the documents. The last person who did this with Marie was Steve Hebert in his new role as Dean of KDA and that was a few years ago.

Shelia suggested the deficient Program Reviews are probably going to come from people who are not engaged or interested to seek assistance. As Adam suggested, they should be reviewed more often. It is enough to say you need to do this portion. If the committee can identify the areas that need improvement and these should be done next year or next semester. It will be a rewrite.

Kathy asked what if we have reports that are not stellar and they've asked for certain items and they do not receive that information. If this is what Program Review is supposed to be, you line up you items and as the gatekeeper this would be a motivating factor. Therefore, that would be your leverage.

Katie suggested that perhaps in addition to the Program Level recommendations, commendations and institutional level recommendations a general check off list of outstanding, sufficient, follow-up needed and then instructions as to when the follow-up will take place should be included.

Howard stated if we were clearer about our expectations people would understand upfront or if they received notice of deficiencies. Then we can ask them to come back and work on it not because it is punitive but more importantly because they will understand the process better and what is expected. No one wants to let their division/department down.

Robert asked if at the beginning of the planning season, could the Program Review Committee make available or highlight an exemplary example to follow. Marie stated that they already do this and Physics is one that is used.

Adam suggested that the deans could play a role in this too. There was faculty that did not show up for their Program Review day. The one day in six years that faculty had to be present. The deans also need to be involved in the process and if they see that there is something that is not good enough, then the dean should enforce the contract and say this is a professional obligation once every six years. It doesn't take that long to get it up to par. It may take several times before it is good enough.

Vann expressed when talking about Program Plans, we talk about faculty not rising to the occasion. There is a flip side to that and sometimes it's the deans and directors not rising to the occasion as well. Let's realize this is a campus wide effort and although most program plans are fielded out by faculty, it is not universal.

Howard shared it is not just the Academic Programs we are talking about here. Student Services and all the administrative units are included in this topic. Some of these are the ones that have not made the effort to do a good Program Review. Some of that may be because they are not used to writing a document. We need to find ways to assist them in doing a better job. It's not what they do because they are in the Accounting Department or Research and Planning for example.

Jeannie shared that she wrote her Program Review on her own because she had no other faculty in her department. She suggested highlighting the benefits of doing this because faculty need to see themselves and be familiar with their own Program.

Kenn asked to go back to the idea that Katie proposed regarding a check off list with some specific guidelines. Marie explained that a rubric and criteria for each of the boxes would be needed for something like this for purposes of explanation. Kenn stated this

would take the context of feedback given. If there is something that is less than satisfactory then there should be something additional.

No additional comments were made.

Marie reviewed the Program Review summaries listed below.

Administration of Justice - No Institutional Level Recommendations

Auto Collision - Institutional Level Recommendations

- The College need to consider efficacy of continuing the Auto Collision program in light of the expense needed to revive it and the limited opportunities for its completers.

Career Center – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Hire a classified job developer for the Career Center in order to identify job and internship opportunities, coordinate internships and service learning projects and programs, as well as track students who gain employment in their chosen fields of study in order to compile institutional data to support the College Scorecard.
- Include career exploration as component of the orientation experience, so students can make informed decisions regarding majors.
- Create a document/webpage that explains the function of each student services office, so that students and staff may refer to it for information about each service.

College Cashier & A/R – Institutional Level Recommendations

- The College should develop a process whereby personnel knowledgeable of the various student services functions could strategically circulate the campus and assist students during registration periods, first weeks of school, etc. in order to direct them to the correct offices (cashier, financial aid, counseling, etc.). This would help alleviate student frustrations and possibly increase retention.
- Create a document/webpage that explains the function of each student services office, so that students and staff may refer to it for information about each service.

Contract Education – Institutional Level Recommendations

- The College should seriously consider the future of the Contract Education program, and should it continue, the College should invest considerable energy and funds to bring the program into the competitive market with other community colleges.
- Clarify the role/placement of Contract Education throughout the campus.

Dance – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Tie program's needs to Student Learning Outcomes and Mission Statement so rationale to hire additional personnel is substantiated.
- Include data and rationale to substantiate assertions throughout the document.
- Annotate the accomplishments.

Desktop Services - Institutional Level Recommendations

- Tie the Strategic Direction back to the Technology Plan.
- Include Service Area Outcome assessment results.
- Revise Accomplishments section; move appropriate sections to Characteristics, Performances and Trends section.
- Categorize Help Desk calls/requests, which can yield useful information.
- Revise Goals and Objectives to ensure they are measurable and time-bound.

Environmental Technology – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Hire a classified job developer for the Career Center in order to identify job and internship opportunities, coordinate internships and service learning projects and programs, as well as track students who gain employment in their chosen fields of study in order to compile institutional data to support the College Scorecard.
- Consider focusing the theme of the upcoming staff development year on intensive professional in-service toward the inculcation of methods, materials, approaches, and techniques that are specific to teaching in the various academic disciplines.

