

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES  
Tuesday, April 12, 2016, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

---

**Members Present:** Joanna Schilling (VPAA & Co Chair), Robert Bethel (Co-Chair and President, AS), Henry Gee (VPSS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), Dr. Kevin Smith (1<sup>st</sup> VP, AS), Katie O'Brien (2<sup>nd</sup> VP, AS) Michelle Bean (Secretary, AS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Dr. Sergio Guzman (President, RHCFA), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Mark Littrell (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (CSEA), Sean Burton (ASRHC), Javier Cano (ASRHC), Dr. Vann Priest (Mgmt. AA)

**Members Absent:** John Frala (ASCCC Rep.), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), William Ashby (ASRHC), Dr. Mike Muñoz (Mgmt. SS)

**Staff Members:** Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), Reneé Gallegos (Recorder)

- I. **Call to Order-** Robert called the meeting to order at 2:37pm
- II. **Acceptance of Minutes** – The minutes of March 22, 2016 were consensed upon with minor corrections to page 3.
- III. **Co-Chairs Report** – JoAnna reported that she and Robert will be reviewing the Service Animal BP and AP and will bring it back to this body when it is ready.

**IV. New Business**

- **SEMP Action Plans** – Joanna reported that we are spending an hour and fifteen minutes at the Institutional Planning Retreat this Friday to discuss the Strategic Enrollment Management Plans (SEMP). You received a copy of the draft action plans from Reneé for PFC and from Howard who handles the retreat. The document shows the categories broken out into three columns: proposed action plan, timeline and the responsible area. How much do we want to discuss this here today? The same document will be reviewed at the retreat on Friday.

Adam commented that feedback from faculty especially those in Counseling are critical because they know the challenges our students face such as during registration, utilizing Access RIO and these types of issues. If we focus on those things and include some professional development for faculty and classified staff that would be best. Ensuring student success, not just enrollment management, also focusing on keeping enrollment up is critical. We must also support the cause for our students to have a positive experience here at RHC. In the past we have focused solely on FTES. We need to be asking students how they feel when they use the library, how they feel when they walk on to campus and things of that nature.

Javier inquired about bullet 3a. Create a pilot for fast-track ADT's. Will we be creating these fast tracks at the retreat on Friday?

JoAnna explained that we will not be developing the fasts tracks at the retreat. A student will receive a planned out schedule if they are participating in a fast track. As far as the survey, we can assume that the students total experience back in 2012 is very different in 2015-2016.

---

Howard responded that students were asked about their experience in the last survey.

Julius reported that one thing he would like to see is on new intakes. Is there a step by step process somewhere to assist students when they are registering? At CSULA they get a step by step procedure when registering. Our students do not know that they have to make an account and check their student email after it has been set up. If students knew ahead of time that they have to set up accounts that would help them out.

Henry reported that Rachel set up the step by step process that is on the college website. This walks the student through the process. The difficulty is that most students don't have two monitors available to them. The other caveat is that CCCApply has its own processes in place which we can't alter. We have tried sending letters in the mail but that is not cost effective. Now students receive an email letter from Henry.

Mark reported that he has a friend that markets to the tech industry and he recently had an epiphany while in class. A student was going back and forth with Mark that he had sent in an assignment. After talking to the student and having him log into the portal he could see line after line of unread emails. The student was unaware of this account and Mark was amazed at the situation himself until he experienced this visual illustration that Julius speaks of.

Sergio reported in the system there is a new process if you click on "Get Started" it has every sequence from registration process to applying for Financial Aid. If you have a chance, please familiarize yourself with the process. Maybe we need to clarify this to students and make it more prevalent.

Michelle gave her perspective. We are making the assumption that the students are reading. We are used to memos, if students were to see a link they will click on it and follow. She is speaking from her own experience with her son and emails are glanced at. Cerritos College sent her son a letter through the regular mail that showed what the next steps were. Sacramento College sends links to students. We all agree that email is not an effective way to communicate with today's student. What they are responding to now is SNAPCHAT. Maybe that is a question we should be asking in the student survey.

Julius reported that the Counseling department is texting students and they are responsive.

Howard reported that many colleges use Black Board Connect to communicate to students. We can certainly revisit this idea. We have the numbers and technology available.

### **BP/AP Review (11 items)**

The following BP is recommended for deletion in that the material is covered in BP 3430, Prohibition of Harassment and AP 3435 Discrimination and Harassment:

- ❖ BP 7160 Sexual Harassment - [Consensus reached.](#)

The following BPs have been revised:

- ❖ BP 3820 Gifts - [Consensus reached.](#)
- ❖ BP 5010 Admissions and Concurrent Enrollment - [Consensus reached.](#)
- ❖ BP 5015 Residence Determination - [Consensus with edits.](#)
- ❖ BP 5040 Student Records and Directory Information - [Consensus reached.](#)
- ❖ BP 5050 Student Success and Support Programs - [Consensus with edits.](#)
- ❖ BP 5110 Counseling - [Consensus with edits.](#)

- ❖ BP 5130 Financial Aid - [Consensus with edits.](#)
- ❖ BP 5700 Intercollegiate Athletics - [Consensus with edits.](#)

The following APs have been revised:

- ❖ AP 5013 Students in the Military (revised by Senate) - [Consensus reached.](#)
- ❖ AP 3510 Prevention of Workplace Violence and Disruption (PFC Sub-Committee/Senate)

This body had concerns with the committee that would be convened to determine that bullying had occurred. There are many gray areas and there is no concrete definition. It is more common to have bullying between a supervisor and a subordinate. Should the supervisor be a part of the committee to determine if bullying occurred that would be a problem for many.

JoAnna clarified that that an investigation would be conducted by someone who is trained; this is our current practice.

Henry reported that on the Student Services side it is simpler for them because the Dean of Student Affairs is charged with upholding the Student Code of Conduct. It is very black and white.

When you involve faculty, staff and administrators then it becomes gray. You can have parties who do not agree with the language or can interpret it in their own way. How do we ensure that people are adequately trained?

