RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, September 22, 2015, 2:30 p.m., Board Room

Members Present: Kenn Pierson (Co-Chair and VPAA), Robert Bethel (Co-Chair and President, AS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), Dr. Kevin Smith (1st VP, AS), Katie O'Brien (2nd VP, AS) Michelle Bean (Secretary, AS), John Frala (ASCCC Rep, AS), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Dr. Sergio Guzman (President, RHCFA), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), René Tai (CSEA), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), William Ashby (ASRHC), Sean Burton (ASRHC), Dr. Vann Priest (Mgmt. AA), Loy Nashua (Mgmt. SS)

Members Absent: Henry Gee (VPSS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian, AS), Mark Littrell (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Herzon Alfaro (ASRHC)

Staff Members: Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), Marie Eckstrom (Faculty & Program Review Chair), Reneé Gallegos (Recorder)

I. Call to Order – Kenn called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. A revised agenda was posted and is available in the back. Items have been rearranged on the agenda to allow the Program Review Proposal to be discussed first.

II. Acceptance of Minutes – The minutes of September 8, 2015 were consensed upon with one edit on page two.

III. Co-Chair's Report – Robert has nothing to report at this time. The APs and BPs are working their way through Academic Senate and will be coming to PFC one by one. Many of the adjustments are very minor.

Kenn reported that most of his recent work has been helping to complete the *ACCJC Follow Up Report*. The Board will review the document on October 14, the signed document will be mailed on October 15 and the team will be here on Friday, October 16, 2015. Any recommended changes that we talk about today will be recorded. Kenn stressed that edits are still being made. One of the remaining revisions is changing the name of "faculty" to RHCFA, the official title. There are additional smaller edits, as well. Kenn worked intensively with Reneé and Angie last week to complete the document and evidence.

IV. New Business

- **Program Review Proposal** – Robert & Marie Eckstrom – Robert reported on the proposed Program Review procedure. An additional component will be incorporated, which emphasizes the need to improve the program review document and/or the program itself. The peer review committee, consisting of all constituents of the College, will discuss the document and the program with the program participants and, based on their evaluation, accept the program review as submitted, or ask for a minor or major revision. Minor revisions will be submitted to the co-chairs in the spring; major revisions will be submitted in the fall in place of the program plan. If necessary, a second formal program review will follow the next year, not to supplant the regularly scheduled position in the six-year program review cycle. The language proposed is below.

Program Review Proposal

Following the annual program review cycle and based on the peer review, each document will be given one of three status conditions: accepted as written, requested to make minor revisions, or requested to make major revisions. Suggestions for improvement will be based on the program peer review and detailed in the Executive Summary.

Minor Revision: This indicates the document needs surface-level attention, such as reorganization, elaboration, and/or stylistic attention. The document is basically sound. Revision will be submitted before the Institutional Planning Retreat in the spring. The Program Review co-chairs will review the re-submitted document and either accept the revision or suggest further revision.

Major Revision: This indicates the document and/or the program needs serious reconsideration. This takes time and should include all participants in the program. Major revisions will be submitted by the program review deadline the following year, and the revised program review will serve as the program plan for that year. The Program Review co-chairs will review the re-submitted document. If necessary, the program will be asked to undergo another formal program review the following year to ensure improvement. This second formal program review will not supplant the regular and established six-year program review cycle.

Howard reported that even if a program does a spectacular job, there is still the possibility of recommendations. If someone had to do a major revision, they are doing it as part of the program planning process. We are not asking participants to do anything different. They just need to do a good job.

Katie asked who the information is disseminated to regarding the outcome of program review. Do faculty receive it, the Deans, and/or the Vice Presidents?

Marie responded that the information and suggested improvements are in the Executive Summary that is available online and anyone can look at it. This is inclusive of all the programs. The Executive Summary also comes forward to the PFC each year.

