RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, February 10, 2015, 2:30 p.m., Board Room

Members Present: 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), Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad (Faculty), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Suzanne Frederickson(CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Alex Ramirez (President, ASRHC), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Kathy Pudelko (President RHCFA), Don Mason (Mgmt., AA), Heba Griffiths (Mgmt. SS)

Members Absent: Dr. Kenn Pierson (Co-Chair and VPAA), vacant (ASRHC)

Staff Members: Mike Slavich, Dean, CTE, Loy Nashua, Dean, Student Affairs, Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), Reneé Gallegos (Recorder)

I. Call to Order – Vann called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

II. Acceptance of Minutes – December 9, 2014 – After hearing no comments or corrections, consensus to accept as presented.

III. Superintendent’s Report – President Dreyfuss welcomed all to the first Spring PFC meeting.
   • Administrative Hiring Position

   President Dreyfuss shared the rationale for the creation of a new administrative position for the Dean of Educational Centers. Currently, we have two centers operating and a third will be coming online shortly. There are limitations with Faculty Coordinators assigned to the centers. They cannot supervise classified staff and are limited in scope and hours. The Board of Trustees is in support of this position and has been for the last several years. It is more feasible to have this position service all the off-site centers. Are there any questions?

   The following questions were asked.

   1.) Is PFC is going to be able to see the job description? (René)
   2.) One thing that is unclear is how will this Dean coordinate with the rest of the Academic Deans in scheduling of classes, etc. (Robert)
   3.) One concern is the scheduling of classes and faculty assignments will that still fall to the Academic Deans? (Vann)
   4.) Is this an Interim position? (Sheila)

   President Dreyfuss responded that the job description go forward to the Board of Trustees for approval on February 18th. As far as coordination, this Dean will work with all facets of the college, Academic and Student Services Deans, Information Technology, Facilities, Security, etc. All parties will work together. This is not an interim position.

   There were no other questions and President Dreyfuss departed at this point of the meeting.
IV. Co-Chair’s Report – Vann reported that the college received word from ACCJC regarding accreditation and Rio Hondo has been reaffirmed with a follow up report and visit this October. Overall this is great news.

Howard reported that there were errors on the initial 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.

V. New Business

- New Members for Spring Semester up report and the visit.

  Vann welcomed the new Dean of Student Affairs, Loy Nashua who started with the college this week. In the interim, as Loy acclimates to his new position, Heba Griffiths, Director of EOP & S will be representing the Student Services area on PFC.

- AP & BP Review (1 Item)
  - BP4030 – Academic Freedom – Vann reported that a sub-committee consisting of Henry Gee, Dyrell Foster, Sandra Rivera and Adam Wetsman met last semester and developed language for revision of the Academic Freedom Board Policy. This went forward at the Special Board Meeting on January 20. The Board had some suggested revisions. Consensus to accept as presented.

  Henry reported that he is working with completing the OCR’s requirements.

VI. Unfinished Business

- Update on Four Year Degree

  Vann reported that the Academic Senate endorsed the recommendation of the Auto Tech four year degree go forward for submission to the Chancellor’s Office. The Senate also recommended that the cost analysis be provided to Academic Senate. PFC was in agreement to move this item forward with the condition that the council be informed of the costs involved for this pilot program. This was noted at the December 9, 2014 special PFC meeting.

  Mike Slavich, Dean of CTE was present to provide an update and to field questions.

  We have been having weekly calls with the Chancellor’s Office. The Chancellor is working with the UCs and CSUs to respond to their concerns regarding the four year degree. There are many questions that have yet to be answered. The Chancellor’s Office will respond on March 15th. As of now all fifteen pilot colleges are required to get letters of support from industry. Once final approval is handed down, the next task is going to be curriculum. We evaluated our labs and equipment. We probably exceed most CSUs in our area. On the business side we are looking at talent and classrooms. There is a significant talent pool in industry who are willing to help. We have the talent here on campus for the GE side and we need to develop the curriculum. Costs is the piece that also needs to be looked at. We see that sections will need to be added and we will collect apportionment. The $84.00 unit fee is the suggested rate. We all know that enrollment is soft. We are not hitting growth so we need to focus on headcount. We are waiting for the Chancellor’s
Office to review curriculum for the TMC’s right now. That is all the resources that we have at this point with the existing infrastructure.