Henry touts Shaina who has been trained, has the knowledge and expertise in this area. He is not comfortable with a committee who has not been sufficiently trained. Henry cited the October, 2010 letter from the Office of Civil Rights and that we should use the language they used in regards to the training component.

JoAnna reported that this is coming from fear that the upper level administrators would come in and the administration would determine the outcome.

Sheila responded that there may be a tendency to lean one way depending on one's own interpretation.

Sandra reported that she would like to see the following language. A subcommittee made up of the Title IX Coordinator, Compliance Officer, President of the RHCFA or designee and President of CSEA or designee, is how it should be worded with the caveat that they receive training.

Kevin responded that this is an effort to try to head off an investigation. Sometimes the investigation causes damage.

Sheila reported that she was part of an investigation years ago. There were staff who had to investigate others and there was no merit to the claim. Had it gone to a subcommittee, it would have been dealt with at that level. It was not and the situation dragged on.

AP 3510 was pulled for further revision. Concerns were raised regarding convening a subcommittee of individuals who may not have the knowledge or expertise to make the determination of bullying. It was also suggested to include specific language that the Title IX and Compliance Officers be a part of this committee and that individuals who are on the sub-committee receive ongoing training.

**V. Unfinished Business** – No items.

**VI. Committee Reports**

PFC Sub-Committees

- Safety – No report.
- Staffing – Report below.
- IEC – Report below.
- Program Review – Report below.
- Facilities – No report.
- Equipment & Technology – No report.

Other Committees

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

**Staffing** – Howard reported that this item will be discussed at the Planning Retreat.

**IEC** – Howard reported that aside from the retreat, the IEC is working on the Climate Survey. Students and staff will receive it in late April or early May. We will go through the same process visiting random classrooms. The Deans and faculty members will be included in this process. All of your help is requested during this time. The results will be tabulated and a report will be generated after summer.

**Program Review**– Howard reported that Program Review is complete. We will review the Executive Summaries at the retreat as well as the Institutional Goals and Objectives.

Sheila inquired if the Program Review Executive Summaries will come forward to PFC like they have in the past.

Howard responded that the process is a little different in that a rubric was used this time around. Marie Eckstrom can certainly come to this body to present possibly at the next PFC meeting. This helps us look at priorities and it will be good to have Marie come in and we can discuss what came out of the retreat and what we want to do in the new year.

**Staff Development** – Katie reported that the 2<sup>nd</sup> new faculty session was held. The numbers were very disappointing so we need to get more buy in from the Deans. We have ongoing workshops and we want them to be valued. We are also recruiting for the RHC Leadership Academy. Applications were received and we have to notify applicants. An orientation will be held on May 12<sup>th</sup> at 4:45 pm. Deans and Managers will be invited to attend the orientation. The SANFACC Mentor Program is also finishing up. Our campus will host the closing reception on May 12<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm. The deadline for the next round of applications has also passed.

**Basic Skills** – Sergio reported that we did not get the BSI grant. We scored enough points on the rubric but the State did not have enough funds for everyone. We were missing points on how we collect data. We have an opportunity now to work in conjunction with a local Cal State School to revisit applying for a partnership grant.

JoAnna reported that it was disappointing that RHC was not funded. JoAnna was a reader and scorer for the grant applications because she was curious on how the process works. Different people read the proposals. The area that was most challenging was the action plan. Are the objectives measureable as well as outcomes? If we had known what we needed to demonstrate that it would have been easier to make the cut. Moving forward, we have centers and classroom space where we can remediate CSU students. We can focus on faculty entry groups creating alignment with the high schools and Basic Skills. We would be able to boost up our Basic Skills delivery. Developing the agreement and connections is critical. Henry is helping with this and CSULA has been responsive. There are only five grants two in the Southland and three up north in the amount of \$2.5 million.

JoAnna reported that Student Equity money has been awarded. We should have brought that here to this body and will have a report on April 26<sup>th</sup>. The information sheet is posted on the website.

## **VII. Announcements**

Javier reported that the Washington D.C. trip went very well. Special thanks was given to Flor Sandoval for scheduling meetings with local legislators and to Russell Castaneda-Calleros for his guidance when students were speaking to legislators and staff. We were well prepared compared to other students. We put a very polished foot forward. There were 350 students from over 500 schools with about half from California. There are different ways for students to fund their travel for this conference. Ralph Nader knew about the Student Rep fees for students. Those funds can be used to advocate for students. We met with Congresswoman Linda Sanchez who validated all the things that the students presented. She even tweeted about the visit. ASRHC President Will Ashby will give a presentation at the Board Meeting tomorrow.

Sheila reported that the Writes of Spring will be held next Tuesday and Wednesday. This is the student film festival, including poetry and readings.

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

**IX. Adjournment** – Robert adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m. The next PFC meeting will be held on April 26, 2016, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room.

### **Important Dates:**

Friday, April 15, 2016, 8-3pm, Institutional Planning Retreat, Whittier Radisson

Friday, May 6, 2016, 5:30 pm, Mid-Quad – A Taste fo Rio

<b>1. Develop trustworthy, accurate data and a reliable system for planning, projecting, and monitoring FTES.</b>		
<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Research EM software products, including ESS, to determine the best system for our EM plan. Products being considering are revised ESS, Tableau data warehouse.	Spring 2016	Academic Affairs, IR&P, IT
b) Solicit input and buy-in from users	Spring 2016	Academic Affairs
c) Decide on new EM system and begin design. Essential features must include: i) consistent data ii) Access to data reports regularly iii) Dashboard with user-configurable features (ad hoc reports)	Summer- Fall 2016	Academic Affairs, IR&P, IT
d) Implement new system	Spring 2017	IT, IR&P
e) Provide ongoing training about how to effectively use data	Spring 2017	Academic Affairs, IR&P, IT