Sergio asked if the co-chairs are the ones who decide the outcome. If there is a disagreement between the two, what is the understanding of what would happen then?

Marie reported that it is not only the two individuals who decide, it is based on the program review/peer reviews which are all detailed in the Executive Summary. Also, Adam responded that the Executive Summary comes through this body, so we all have access to it. Robert reported that the Program Review Executive Summary should come to PFC in February 2016.

Vann asked what the percentage is for the programs that do not respond. Howard reported that he did not have that information; however, he is aware that very few programs that actually respond to follow-up inquiries.

Marie added that Program Review has resulted in many positive changes over the past years on this campus. We shall implement this revised process during the current review cycle.

Consensus was reached on the Program Review Proposal.

Marie left at this point of the meeting.

- **AP Review (1 Item)**
  - **AP 4020 Program and Curriculum and Development** - Robert reported that there are four minor corrections on this AP. A title change correction to the Dean of CTE/IO, the website address, and two new references to the ACCJC standards. One of the reasons that we are bringing this through is because Curriculum has to reference this AP when they send documentation up to the Chancellor's Office. We may be revisiting this AP often so there is

always a current date on it otherwise the Chancellor's Office may deny our submissions. Adam reported a few grammatical changes.

Consensus reached on AP 4020.

- ***ACCJC Follow-up Report*** – Kenn & Howard - Howard reported that the *ACCJC Follow-up Report* is due October 15. Howard talked to a representative from ACCJC and they will accept the unsigned report due to the timing of the site visit. The Board will review the final report on October 14. The signed report will be mailed on October 15, and the team visits us on October 16.

  Howard clarified that the timeline is a component of the requirements from ACCJC. Each of the recommendations had one or more authors. We wrote each of the sections and gathered evidence. Most of the recommendations were coming up with new processes or showing the current processes that we have in place. Sometimes we were writing in future tense. We had to convert language to the present tense and update the document.

  Kenn reviewed the *Follow-up Report* section by section. Commenting on Recommendation #1, Howard said, like institutional set standards, we have program set standards this year. We will now establish several program level standards in each of the academic programs and implement these as part of the institutional planning process. They will show where we should be at any given time regarding licensure, exam rates, success, etc. Sometimes programs will have some or they will not have any.

  Kenn read Recommendation #3. This has been a campus-wide effort to ensure that online faculty are conducting regular and substantive contact with students. We received recommendations. Kenn authored this section in the spring. Progress includes the formation of the DEC, outlined by AP 4105 guidelines. The DEC has enhanced the process by developing the course expectation letter in Fall 2014. Students are informed ahead of time of the rigor of the course, along with information regarding regular and substantive contact. Kenn referenced Jeannie Liu who uses multiple means to stay in touch with her students. Jeannie uses Skype and calls her students, so there is significant contact.

  Suzanne reported that the DEC is proposing a name change to the Online Education Committee, to be aligned with the Office of Online Education. Kenn reported that we will reference as the DEC since the change has not yet formally occurred.

  Kenn also referenced the training modules for best practices in online teaching. Katie asked if the report includes faculty that have completed the online training. The “Best Practices” form is also new and came from the DEC. There are new processes that have just begun to demonstrate that we are working toward the goal. Kenn has included the list of on line training completers as evidence.

  Vann reported on the expanded process for program continuance to address Recommendation #4. There were a lot of changes made to AP4021; “Program Discontinuance”. ACCJC is concerned that we have a process for students to complete their programs. In the past, we had an AP that involved only Vocational Programs. After a lengthy revision by the Academic Deans as well as input from Senate, the AP now includes both vocational and academic programs. This AP was exhaustively revised.

Regarding Recommendation #5, Adam reported that he created a summary for each program level SLO associated with each course SLO. We indicated there is a program level SLO and Adam needed to assess. These were all specified in SLOutions. Adam also attended the Academic Dean's Council meeting on March 26, 2015 to brief the Deans on status and demonstrated the software.