The following questions were asked.

1.) From the Counseling perspective and articulation, the degree will come through Song Graham. What about the student who completes a BA degree and moved on to the Cal State, is that the plan here? How is that going to work? (Julius)

Mike reported that we have contacted folks to help with the 400 level courses. That is the final piece we need. The goal here is to get students on a path to a graduate level degree. We don’t want to have a standalone degree. We don’t want duplication of coursework. We have positive responses from employees at CSULB and CSULA at the professor level. We are working on this piece now.

2.) In order to complete the degree a student has to take upper division in the CTE area and also in English and Math is that correct? Logistically, you will not have that many students so are you going to offer upper division in these core classes that you need to complete the degree? Will there be an opportunity for non-bachelor students to take any of these classes? (Adam)

Mike responded if we follow the template we have a couple of themes that a student can pick from to get the rigor that is comparable to 300 level coursework at the CSUs in the other academic areas. It looks like the cohort will be around 50 students. Technically, they will not start until Spring 2017. That’s not to say that a student could not start on general education requirements now. For those students who are not an official part of the cohort, if they met the prereq I don’t see why they would not be able to take the higher level courses. We are getting a lot of industry personnel who have already completed an AA degree and are interested in joining the cohort. We targeted 20 students in our proposal. There will be some growing pains working through this process. This effort needs to involve the entire campus for input. We do not want to work in a silo. Steve Tomory and John Frala will be the leads.

3.) In terms of getting the courses written, it seems to me that we need to have a concerted effort on campus before we start writing curriculum. Will students who take the 300 and 400 level courses who are not in the co-hort be able to articulate these classes to another college or university? (Sheila)

Mike responded that we have a full time Articulation officer who can verify this.

4.) Will all instructors have the opportunity to teach these classes? Do we have administrative buy in to keep low enrolled classes and not cancel? Who is paying for this? These are the questions that are on our minds. (Adam)

Mike responded that a Master’s degree or higher is required for minimum qualifications. We are working with our other schools who have the same questions. There are 21 states that have programs similar to this one. There is also a national organization that is hosting a conference in Boston in March. This is new to California but not to the education system. We can learn from others and model what has worked.

5.) What is the timeline here is there potential to offer classes prior to January 2017? (Robert)
Mike reported that the lower division coursework can be completed now. The upper division offerings we must abide by the 2017 start date.

6.) Will this program be accredited? (Kathy)

Mike reported that all coursework will be accredited. Students will have an ed plan that will include the upper division coursework. This is targeted for the Southern California area where we have a specific niche. We could have gone with logistics, but CSUDH offers this program so we removed it so there was no conflict.

7.) Is there a general sense about the number of classes of the general ed piece? Do you have an estimated time for the costs? (Katie)

Mike reported that Steve Tomory worked with Song Le Graham on this portion of the application and will have to come back with that information. Mike hopes to have a good template by the end of spring. Technically, the following year is the development year. He is keeping these items on the weekly agenda.

8.) Is there a specialized counselor for this effort? (Alex)

Mike reported that he has one CTE counselor up in his area but more than likely yes there will need to be. Mike is not sure if that will run through the Transfer Center. He will have to consult with Student Services and Mike Munoz soon.

Mike reported that he can come back to this body at any time to give updates. He will know more by the end of March. Mike departed at this point of the meeting.

- Update on Instructional Equipment Sub-Committee Work

Vann reported that Gary Van Voorhis was busy getting quotes from vendors during the month of January. He requested that the committee reconvene to come up with recommendations. Renee will coordinate the meeting. It was suggested that this committee elect a chair. The Sub-committee will reconvene at the end of the PFC meeting to select one member as the chair.