Revised 3-14-16 1

<b>2. Develop common protocols and basic understanding and knowledge for all employees responsible for scheduling and/or monitoring schedule and college performance relative to best business practice metrics for enrollment management, including WSCH/FTEF, fill rates, use of scheduling matrix, use of waitlists, strategies for assignment of FTEF, sections, class additions/class cancellations.</b>		
<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Provide ongoing training	Spring-Summer 2016	Academic Affairs
b) Evaluate scheduling for student ease, accessibility, program course sequencing	Spring-Summer 2016	Academic Affairs
c) Develop EM reports: fill rates, high demand lists, success rates, etc.	Spring-Summer 2016	Academic Affairs
<b>3. Enhance partnership, collaboration, and communication between student services and academic affairs leadership to enhance a culture of student centeredness, and address collaborative enrollment management topics, such as student assessment scores, student educational plans, Student Success and Equity Plans, First Year Experience/Title V/Trio grant activities, outreach activities, marketing of programs, waitlists, and priority registration, to name a few.</b>		
<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Create pilot for fast-track for ADTs	Fall 2016 (Spring 2017)	Academic Affairs, Student Services
b) Enhance K12 partnerships by adding academic component to Outreach (including recruitment for MESA, TRIO, EOP&S, SHP, FYE in high schools, not after students arrive at RHC)	Fall 2016-Spring 2017	Academic Affairs, Student Services

c) Develop Rio Road to College workshops for K12 parents	Fall 2016 - Spring 2017	Academic Affairs, Student Services
d) Host K12 Summit with RHC and all area HS counselors, faculty, administrators	Fall 2016	Academic Affairs, Student Services
<b>4. Create clear procedures and assignment of roles relative to enrollment management as well as centralization/identification of enrollment management leadership.</b>		
<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Develop a working structure for enrollment management procedures	Spring 2016	Academic Affairs
b) Renew Enrollment Management Committee	Spring 2016	Campus Leadership
c) Identify an enrollment management "champion"	Spring 2016	Campus Leadership
d) Develop a manual of enrollment management procedures, definitions, and information	Summer-Fall 2016	Enrollment Management Committee
e) Specify faculty, staff, administrative responsibilities and regularly communicate	Fall 2016	Enrollment Management Committee
f) Hire scheduling analyst to ensure schedules are student centered and consistent with student demand/need and can be a resource and provide training	Summer 2016	Academic Affairs

Revised 3-14-16 3

<b>5. Modify classroom and lab facilities allocation practices in order to maximize space allocation by departments/divisions.</b>		
<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Implement new version of R25	Summer 2016	Academic Affairs, IT, Facilities
b) Develop comprehensive classroom usage reports	Fall 2016	IT, Facilities, Academic Affairs
c) Re-purpose labs experiencing usage decline	Summer 2016	Academic Affairs
d) Provide time of day reports: afternoons, summer, and week-end timeframes and evaluate usage throughout college's open hours	Spring 2016	IR&P, Academic Affairs
e) Promote classroom sharing among divisions/ Departments	Spring-Summer 2016	Academic Affairs
f) Identify individual responsible for monitoring facility use	Spring 2016	President/Superintendent
<b>6. Develop research with data specifically tailored to enrollment management. Create a greater connection and interaction between Institutional Research &amp; Planning (IRP), Information Technology Services (ITS), and decision makers to develop appropriate inquiries.</b>		
<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Develop data warehouse with widespread access and query capability	Fall 2016	IT, IR&P
	Fall-Spring 2016	IT, IR&P, Academic Affairs

b) Create dashboards of routine and special reports accessible to all deans, faculty, counselors, administrators	Fall-Spring 2016	IT, IR&P, Academic Affairs
c) Provide historical trend reports	Fall-Spring 2016	IT, IR&P, Academic Affairs
d) Provide projections of high school graduation rates	Fall-Spring 2016	IT, IR&P, Academic Affairs
e) Refine scheduling software		
<b>7. Regularly determine and report statistics for high school graduate enrollments at RHC from area feeder high schools, and prioritize maintaining and increasing those enrollments.</b>		
a) Evaluate data and practices	Spring-Fall 2016	Academic Affairs, Student Services
b) Develop clear transitions from high school to RHC for more efficient enrollment/access opportunities	Fall 2016-Spring 2017	Academic Affairs, Student Services
c) Coordinate and enhance outreach efforts with K12, student services, and academic affairs	Fall 2016-Spring 2017	Academic Affairs, Student Services
d) Define/expand priority registration capacities	Fall 2016-Spring 2017	Academic Affairs, Student Services
<b>8. Holistically evaluate program mix vis a vis age distribution projections and educational attainment of service area population.</b>		

Revised 3-14-16 5

<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Analyze programs relative to regional colleges and universities	Spring-Summer 2016	Student Services
b) Create a "brand" for RHS non-credit programs	Summer-Fall 2016	Academic Affairs, Marketing
c) Develop additional continuing education programs aimed at mature learners	Summer-Fall 2016	Academic Affairs
d) Focus on pathways for adults (evening degree pathways, class offerings at work site, etc.)	Summer-Fall 2016	Academic Affairs
<b>9. Using results of Student Media Preferences Survey, prioritize engaging marketing messaging that focuses on RHC benefits to students and that utilizes social and digital media.</b>		
<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Re-brand campaign for best programs	Summer-Fall 2016	Marketing
b) Update college logo	Summer-Fall 2016	Marketing
c) Increase outreach to older populations	Summer-Fall 2016	Marketing
d) Highlight new programs and initiatives	Summer-Fall 2016	Marketing
e) Develop culture that "we are all RHC ambassadors"	Fall 2016 – Spring 2017	Campus Leadership
	Fall 2016 – Spring 2017	Campus Leadership

f) Create a more attractive environment for students (food, activities, parking, wifi)	Fall 2016 – Spring 2017	Marketing, Academic Affairs, Student Services
g) Develop Rio as the “1 <sup>st</sup> Choice Option”	Summer - Fall 2016	Marketing
h) Create clear communication on pathway opportunities	Fall 2016 – Spring 2017	Admissions & Records, IT
i) Complete Degree Works	Fall 2017	Academic Affairs, Student Services, IT
j) Develop completion dashboards for students (from Degree Works)		
<b>10. Develop and provide clear, thorough, coordinated and customer-friendly communications and instructions to students about Admissions and Financial Aid processes, pathways, timelines, and procedures.</b>		
<b>Proposed Action Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Responsible Area</b>
a) Provide clear one-stop services	Fall 2016-Spring 2017	Student Services
b) Create full matriculation opportunities prior to entry	Spring 2017	Student Services
c) Email students with reminders	Fall 2016- Spring 2017	Student Services
d) Answer phones in a customer-friendly way		
e) Answer in-person questions, behind the counter, in a customer-friendly way		