Adam reported that SLOs are now part of the collective bargaining agreement for full-time faculty. Adam also follows up with emails to the faculty.

Kenn also reported that the Academic Deans are working in pairs with the designated SLO committee faculty members within their own divisions to look at assessments in an effort to monitor SLO reports. We are waiting for data that is due from the Deans on October 9th. The data submitted will speak to the completion rates for assessment reports.

Adam reported that he did not have the data for non-credit courses as of yet. He also reminded the PFC that, as an example, we may have twenty sections of Anthropology yet only have five sections with data. However, we would have 100% compliance.

Adam also authored Recommendation #7. The response includes a statement related to having to negotiate SLO's in the next openers that will occur in the next several months. Adam also suggested that the all faculty are not ranked as "professors," so we may want to change that title to "faculty members," or "faculty union."

Robert asked if there is general sense on what is going to happen after the report is submitted.

Howard responded that the report accurately responds to what ACCJC has asked of the College. RHC is serious about moving forward. ACCJC may decide that they will wait for negotiations, otherwise everything else is answered. Due to the enhanced monitoring of the SLOs, ACCJC may look closer at Recommendation #5. Howard also had a conversation with Jack Pond on how SLOs relate and how to respond. Mr. Pond responded that the follow-up report should show how we have modified our process; if we have done that sufficiently, then that should be satisfactory to the Commission.

V. Unfinished Business

AP & BP Updates – Kenn gave updates on the following APs & BPs:

- AP 3510 Workplace Violence – A sub-committee time has been scheduled.
- BP 7211 Faculty Service Area, Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency – The sub-committee consisting of Yolanda, Robert, and Kenn made minor revision to the BP. The sub-committee also wants to create an AP as well, so both documents will come forward in tandem.
- AP 4222 Remedial Coursework – This AP is will be coming forward soon. There are a few minor edits to be made.
- AP 4225 Course Repetition - This AP is in the hands of Academic Senate.
- AP 4610 Instructional Service Agreements - This AP is in the hands of Academic Senate.

VI. Committee Reports

PFC Sub-Committees

- Safety – No report.
- Staffing – 2015-16 Faculty Resource Allocation Requests – Kenn, report below.
- IEC – Report below.
- Program Review – Marie Eckstrom, report above.
- Facilities – No report.
- Equipment & Technology – No report.

Other Committees

- Staff Development – Report below.
- Basic Skills – No report.
- SLO – No report.
- Distance Education (DEC) – No report.

Staffing – Kenn reported that President Dreyfuss asked that this body be informed of the Faculty Resource Requests for 2015-2016. Requests 1–5 will be funded (list attached). Affected deans will be notified after this meeting to submit the required paperwork. These will be District-funded, tenure-track positions that could be hired as early as spring 2016. Please keep in mind that Human Resources is backlogged, so it is likely we will target Fall 2016 to fill these positions.

Adam recalled that we downsized the Technical Theater Program.

Kenn clarified that the previous position in theatre was occupied by a faculty member who had vocational qualifications in technical theatre. This new position is an academic position that involves courses being taught where a Master's degree is required. Also, there was not a program in technical theatre in the past, as no program review was ever written or identified.

Adam asked of Myeshia if these are extra positions that are funded by the $60 million coming out of the Governor's budget.

Myeshia responded that any additional monies that come from the augmentation to the budget will be infused into the General Fund. The five positions are full-time, tenure-track positions funded through the Governor's budget for faculty additions. The new positions would count towards the Faculty Obligation Number (FON) obligation.

Vann asked if there are any decisions regarding the technology and facilities resource allocations?

Howard reported that President Dreyfuss is reviewing the requests and will be giving an update soon.

No further questions were asked.