Equal Employment Opportunity – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Reduce Mission Statement to a single paragraph; move other information to Performances and Trends.
- Revise Program Review Goals and Objectives so they are specific, measurable, and time-bound.
- Ensure that Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) are succinct and measurable.
- Revise Characteristic, Performances, and Trends to reflect external trends.
- The Recommendations for Improvement should be rewritten into goals, objectives and requests for resources.

Geography – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Augment existing science labs (biology, chemistry, geography, geology, astronomy, and anthropology) with updated equipment, materials, software, and computers.
- Secure a dedicated lab space for the physical sciences.
- Maintain existing science labs by hiring an instructional assistant.

Grant Development & Management – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Work with administration and marketing to create a grant-seeking culture on campus.

Music – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Provide the funds need to upgrade and repair musical instruments.
- Provide funds to establish an applied music program and confer with neighboring colleges about the possibility of establishment of an applied music consortium.
- The College needs to consider the space requirements of the music program: more space for storage of instruments, more space for practicing, and more space for instruction.
- The College needs to provide more custodial services to improve the appearance of learning spaces.

Political Science – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Hire a classified job developer for the Career Center in order to identify job and internship opportunities, coordinate internships and service learning projects and programs, as well as track students who gain employment in their chosen fields of study in order to compile institutional data to support the College Scorecard.
- Consider focusing the theme of the upcoming staff development year on intensive professional in-service toward the inculcation of methods, materials, approaches, and techniques that are specific to the various academic disciplines.

Safety and Security – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Consider establishing a “blended” security program, wherein a permanent armed security officer organizes and oversees college security implementation.

Speech - No Institutional Level Recommendations

Student Life & Leadership – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Provide additional clerical assistance to the program.

Warehouse – Institutional Level Recommendations

- Either increase storage capacity or decrease paper usage and storage of facilities surplus.
- Encourage efforts to reduce paper through electronic means: increased use of scanners, learning management systems, and other appropriate software.
- Replace pallet jack and delivery van.

V. Unfinished Business

- Update on PFC Sub-Committee on Instructional Equipment

Kenn reported the Sub-committee is scheduled to meet on Thursday, February 26th in B118. During the month of January, Gary Van Voorhis, Carlos Monteros and others were working on getting vendor quotes for rooms. Gary will not be at the meeting. Carlos will attend in Gary's place since he has been involved in the process of getting quotes. Carlos will be there to review compiled list and answer any questions. Kenn encouraged members of PFC who are involved in this committee to attend because there will be fundamental questions to discuss. Jeannie and Suzanne requested a copy of the compiled list that Kenn received from Vann today. Michelle will email the document to the PFC Sub-Committee today.

VI. Information Items

- Budget Calendar
Myeshia reviewed the Budget Calendar and explained some changes that have been made. This calendar will be submitted to the Board of Trustees as an informational item. Development of the budget will take place in the next quarter. The dates on here correspond to the dates that have been developed by the Institutional Research and Planning Office. Some of those activities will correspond with this calendar. This is her first year with the budget development process at Rio Hondo. This is something that she has participated in and led in her previous experience. She will be working closely with President Dreyfuss as we undergo this process. Any additional updates will be provided to PFC. In May, there may be areas to highlight in once the Governor's budget is released.

Katie asked if the April 14th meeting of PFC will be when we review the prioritized resource requests related to staffing, etc. Myeshia was not sure of the entire process. Once the list is developed it should come forward to the PFC. The Budget Calendar was developed from the previous year.

Howard explained this in regards to the results from the classified and faculty staffing committees, along with facilities and technology requests as well as the other budget augmentations as we've done in the past so the committees prioritize requests. They will score the information and the IRP Office will put together the recommendations. This is the same thing that goes to PFC and President's Council before it goes to the retreat.

Myeshia asked if this was acted upon before it comes to PFC in any kind of way. Howard clarified unless there was question, discussion or clarification about it. There is no action taken at PFC. The purpose is to inform PFC and to follow the process.

Robert asked what happens if there are significant differences between the January budget and the May revision?

Myeshia explained what typically happens is that we look at the January budget and try to develop a skeleton budget. If in May the revision throws us a curve then we will have to make adjustments before we present our final budget. Typically, there are not a lot of changes, but you never know. With SSSP and Student Equity she really looks at information from the Chancellor's Office as well as the past history of the institution for some of the programs. Some things have not decreased as far as funding goes. Right now, funding is on the rise for a lot of the categorical programs. That is to be anticipated that it may continue at the same level with the possibility of an increase. There are other things that we will be considering especially this next year as rates for CalSTRS is going up and some other traditional things that we have not thought about in the past will increase. Our revenue source will be the biggest concern. We will have to start thinking of other ways to generate revenue because at this point our Prop 30 funds will start fading away.

Katie asked about the \$128 million in the January budget to cover mandates or issues that the colleges have to address including professional development. What is our campus process going to be to look in terms of how to spend the money the college receives?