Revised 3-14-16 7

f) Revise website to customer-service language		Marketing
--	--	-----------



PROGRAM REVIEW RUBRIC (DRAFT)

	Written Discourse	Content	SLOs/SAOs	Data Analysis	Goals & Objectives
<b>Accepted as submitted</b>  <b>Or Accepted with suggested revision</b>	The document is relatively free of surface-level (sentence-level) errors, and exhibits acceptable grammar and mechanics.	The document thoroughly addresses the Help Text prompts.	The document thoroughly responds to all prompts related to SLOs/SAOs.	The document exhibits thoughtful analysis of available data.	The goals and objectives reflect the trends, strategic direction, and data analysis of the program.
	The written discourse is coherent, cogent, and demonstrates unity	The document includes many relevant details and thorough analysis.	All SLOs/SAOs are addressed within the six-year program review cycle.	Inferences and conclusions drawn from the data are logical and cogent.	The goals and objectives include rationale in support of resource allocation requests.
	The discourse addresses a collegiate audience, with the commensurate tone.	The document exhibits depth and is comprehensive in scope.		The data is used to substantiate assertions.	The Goals & Objectives are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Bound.
<b>Revision Required</b>	The document contains several surface-level (sentence-level) errors, and several errors in grammar and mechanics.	The document adequately addresses the Help Text prompts.	The document responds to some of the prompts related to SLOs/SAOs.	The document exhibits some analysis of available data.	The goals and objectives somewhat reflect the trends, strategic direction, and data analysis of the program.
	The written discourse is generally coherent, cogent, and unified.	The document includes several relevant details and some analysis.	Some of the SLOs/SAOs are addressed within the six-year program review cycle.	There are some inferences and conclusions drawn from the data analysis.	The goals and objectives include some rationale in support of resource allocation requests.
	The discourse generally addresses a collegiate audience, with the commensurate tone.	The document exhibits an adequate depth and scope.		The data is sometimes used to substantiate assertions.	The Goals & Objectives are somewhat Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Bound.
<b>Significant Revision required</b>	The document contains many surface-level (sentence-level) errors, and many errors in grammar and mechanics.	The document does not (or does in a limited way) address the Help Text prompts.	The document does not adequately respond to the prompts related to SLOs/SAOs.	The document exhibits little analysis of available data.	The goals and objectives do not address the trends, strategic direction, and data analysis of the program.
	The written discourse lacks coherence, cogency, and unity.	The document includes few relevant details and little analysis.	None or few of the SLOs/SAOs are addressed within the six-year cycle.	Inferences and conclusions are not (or rarely) drawn from the data analysis.	The goals and objectives do not (or rarely) include rationale in support of resource allocation requests.
	The discourse does not address a collegiate audience, with the commensurate tone.	The document lacks in depth and scope.		The data is not (or rarely) used to substantiate assertions.	The goals and objectives are not, rarely, or are otherwise inappropriately Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Bound.



INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING  
2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



**Program Review Executive Summary  
Explanation of Rating**

Following the annual program review cycle and based on the peer review, each document will be given one of four status conditions: accepted as submitted, accepted with suggested revision, some revision required (due before the spring planning retreat), or significant revision required (due by the program plan due date the following fall). Suggestions for improvement will be based on the program peer review and detailed in the Executive Summary. Programs requiring significant revision should work with the program review co-chairs towards improvement; their subsequent program plans will be peer-reviewed following year.

Accepted as Submitted: No changes suggested or required.

Accepted with Suggested Revision: Suggested recommendations may be implemented as part of the response to the Executive Summary or may be implemented the following year.

Revision Required: 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.

Significant Revision Required: 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 plan deadline the following year. The document will be peer-reviewed. 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.



# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING 2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



## PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>Program: Accounts Payable</b>	<b>Date: November 20, 2015</b>
----------------------------------	--------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Myeshia Armstrong, Evelyn Arias, Lydia Gonzalez, Vanessa Chavez, Heba Griffiths, Janet Cha

**Program Members Present:** Stephen Kibui,

### Commendations

- Commendations on the timely processing of over 12,000 invoices annually.
- Commendations on receiving no audit exceptions.
- Commendations on a succinct Mission Statement.

### Program-Level Recommendations

- Program Review Document Revision
  - Follow Help Text guidelines in revising the Program Review Document.
  - Create Service Area Outcomes, such as internal measures (i.e. turn-around time or number of payments) and begin to monitor them.
  - Elaborate on Staff Development.
  - Write clear, achievable goals and objectives that are measurable, time-bound, and include needed resources to achieve those goals.
  - Elaborate on Program's Strengths and Program's Weaknesses.
  - Complete the Program's Opportunities and Program's Threats sections.
  - Elaborate in the Accomplishments and Recommendation for Improvement section.
  - Remove narrative in the Executive Summary.

### Institutional-Level Recommendations

- Consider moving toward integrated financial software processing for efficiency and compliance with the increasing number of businesses that prefer e-transfer of funds.
- Consider limited use of credit/debit cards for employee convenience.

**SIGNIFICANT REVISION REQUIRED**



# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING 2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



## PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>Program: ACEDD</b>	<b>Date: November 20, 2015</b>
-----------------------	--------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Myeshia Armstrong, Evelyn Arias, Lydia Gonzalez, Vanessa Chavez, Heba Griffiths, Janet Cha, Gary Halvorson, Jay Sunyogh, Sean Hughes, Mike Slavich

**Program Members Present:** Gary Halvorson, Jay Sunyogh, Sean Hughes, Mike Slavich

### Commendations

- Commendations on meeting the scheduling needs of various student populations, such as recent high school graduates and returning professionals.
- Commendations of a well-written, comprehensive program review document.
- Commendations on collaborating with other departments such as Counseling, MESA, and GIS/GPS and with community industries.