IEC- Howard reported that the IEC is working on the Institutional Set Standards that are in the process of being revised. IEC is working on the local standards based on the Student Success Scorecard. There is the ongoing process for Institutional Goals and Objectives. Since we made such a big change with G & O's, we created work groups. All constituent groups will be represented. Howard will be sending forward a list of potential work groups to President Dreyfuss. We will have a product when we come up for the next level of recommendations. The IEC is also reviewing new software called TK20 on Tuesday, October 6. Howard hopes to

have the demo at the IEC meeting as well as Administrative Council, too. If you wish to attend the October 6, demo it is at 1:00pm in L402.

Staff Development – Katie reported that the RFP has gone out for the November 13 All-Staff Retreat. A few faculty development workshops will be coming, based on survey results filled out by the campus. Classified and Confidential staff have to come back with suggestions for their respective groups. We are still waiting on news about the Title V grant. We should hear something any day now. The current grant ends on September 30.

VII. Announcements

Robert reported that he was fortunate to participate in a field trip last Friday at the Armstrong Flight Center. MESA Center Grant sponsored by NASA. This MESA Center Grant encourages STEM students to participate by competing through projects. This was a culmination at the Armstrong Flight Center. We accompanied 16 students who presented their projects along with four other community colleges. It was a fascinating glimpse into what NASA and the Air Force does. All of this having to do with flight engineering. This was the first co-hort, and there is funding for another.

Will reported that two of the ASRHC officers (Herzon Alfaro, and Misael Piña-Torres who was the designated substitute) are not able to attend the PFC meetings this semester. ASRHC will try to appoint another member to this body. Will is not sure if this will be possible due to scheduling conflicts. For now, ASRCH will have two representatives on the PFC.

René reported that as far as she knows, the District is still charging students for the Health Fee even though students are not receiving all services because there is no doctor available. Why aren't we hiring a replacement for this position? If there are no doctor services available, then we should not be charging the students the full fee. How much are we collecting in fees? René is recommending that the District stop charging the students the Health Fee.

Loy responded that we are providing psychological and nursing services. We are looking for a doctor replacement, but there is a personnel manner involved that he cannot speak to. We cannot dissolve services that we once offered. We tried a placement agency, but that is very costly.

Kevin reported that one of the nurses informed him that they are no longer administering immunizations.

Julius reported that the physician is the holder of the license to administer immunizations and write prescriptions. When the previous doctor departed, the license went with him. Psychological services have been expanded in recent years. Students have been referred to other facilities for services such as physicals, tests, and immunizations. He also reported that the Student Health Fee is now $17.00.

Kenn responded that Henry is not here today and ideally, he is the person to speak to this matter.

Myeshia responded that there are some details unique to the Health Office, when we implement fees; we need to look at what the students are being assessed and the level of care we need to provide. It is necessary to go back to research and bring some clarity back to this body.

Jeannie asked where the money that is collected goes. Is there a special fund?

Myeshia responded that there are nurses and a full time classified staff member in the Student Health Office. Again, the focus should be on what services are provided.

Robert suggested developing a resolution urging the administration to resolve the problem. This will put added pressure on the Administration to address this immediately.

Kenn requested Henry and Myeshia to research the Student Health Fee and report back at the next PFC meeting. If they can review the past five years, looking at costs incurred, etc. that would be very helpful.

Sergio reported that the faculty member in the Health Office is not paid from the Student Health Fees. The doctor is a full-time faculty member. The health fees are there to maintain the Health Office for the students. It has been a few years without a doctor, and that is what needs to be clarified.

Robert reported that what is much more important here is that fees have been collected and, from a student standpoint, it matters where the money goes. Students are paying a fee with the expectation of receiving services. Whatever needs to be done to resolve this should be done with a sense of urgency.

Myeshia directed her question to Will as President of the ASRHC. Has this conversation come up in your group?

Will reported that when students come for a BOGG waiver, they are focused on the tuition being paid, not so much the Student Health Fee. Many people use the Health Office for psychological services/ therapy so it does serve a purpose. For that type of therapy, students are getting their money's worth. There is a full-time person in the office who helps keep the center operational.