Myeshia explained that Rio Hondo has asked for the block grant and this is calculated on the FTEs. She did not want to misspeak but she believed that it goes to our general fund.

Katie stated there are particular areas under that such as retirement, facilities, professional development and suggested this topic be brought up at President's Cabinet. What will the process be on how the money is allocated? Is it necessary to report to anyone else how the money is spent?

Myeshia clarified that because it is a block of funds it is going to be one lump sum versus if you were going to submit your claim based on an entirely different category.

Katie asked if it is necessary to report to anyone else how it is being distributed. Myeshia shared in her past experience they continued to prepare these reports because at some point, if the block grant is no longer needed and these are mandated activities, there is still some record as to the collection and level of service, hours, requirements for board meetings, Health Center fees, etc. that need to be provided. Again, she stated that she did not want to speak out of context and how we are using it. She will have to consult with President Dreyfuss and report back at a later time.

Howard shared there was a possibility that the prioritized requests for classified and faculty may be available before the break because they are getting scored a week before. It's just how quickly IRP can put the information together. His goal is for PFC to see it earlier not just the week of retreat. He is aiming for that.

- **Title V Grant**

Kenn reported that in the fall we had in had various people including Deans, Administration and faculty brain storming for the next proposed Title V grant application that we would like to submit. Staring us in the face is the fact that this September our current Title V grant is expiring. We need to get our idea formulated, written and submitted by May. Kenn has asked Maria Elena, Barbara to take leadership roles in organizing the focus for the grant.

We held another campus wide discussion last Thursday and then added other members to the work group deciding the focus for the grant based on input received thus far. If you recall, we had folks from PCC come to campus and explain their model of the 1st Year Experience. Various components of that seemed attractive to us and we may be using portions of that model. He could not recall from memory exactly all the people who are involved. He recalls Katie, Song, Marie, Sharon, Raquel. Kenn has asked Mike to identify a faculty member from CTE. Especially, if there is any chance of pursuing the idea of putting the 4-year degree in the pathway and tie it to something else.

Shelia stated that there is no one from the Math department.

Both these discussions are close at hand and over the next month or so Maria will look into area plans. Part of what we have to do for the grant is come up with proof that we have SWOT analysis from the three different areas. One is the area plan for the SWOT analysis and also the Accreditation Report for materials that can also be used for the grant. This is the concept team and from that will grow the writing team. We hope to be as successful as we were the first time.

Sandra asked if we are not successful, how much money would be lost.

Kenn reported that there would be a \$5 million for the five years of the grant.

VII. Committee Reports

PFC Sub-Committees

- Safety
- Staffing
- IEC
- Program Review
- Facilities
- Equipment & Technology

Other Committees

- Staff Development
 - Basic Skills
 - SLO
 - Distance Education (DEC)
-
- **IEC** – Howard reported they IEC is working on updating the Institution Set Standards which is what ACCJC looks at as our student achievement data for measuring a lot of different programs and other ways to monitor the campus.

- **Staff Development** – Katie reported that last Thursday Adam, Vann and Kathy hosted a New Faculty Orientation. This will be the first of four sessions. It was gratifying to see about 99% attendance. To have good dialogue with that many people is a challenge. It was a very positive start seeing that we have three more sessions to go. The next one is on March 12th. Kenn is scheduled to speak at 4:30pm.
- **SLOs** – Adam reported the SLO committee met a couple of days ago to address the recommendations coming from the ACCJC letter. We are working on the all of the areas. We will have some recommendations that will go to IEC and PFC. We will know more in the next meeting to move forward with meeting all of the recommendations from the accreditation commission.

VIII. **Announcements** – Janira announced that students have noticed the class schedule is up in AccessRio through Spring 2016. They are happy about that! She thanked the group for following through and the division secretaries who helped make this happen.

IX. **Public Comment** – No public comments were made.

X. **Adjournment** – Kenn adjourned the meeting at 3:56 p.m. The next PFC meeting will be held on March 10, 2015, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room



Budget Development Calendar FY2015-16

January 9, 2015	Governor released FY2015-16 Budget Proposal
January 23, 2015	Final submission of Area Plans
February 11, 2015	President's Cabinet reviews resource allocation requests
February 24, 2015	Budget Development Calendar presented as information item to PFC
March 9 & 11, 2015	Resource Allocation Committee score/prioritize resource requests
March 11, 2015	Budget Development Calendar presented as information item to Board of Trustees
March 20, 2015	President and VP Finance & Business reviews prioritized resource requests
April 1, 2015	President's Council reviews prioritized resource requests
April 14, 2015	PFC reviews prioritized resource requests
April 17, 2015	Institutional Planning Retreat
May 15, 2015	Governor's May Revise State Budget update to Board of Trustees
June 10, 2015	Tentative Budget FY2015-16 approved by Board of Trustees
July 1, 2015	State of California budget enacted
July 1 – August 31	Finalize closing of FY2014-15
September 9, 2015	Adopted Budget FY2015-16 for approval by Board of Trustees