### Program-Level Recommendations

- Develop the proposed Landscape Degree/Certificate.
- Develop an Engineering Technology Transfer Degree in the ACEED/GIS program.
- Develop a Construction Management Degree and Certificate in the ACEDD/GIS program in collaboration with the Business Division and Fabrication Program.
- Seek in-service training on how instructors can assist students in developing collegiate protocol (academic/business place department).
- Program Review Document Revision: Revise/separate goals and objectives to be discrete, concise, measurable, and time-bound.

### Institutional-Level Recommendations

- Hire a full-time instructor with the requisite engineering degree.
- Staff development should present in-service training on how instructors can help students develop collegiate protocol (academic/business place behavior).

**ACCEPTED AS SUBMITTED**



## INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

### 2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



#### PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Program: Bookstore**

**Date: November 6, 2015**

**Committee Members Present:** Howard Kummerman, Marie Eckstrom, Jim Newman, Allen Leung, Jim Sass, Rebecca Green, Gloria Reyes, Jasmine Lopez

**Program Members Present:** Andrea Rion

The bookstore supports the college by providing students, faculty, and staff with course materials, supplies, and other incidentals. The bookstore provides competitive pricing, customer satisfaction, and support of student programs by returning a percentage of its profits to the college.

#### Commendations

- Commendations on 40-plus years of partnership with the college, which includes hiring students; maintaining an above state average market share; responsive customer service; and working with Financial Aid, EOPS, and the Faculty Association to serve students' needs; and supporting various campus-wide activities and events.

#### Program-Level Recommendations

- Consult with discipline faculty before ordering and offering ancillary course materials to ensure that such materials are appropriate.
- Work with off-campus sites to ensure textbook availability to those students.
- Publicize the nature and amount of financial support that the bookstore gives to the college.
- Continue to emphasize the importance for faculty to submit their textbook adoptions in a timely manner. Consider incentivizing the process in various ways.
- Program Review Document Revision: Further develop Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), ensuring they are measurable so that the data can be analyzed; include descriptive passages which explain and analyze the graphics in the document; explain, elaborate, and include *current* information in all sections of the program review document; ensure that goals and objectives are discrete, specific, measurable, and time bound.

#### Institutional-Level Recommendation

- Consider ways the college can encourage and support faculty members in placing complete orders on time
- 

**ACCEPTED WITH SUGGESTED REVISION**



# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

## 2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



### PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Program: Chicano/a Studies**

**Date: November 11, 2015**

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Adam Wetsman, Jim Newman, Jeannie Liu, Kenn Pierson, Vann Priest, Dulce Delgadillo, Kevin Smith, Shari Herzfeld, Gina Bove

**Program Members Present:** Rebecca Green, Juana Mora

The Chicana/o Studies Program is interdisciplinary as it draws from humanities, language, fine arts, and the social sciences. Its courses focus on the experiences of Mexican Americans with the intent of recognizing the socio-historical, political, cultural, and economic contributions of Mexican Americans to the United States.

#### Commendations

- Commendations on building the program from its start in 2006.
- Commendations for the many extra-curricular programmatic contributions to the college, such as guest speakers and topical panel discussions.

#### Program-Level Recommendations

- Collaborate on the Title V grant in creating freshmen seminars that capitalize on the ethnic experience in Los Angeles.
- Complete AA-T degree in Social Justice.
- Effectively market the uniqueness of the program with the goal of increasing completers.
- Monitor success and retention rates and consider ways to improve them.
- Open a pool and hire at least one part-time instructor to gain some intra-departmental collaboration, provide students with some choice in the selection of instructors, and prepare for unexpected threats to the department.
- Program Review Document Revision: Revise Mission Statement to be concise and succinct; include specific SLO information, data, and analysis; complete Program Level-Standards section; analyze available data and thoroughly discuss the program's characteristics, performance, and trends; include specifics in the program's strengths and weaknesses; revise opportunities and threats to reflect internal and external mitigating factors impacting the program; elaborate on the program's accomplishments; revise goals and objectives to be specific, concise, time-bound, and measurable.

#### Institutional-Level Recommendations

- Survey students about their preferences concerning the scheduling of classes. Use that information across all curricular areas to increase enrollment while responding to students' needs.

**SIGNIFICANT REVISION REQUIRED**



**INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING  
2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS**



**PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<b>Program: Continuing Education</b>	<b>Date: December 4, 2015</b>
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Adam Wetsman, Jim Newman, Maria Martinez, Jim Sass, Stephanie Wells, Patty Luna

**Program Members Present:** Chris Guptill, Elizabeth Avila

**Commendations**

- Commendations on managing the program despite limited staff and budget.

**Program-Level Recommendations**

- Hold regular advisory council meetings.
- Formalize and widely distribute a survey instrument to determine needs and desires of the community.
- Utilize the *World Education* option for classified staff development.

**Institutional-Level Recommendations**

- The college needs to invest considerably in the program in order to make it relevant, viable, income-producing, and competitive.

**ACCEPTED WITH SUGGESTED REVISION**



**INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING  
2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS**



**PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<b>Program: DSPS</b>	<b>Date: December 4, 2015</b>
----------------------	-------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Adam Wetsman, Jim Newman, Maria Martinez, Jim Sass, Stephanie Wells, Patty Luna

**Program Members Present:** Mark Matsui, Tep Thoeurb

**Commendations**

- Commendations on a comprehensive and well-written program review document.

**Program-Level Recommendations**

- Provide campus-wide opportunities for instructors and classified staff to learn about better supporting students with disabilities.
- Increase hours of operation/availability to accommodate all hours of classroom instruction.
- Program Review Document Revision: Include comparison data with other colleges in Characteristics, Performances, and Trends; delete duplicate information in Program's Accomplishments and Recommendations for Improvement; include SLO results from EDEV courses; revise Evaluation sections in Goals and Objectives to reflect the purpose of the section; include management software in Goals and Objectives.

**Institutional-Level Recommendations**

- Purchase camera surveillance equipment for the DSPS testing area.