Robert wanted to clarify using a scenario. As a Biology lab instructor, if he has an accident that needs more than a band-aid, what should he do? The consensus was to call 911 depending on the nature of the injury.

Adam agrees with Rene's sentiment. We need a doctor. For those of you who know history, we have had a doctor on site for at least the past five years. Before that we had a nurse practitioner. We should review the history, look at our needs, and make a recommendation. Certainly, a doctor and a nurse's salary are not going to be the same. This may be very timely and is something as an institution we should commit to, especially since we have Student Equity funds.

Loy responded that not all of the nurses we have are nurse practitioners. Our nurses do respond to emergencies as best they can.

Rene reported that KDA is an example when there is a student injury, the student ends up paying for the ambulance if they are indeed transported to a local hospital. The nurses in the Health Office have difficulty getting down to the field.

Kenn reiterated that it is only fair to give Henry and Myeshia time to research this matter and report back, especially with Henry being absent today. This is the route we will go.

No further comments were made.

VIII. Public Comment – None.

IX. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 p.m. The next meeting will be held on October 13, 2015, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room.

RANKED POSITIONS

Rank	Unit	Program	Position Title	Salary
1	Behavioral and Social Sciences	Human Services	Human Services Faculty Member	$85,000
2	Health Sciences	Nursing	Health Sciences Faculty Member	$85,000
3	Career Technical Education	ACEDD	Architecture/CAD/Drafting Instructor	$85,000
4	Arts and Cultural Programs	Theater	Theater (Design/Tech) Faculty Member	$85,000
5	Counseling and Student Success	Counseling	General Counselor	$85,000
6	Behavioral and Social Sciences	Political Science	Political Science Faculty Member	$85,000
7	Communications and Languages	Speech	Speech Faculty Member	$85,000
8	Kinesiology, Dance and Athletics	Kinesiology	Kinesiology/Head Coach Volleyball	$85,000
9	Counseling and Student Success	Counseling	Career Counselor	$85,000
10	Behavioral and Social Sciences	Sociology	Sociology Faculty Member	$85,000
11	Business	Accounting	Business/Accounting Faculty Member	$85,000
12	Kinesiology, Dance and Athletics	Dance	KDA Faculty Member/ Dance,Yoga,Pilates	$85,000
13	Business	Business Management	Business/Marketing Faculty Member	$85,000
14	Public Safety	Fire Technology	Fire Technology Faculty Member	$85,000
15	Kinesiology, Dance and Athletics	Kinesiology	Kinesiology/Head Coach Men's Soccer	$85,000
16	Library and Instructional Support	Library	Librarian	$85,000
17	Public Safety	Administration of Justice	Administration of Justice Faculty Member 1	$85,000
18	Public Safety	Administration of Justice	Administration of Justice Faculty Member 2	$85,000
19	Behavioral and Social Sciences	Humanities	Humanities Faculty Member	$85,000
20	Kinesiology, Dance and Athletics	Kinesiology	Kinesiology/Head Coach Men's Basketball	$85,000

RIO HONDO COLLEGE

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

October 9, 2015

To: President's Council
Administrative Council
Planning Fiscal Council

From: Sandy Sandello

Subject: **REVISION OF BOARD POLICIES**

Attached is a revision to the following Board Policies:

- BP 1100 Rio Hondo Community College District
- BP 1200 District Vision, Mission, Values Statement

This will begin the review process for the above policies.

I. The District has been named the Rio Hondo Community College District.

II. The name is the property of the District. No person shall, without the permission of the Board **of Trustees**, use this name or the name of the college or other facilities of the District, or any abbreviation of them, to imply, indicate or otherwise suggest that an organization, product, or service is connected or affiliated with, or is endorsed, favored, supported, or opposed by, the District.