VII. Information Items – No Items

VIII. Committee Reports

### PFC Sub-Committees
- Safety
- Staffing
- IEC
- Program Review
- Facilities
- Equipment & Technology

### Other Committees
- Staff Development
- Basic Skills
- SLO
- Program Review
- Distance Education (DEC)
Staffing – Howard reported that five of the committees including Staffing, Facilities, Equipment and Technology all have to do with resource allocation. He will be receiving the names from the constituent groups and schedule the meetings. The reports are being pulled now.

Vann put out a call for volunteers for the faculty staffing committee. The new makeup of the committee allows for five faculty members from PFC and five from Academic Senate. The following members volunteered – Julius B. Thomas, Jeannie Liu, Sheila Lynch, Gisela Spieler and Kevin Smith.

Adam voiced his concerns regarding the change of the representation of the committee as reflected in the 2015 Governance Manual. It may be a challenge to have a broad base of representation of Divisions that is his concern. As of now Communications & Languages, Public Safety, Library and Health Sciences are not represented.

Howard reported that part of the restructuring of the staffing committees is that the way the old committee was structured in representation many were not involved in the college wide process. This was the rationale for going to members of PFC who have more knowledge about what is going on institutionally.

Howard is pulling the reports now. If he recalled correctly there are roughly 25 requests. There are two meetings in March and time will be required to score online. Those participating must be available for both meeting dates. All meetings will be held in SS-305.

Sandra requested the staffing requests before appointing classified members.

Howard responded that committee members are not present to advocate for their division/department. We are looking to have an unbiased committee who can look at requests globally. If you are interested in review those requests, any staff member on campus can access area plans in the planning software. Once reports are cleaned up Howard will post to the summaries on the P:Drive and also to the IRP channel on the portal.

All of the program review executive summaries are in. February 20th is the deadline to resubmit. IEC has a lot of work in a number of areas including sub-committee work on the Institutional Goals and Objectives in preparation for the annual planning retreat on April 17th. Sandy Sandello has already sent out a save the date notice for the retreat.

Howard also reported that the Board Study Session last month the Board had one goal that the Board monitors for ACCJC to develop a list in the context of programs. We are already thinking about how to respond to the Institutional Set Standards. This item will come forward to the PFC.

Staff Development – Katie reported that Staff Development Committee along with Academic Senate is offering Faculty Orientations for the new hires starting on the evening of February 19th. There are four evening sessions throughout the spring semester.

With the passage of AB 2558, which mandates Staff Development, we are looking at the January budget and funding has been put aside for Staff Development. We are also working with Jim Sass to develop a needs assessment to be sent out to staff. We also want to build a solid staff development plan.
• **SLOs** – Adam reported that we have received the report from ACCJC. He thinks the next steps for the SLO committee will be to ensure that we fulfill all the requirements outlined in the letter.

• **DEC** – Sheila reported that the DEC had its first meeting yesterday. The certification program will be up and running (all three modules) by spring break. The first module is up now. Module two focuses on accessibility. Part three is best practices, developed by faculty. For faculty wanting to teach online, they must complete this certification by Fall 2015. Classes for Spring 2016 will only be assigned to those who complete the training. Flex credit is given to participants. Mike Javanmard, DEC Coordinator is the person responsible for verifying who has completed the certification. A report will need to be generated to keep the Deans and VPAA informed of completers. We are not yet at this stage. It was suggested that a certificate of completion be given to faculty who complete training.

Alex queried if there is student representation on the DEC committee. Vann clarified that there is no student representative because this is an Academic Senate committee.

Adam reported that one of the things ACCJC noted in their report regarding online education is the regular and substantive contact. Does the committee think that by doing this certification program it will satisfy ACCJC? What more needs to be done?

Sheila responded that it was suggested that we come up with a proposal to show that we ensure regular and effective contact. It has to be faculty initiated contact. Academic Senate and DE cannot ensure that this is done. This gets involved with contract language, etc. Mike will be talking to Kathy Pudelko about this matter.

IX. Announcements – No announcements were made.

X. Public Comment – No public comments were made.

XI. Adjournment – Vann adjourned the meeting at 3:23 p.m. The next PFC meeting will be held on February 24, 2015, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room