**ACCEPTED WITH SUGGESTED REVISION**



# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

## 2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



### PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>Program: Economics</b>	<b>Date: December 4, 2015</b>
---------------------------	-------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Adam Wetsman, Jim Newman, Maria Martinez, Jim Sass, Stephanie Wells, Patty Luna

**Program Members Present:** Barbara Mikalson, Mike Javanmard, Rebecca Green

#### Commendations

- Commendations on a clear Mission Statement.

#### Program-Level Recommendations

- Consider innovative ways to include the needed lab component in economics classes: online lab, increase in unit value of courses; co-requisite lab course, etc. Or reduce class size to 35 students.
- Program Review Document Revision: Revise entire program review document adhering to help text prompts and ensuring the included information is current; the program must engage in robust discussion concerning its focus and underlying philosophy and articulate its vision, direction, and activities in the program review document.

#### Institutional-Level Recommendations

- Establish a computer lab for large class size (i.e. 45 students).
- Consider a large-scale, campus-wide effort in offering 8-week classes to increase success and persistence.

**SIGNIFICANT REVISION REQUIRED**



**Program: History**

**Date: November 11, 2015**

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Adam Wetsman, Jim Newman, Jeannie Liu, Kenn Pierson, Vann Priest, Dulce Delgadillo, Kevin Smith, Shari Herzfeld, Gina Bove

**Program Members Present:** Rebecca Green, Irma Valdivia, Joaquin Duran, Abbie Perry, Ea Madrigal

The History program endeavors to engender a positive and enduring appreciation of historical study that will empower students to contribute to their world and become productive, resourceful, and intelligent citizens of this country and the world.

### Commendations

- Commendations on a thoroughly prepared, in-depth document that provides a comprehensive overview of the history program and a clear strategic direction.
- Commendations on developing an upper-division course, the History of Science and Technology.
- Commendations on the variety of courses and venues of availability the program offers students.

### Program-Level Recommendations

- Clarify the course size issue: include supporting data for requests for large lecture hall classes as well as data supporting smaller class size request.
- Investigate whether lower-division students not in the automotive baccalaureate degree program who take the upper-division History of Science and Technology will be able to receive commensurate credit.
- Develop a brochure or other marketing strategy to inform students of options in taking history courses.
- Program Review Document Revision: move some of the text in the Mission Statement to Characteristics, Performances, and Trends; address SLO cycle rotation; revise goals and objectives to be concise, ensure resource requests emanate from the goals, and concretize the evaluation methods.

### Institutional-Level Recommendations

- Allocate a specific adjunct faculty office for Behavioral and Social Sciences, separate from that of the Communications and Languages Division.

- Survey students about their preferences concerning the scheduling of classes. Use that information across all curricular areas to increase enrollment while responding to students' needs.
- As the college replaces classroom lighting to LED, install dimmer switches to accommodate note taking during audiovisual presentations.

**ACCEPTED WITH SUGGESTED REVISION**



# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

## 2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



### PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>Program: Instructional Operations</b>	<b>Date: November 6, 2015</b>
--	-------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Howard Kummerman, Marie Eckstrom, Jim Newman, Allen Leung, Jim Sass, Rebecca Green, Gloria Reyes, Jasmine Lopez

**Program Members Present:** Lorraine Castellanos, Mike Slavich

Instructional Operations supports the mission of the college by ensuring that program and class offerings are accurate and follow state and federal guidelines and regulations. The mission of Instructional Operations is to provide support to the curricular processes and procedures of the college, including maintenance of records pertaining to curriculum and instructional workloads and the development of the college catalog, addendum, and class schedules.

#### Commendations

- Commendations on a succinct mission statement.
- Commendations on the efforts of a small staff in addressing an increasing workload.
- Commendations on moving toward the full implementation of CurricUNET.

#### Program-Level Recommendations

- Develop appropriate SAOs and collect data to begin appropriate and ongoing assessment.
- In order to ensure stability and continuity (legacy training), create a manual of instructional operational responsibilities, including explanations and instructions of the support personnel's duties.
- Revise program review documents, attending to the following: include explanations and elaboration in all sections
- In collaboration with the Articulation Officer, offer a FLEX Day session on the curricular process.
- Add substantive change activities into future program plans and program review documents.
- Program Review Document Revision: Revise program review documents to include explanations and elaboration in all sections; include additional goals and objectives related to CurricUNET.

#### Institutional-Level Recommendations

- Seriously (re)consider the efficacy of moving the office of the Articulation Officer to the Office of Instructional Support in order to address the volume and magnitude of

curricular processes more efficiently so that students receive maximal articulation and curricular benefits.

- Hire a 100% secretary to work with the curriculum chair, articulation officer, faculty, administration, and current Instructional Operations staff to ensure curriculum data is uploaded to the Chancellor's Office and is in compliance with Education Code and Title V regulations.
- Institute a campus-wide initiative to improve the quality and accuracy of the Banner data system.

**ACCEPTED WITH SUGGESTED REVISION**



**INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING**  
**2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS**



**PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<b>Program: LVN</b>	<b>Date: November 20, 2015</b>
---------------------	--------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Myeshia Armstrong, Evelyn Arias, Lydia Gonzalez, Vanessa Chavez, Heba Griffiths, Janet Cha

**Program Members Present:** Pam Boyd, Deborah Chow

**Commendations**

- Commendations on recognizing the changing status of vocational nursing and responding to community and student needs.
- Commendations on working toward redesigning, condensing, and streamlining the course sequence to enable students to progress efficiently and increasing class size to accommodate attrition.
- Commendations on taking initiative to conduct exit interviews with students who withdraw and using the data to improve the program.
- Commendations on a consistently above-state-average pass rate (94.4%) on the licensing exam.
- Commendations on establishing a career ladder focus, extending from single certificates through the AA in nursing.

**Program-Level Recommendations**

- Partner with the Reading Department to offer a nursing-specific reading preparation course for prospective nursing students.
- Develop a Nursing Student Success Center for all nursing students with the goal of increasing success and retention.
- Program Review Document Revision: Narrow the Mission Statement; augment the SLO section to include specific assessments and results; revise program set standard; augment data with comparisons with other community colleges; revise goals and objectives to be discrete, concise, time-bound, and measurable.