III. The visual identities and variations thereof established by Rio Hondo College are the property of the District. They include college logos, words, marks, symbols, mottos, insignia (suggested by legal counsel), and any variation of the Roadrunner college mascot. No person shall, without the permission of the Board, use any visual identities owned by the District, or any manifestation of them, to imply, indicate, or otherwise suggest that an individual, organization, product, or service is connected or affiliated with, or is endorsed, favored, supported, or opposed by, the District.

IV. The District's name, including the name of the College or other facilities or abbreviations thereof, and the visual identities, including variations thereof, as identified herein, shall not be used in a manner that is misleading or could cause confusion regarding the District's affiliation with any person or entity or sponsorship of any product or service.

V. The District consists of the following College and/or educational sites **and any reference in College policies and procedures should apply to the following educational sites**:

A. Rio Hondo Community College

3600 Workman Mill Road

Whittier, CA 90601

(562) 692-0921

B. SFS Regional Training Facility

11400 Greenstone Avenue

Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

(562) 942-4082

C. South Whittier Educational Center

14307 E. Telegraph Road

Whittier, CA 90604

(562) 941-2356

D. El Monte Educational Center

3017 Tyler Avenue

El Monte, CA 91731

(626) 443-8932

VI. Sources/References:

Education Code 72000(b); Elections Code Section 18304.

BP 1100 The *[Name]* Community College District

References:

Education Code Section 72000(b);
Elections Code Section 18304

Note: *This policy is legally required.*

The District has been named the [*Name*] Community College District.

The name is the property of the District. No person shall, without the permission of the Board, use this name or the name(s) of any college(s) or other facilities of the District, or any abbreviation of them, to imply, indicate or otherwise suggest that an organization, product or service is connected or affiliated with, or is endorsed, favored, supported, or opposed by, the District.

The District consists of the following college(s) and/or education center(s):

[*List as appropriate*]

Revised 2/04

DISTRICT VISION, MISSION, VALUES STATEMENT

BP No. 1200

Board Adopted: 1/9/02; 11/12/03; 12/12/12; 6/11/14

I. This policy is required by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)/Accreditation Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) accreditation standards. The accreditation standard requires that "the mission describes the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement."

I. As stipulated in AB 1725, California Community Colleges are charged with the following broad missions: transfer, vocational education, community services, contract education, and economic development.

II. Vision – The Vision of the Rio Hondo Community College District is as follows:

"Rio Hondo College strives to be an exemplary California community college, meeting the learning needs of its changing and growing population and developing a state of the art campus to serve future generations" *(Board: 6/21/06)*

III. Mission - The Mission of the Rio Hondo Community College District is as follows:

Rio Hondo College is committed to the success of its diverse students and communities by providing dynamic educational opportunities and resources that lead to ~~associate~~ degrees, certificates, transfer, career and technical pathways, basic skills proficiency, and lifelong learning. *(Board 11/18/13)*

The mission is evaluated and revised on a regular basis.

IV. Value(s) Statement – The Value(s) of Rio Hondo Community College District is/are as follows:

- Quality Teaching and Learning
- Student Access and Success
- Diversity and Equity
- Fiscal Responsibility
- Integrity and Civility

V. Source/Reference:
~~WASC/~~ACCJC **Accreditation** Standard 1A

BP 1200 District Mission

Reference:
ACCJC Accreditation Standard I.A

Note: *This policy is required by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)/Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) accreditation standards. The accreditation standard requires that "the mission describes the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement."*

The mission of the **[*Name*]** Community College District is:

[*Insert district mission here*]

The mission is evaluated and revised on a regular basis.

Note: *Institutional mission defines the broad-based educational purposes the district seeks to achieve and the students it intends to serve, as well as the parameters under which programs can be offered and resources allocated.*

It is the discretion of the board of multi-college districts whether or not to include individual college missions as board policy.

It is the discretion of the board whether or not it wishes to state a specific time frame for evaluating and revising the mission.

Revised 11/14