**Institutional-Level Recommendations**

- Allocate the necessary funds to create and support a Nursing Success Center.
- 

**ACCEPTED WITH SUGGESTED REVISION**



PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>Program: Mass Communications</b>	<b>Date: November 6, 2015</b>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Howard Kummerman, Marie Eckstrom, Jim Newman, Allen Leung, Jim Sass, Rebecca Green, Gloria Reyes, Jasmine Lopez

**Program Members Present:** John Francis, Robert Holcomb

The Mass Communication program provides student-centered learning in the fields of mass media studies; journalism, including digital newspaper and magazine production; and radio podcasts on KRHC.

**Commendations**

- Commendations on the outstanding productivity of a program with only one full-time faculty member, its many awards, and its connection to the community.
- Commendations on consistent enrollment and increased student success.

**Program-Level Recommendations**

- Program Review Document Revision: Revise program review documents to reflect current information in all sections of the document; update Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as well as their data and analysis; elaborate on all the accomplishments of the program; ensure goals and objectives are specific, measurable, time-bound and directly emanate from the SLO assessments and strategic direction; include program-level standards.

**Institutional-Level Recommendations**

- Hire a full-time faculty member in order to grow the program.
- Hire a full-time technical assistant.

**SIGNIFICANT REVISION REQUIRED**



# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

## 2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



### PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>Program: Physics/Engineering</b>	<b>Date: November 11, 2015</b>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Adam Wetsman, Jim Newman, Jeannie Liu, Kenn Pierson, Dulce Delgadillo, Kevin Smith, Shari Herzfeld, Gina Bove

**Program Members Present:** Vann Priest

The physics program offers a comprehensive, research-based curriculum that is innovative and challenging and aims to guide its students toward an understanding and appreciation of the nature of matter, energy, space, and time.

The engineering program seeks to offer a comprehensive, research-based curriculum so that its students are prepared to transfer to a four-year institution to further their knowledge and practice in using materials and natural forces.

#### **Commendations**

- Commendations on growing the physics program over the past 15 years from a single course to an Associate Degree for Transfer in Physics.
- Commendations on awarding nine Associates degrees the first year of its availability and 15 degrees, the second.
- Commendations on continued collaboration with the chemistry, biology, mathematics, and MESA programs.

#### **Program-Level Recommendations**

- Explore links, partnerships, and/or pathways between physics and the auto technical baccalaureate degree,
- Investigate the possibility of securing Equity funds to augment the lab as appropriate.

#### **Institutional-Level Recommendations**

- Hire a full-time combination engineering/physics faculty.
- Hire a physical science lab technician.
- Complete the remodeling of the physics lab to facilitate enquiry-based learning.
- Invest in the engineering program: hire instructors, support low enrolled courses to grow the program.
- Install an LCD projector in S-224 (physics instructional lab) to facilitate student learning.

**ACCEPTED AS SUBMITTED**



# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

## 2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS



### PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>Program: Risk Management / Emergency Preparedness</b>	<b>Date: December 4, 2015</b>
--	-------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Adam Wetsman, Jim Newman, Maria Martinez, Jim Sass, Stephanie Wells, Patty Luna

**Program Members Present:** James Poper

#### Commendations

- Commendations on the recent and visible increase in emergency preparedness activities of the college.

#### Program-Level Recommendations

- Increase formal outreach to the entire campus for feedback on emergency drills.
- Present regular and ongoing in-service training for the entire campus on security and emergency preparedness.
- Program Review Document Revision: Reorganize the Risk Management program to include security, safety, emergency preparedness, and insurance components; revise/clarify Mission Statement to reflect the focus of the program; Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) should include students; augment Goals and Objectives section and include resource requests

#### Institutional-Level Recommendations

- In light of recent and increasing violence on school campuses, the college should consider a blended security program, with a permanent armed security guard, who, in turn, would be responsible for training other campus security personnel.
- Initiate a campus-wide campaign to ensure all employees and students know the protocol for each emergency scenario: active shooter, fire, earthquake, loss of power, etc.

**SIGNIFICANT REVISION REQUIRED**



**INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING  
2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS**



**PROGRAM REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<b>Program: Theatre</b>	<b>Date: December 4, 2015</b>
-------------------------	-------------------------------

**Committee Members Present:** Marie Eckstrom, Howard Kummerman, Adam Wetsman, Jim Newman, Maria Martinez, Jim Sass, Stephanie Wells, Patty Luna

**Program Members Present:** Bill Korf, Chris Guptill

**Commendations**

- Commendations on a well-written, comprehensive program review document.
- Commendations on a student-focused approach to theater, allowing all students the opportunity to fully participate in the program (i.e. acting in productions, All Around Actors program).

**Program-Level Recommendations**

- Pursue intended creation of a Theatre Technology program.
- Program Review Document Revision: Revise Mission Statement to be more focused and concise; incorporate SLO data into SLO section of the plan; include and address data for enrollment, course success, degrees awarded; revise goals and objectives to ensure they are not repetitive.

**Institutional-Level Recommendations**

- Address the serious safety issues plaguing the Wray Theatre (i.e. fire code violations, student safety hazards, water damage, rigging system damage, etc.).
- Augment budget to address maintenance and safety inspections.
- Hire an additional full-time instructor.

**ACCEPTED WITH SUGGESTED REVISION**



## Priority Registration Recommendation: *Avance*

**Program:** Title V Grant - *Avance* Program

### Timeframe:

- Priority recommendation to begin with Fall 2016 registration as a 5-year pilot
- One-year priority registration (Tier 2) for each annual cohort

### Program Summary:

Rio Hondo College’s new *Avance* Program is funded by the recent (2015-2020) Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI) award from the U.S. Department of Education and is designed to significantly build upon the work already established by the previous (2010-2015) Title V grant.

In providing a comprehensive and integrated first-year (opt-in, pilot) program, *Avance* aims to achieve these four overarching objectives to improve the rates of student success and completion:

- Increased persistence during first Fall-Spring-Fall sequence of semesters
- Increased completion of the basic skills Math sequence within first three semesters
- Increased degree/certificate/transfer completion
- Targeted professional development for faculty

### Benefits for Students:

*The Avance* Program’s key activity components include:

- **Summer Bridge – Math Academy** (*college acculturation, campus networking, intensive math preparation, and math re-assessment for potential higher math placement*)
- **Prescribed/Guaranteed First-Year Schedule** (see Table 1 below)\* (*ensures students enroll/complete/persist in required and guaranteed courses during first-year*)
- **Student Success Center** (*integrated instructional and student service support*)
- **Faculty Professional Development** (*enrichment for addressing high-risk populations*)

\*Table 1: The Prescribed First-Year Schedule:

Fall Term		Spring Term	
<b>Math</b>	4.0 units	<b>Math</b>	4.0 units
<b>English</b> (035 minimum level)	3.5 units	<b>English</b>	3.5 units
<b>Counseling 101</b> (or other Lifelong Learning course, as advised)	3.0 units	General Education course (2017 only)	
		<b>First-Year Seminar Course</b> (NEW - beginning 2018)	3.0 units
<b>General Education</b>	3.0 units	<b>General Education course</b>	3.0 units
	<b>13.5 units</b>		<b>13.5 units</b>

## Student Requirements:

Table 2: Student Requirements for Priority Registration through *Avance* Program:

Fall Registration	Spring Registration
<b>SSSP Core Requirements</b> (application, assessment, orientation, and educational plan)	<b>4 SSSP Follow-up Appointments</b> (with Counselor or Success Coach)
<b>English Assessment</b> (English 035 or higher)	
<b>Summer Bridge – Math Academy</b> (program registration and ½ day Pre-Session attendance)	<b>Summer Bridge – Math Academy</b> (two-week program participation)
<b>Avance student contract</b>	<b>Avance student contract</b> (renewed)
<b>Prescribed Schedule</b> (Full-time enrollment)	<b>Prescribed Schedule</b> (Full-time enrollment)
	<b>“Course Performance” Checks by Faculty</b> (“satisfactory” progress on initial Fall courses)
	<b>2 Success Workshops</b> (facilitated by FYSC – LAC Success Center)

## Number of *Avance* Students:

Table 3. Fall and Spring Priority Registration Projections for *Avance* Program:

Data Sources: RHC\_A&R (Spring 2016 Registration Dates), RHC\_IT (Registration Code Data for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016), Banner/Cognos (Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 Course Enrollment Data). Prepared by Carolina Lepe 3/15/2016.

<b>Avance Cohort</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Priority Fall Registration</b>		<b>Priority Spring Registration</b>	
		<b>Projected %</b>	<b>Projected #</b>	<b>Projected %</b>	<b>Projected #</b>
2016-2017	200-275	42%	<b>84-116</b>	45.3%	<b>91-125</b>
2017-2018	300-375	42%	<b>126-156</b>	45.3%	<b>136-170</b>
2018-2019	400-475	42%	<b>168-200</b>	45.3%	<b>181-215</b>
2019-2020	500-575	42%	<b>210-242</b>	45.3%	<b>227-260</b>
2020-2021	600-675	42%	<b>252-284</b>	45.3%	<b>272-306</b>

The data (Table 3 above) indicates that there will be *minimized impact on all other student populations* in providing (one-year) priority registration for *Avance* students because the majority of *Avance* students would receive priority registration for Tier 2 or higher without *Avance*. On the other hand, *priority registration for Avance will be essential for those students who will not qualify through any other means*; this will ensure that they are able to enroll in the prescribed course schedule, which is a critical component of the program.

### Data Methods:

- Because *Avance* will recruit from Summer Bridge students, the 2015 Summer Bridge students served as the proxy group of similar students. For analysis, the group was limited to those 2015 Summer Bridge students who registered for at least 12 units in fall 2015 since full-time enrollment is a requirement for *Avance* participation. This reduced the list of students from 310 to 183.
- The next step was to identify those students among the 183 who received priority registration on Tier 2 or higher status (e.g., DSPS, Foster Youth, feeder high school) for the fall 2015 and/or spring 2016 semesters. These students would not need priority registration from *Avance* and were separated out to avoid duplication. The remaining students would need to qualify for priority registration through *Avance* (Table 3).



## Discussion Points- Multiple Measures Pilot Program

### Overview

- Current Practice places the majority of students below college level
- Our first interaction with students conveys mistrust and the message of inadequacy
- Cut scores are inconsistent and impacts students of color disproportionately
- LBCC data- Accuplacer is a good predictor of placement or how a student will test. Not necessarily a good predictor of what a student knows.
- Takeaways - GPA a better predictor because it is based on longitudinal data, not just a snapshot in time.
- Success rates in college level courses about the same without the long cycle of basic skills classes (and costs)
- Transfer rates also affected data results
- Statewide Academic Senate recommends using multiple measures - students identified through MM are more likely to succeed
- RHC expectations:
  - College level English – using MM: 47.8% (**current RHC assessment: 36.5%**)
  - College level Math - using MM 38.4 (**current RHC assessment: 1.1%**)

### Questions/Recommendations

1. **How many students will this apply to?** (all incoming students or just district high school students?)
  - a. District students approx. 570 students/all new students would be closer to 3000 (but not all students will enroll in math or English so closer to 1800)
  - b. Executive Board recommendation – all incoming students**
2. **Recency of GPA**
  - a. Data supports 9 years
  - b. Executive Board recommendation – accept 9 years**
3. **Accept Self-reported transcripts?**
  - a. Reviewing all transcripts a challenge for counselors due to volume
  - b. Data supports students self-report honestly
  - c. Executive Board recommendation – accept self-reported transcripts and do spot checks next year to check for accuracy**
4. **One-year Pilot Program**
  - a. Propose to re-assess all students placed using MM in fall 2016 in spring 2017
  - b. Executive Board recommendation – re-assess Fall 2016 success rates in spring 2017 to determine if changes will be made**