RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, May 10, 2016, 2:30 p.m., Board Room

Members Present: Joanna Schilling (VPAA & Co Chair), Henry Gee (VPSS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), Dr. Kevin Smith (1st VP, AS), Katie O’Brien (2nd VP, AS) Michelle Bean (Secretary, AS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian), John Frala (ASCCC Rep.), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Mark Littrell (Faculty), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), Sean Burton (ASRHC), Javier Cano (ASRHC), Dr. Vann Priest (Mgmt. AA), Dr. Mike Muñoz (Mgmt. SS)

Members Absent: Robert Bethel (Co-Chair and President, AS), Dr. Sergio Guzman (President, RHCFA), Sandra Rivera (CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), William Ashby (ASRHC),

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

I. Call to Order – JoAnna called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. JoAnna reported that Robert Bethel will not be in attendance today.

II. Acceptance of Minutes – April 26, 2016 – Consensus to accept the minutes as presented with one minor edit. Sheila will send Reneé the language.

BP/AP Review (8 items)
• AP 3510 Prevention of Workplace Violence and Disruption (PFC Subcommittee / Senate) (Separate attachment) – Consensus with the additional language in II.A.1.a. The District’s Title IX Officer serves as a resource (non-voting member).
• AP 3540 Sexual and Other Assaults on Campus - this item was pulled and we will revisit in the fall.

The following APs were pulled and reviewed by Senate with suggested language in green:
• AP 4021 Program Discontinuance (Senate) – Consensus reached.
• AP 4025 Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education (Senate) – Consensus with edits of inserting Community anywhere it says Rio Hondo College District.
• AP 4050 Articulation (Senate) – Consensus with edits of inserting Community anywhere it says Rio Hondo College District.
• AP 4240 Academic Renewal (Senate) – Consensus reached.
• AP 7211 Faculty Service Area, Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies – This AP was pulled at President’s Cabinet on May 10 and will be returned in the fall.
• AP 5130 Financial Aid - Consensus reached with edit to paragraph B.1 – For the purposes of GPA calculation, a “P” will be considered a “C” grade. An academically disqualified student is not eligible to receive financial aid after the second consecutive term.
III. Unfinished Business – No items

JoAnna reported that she and Robert talked about the AP/BP review process. We are looking at how other schools conduct their review of APs and BPs and cycling them. If the revisions are advisory, then we do not have to act so quickly as we have been. We want to bring back a flow chart/calendar outlining the process and when these items will come to PFC. Certain times of the year we will talk about other things that this committee is tasked to do. We want to come up with a proposal in September. This is our attempt to be more efficient so we are not spending all of our time on APs and BPs.

Adam reminded the group that the AP/BP review is also satisfying requirements for accreditation.

JoAnna responded that this will be part of that process. Specifically, giving attention to those that have been revised because of legal updates, etc. It will help all of us have an action plan on how we address this. JoAnna remembers doing the review during Administrative Council, did that just stop?

Henry reported that we no longer do review AP/BP review in Administrative Council.

IV. Committee Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFC Sub-Committees</th>
<th>Other Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Review</td>
<td>Online Education – Report below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Technology – No Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IEC- Howard reported that we are implementing TK20. The most immediate need is the planning assessment piece of TK20 that will assist us in accreditation. The strategic planning piece has many changes that will benefit us. Some of the changes will not be in place when we start. Planning assessment and the strategic planning will be piloted. Others will continue using the old planning software for one more year. This will help us get feedback etc. We want to ensure that it works properly before the full launch. That is why we are proposing releasing the software in modules. We can start using the accreditation module at any time.

After the retreat we had a lot of results to compile. We looked at the IEC today in terms of the processes and initiatives and what we are going to do with this information. Every process that we identify will have some type of evaluation process. This will come forward to the PFC in the Fall. As next semester starts, there will be a task force working on the vision and values using the data from the retreat to move that forward. We will also be working on the Institutional Goals and Objectives too. All the raw results will be sent to everyone to see the initial data etc.

Howard also reported that originally, he was going to implement the survey in May based on previous feedback. We have changed the timing to conduct the student survey in the fall semester rather than spring because of pushback from faculty on the timing coinciding with finals. Also, will have a different and better perspective so that will help us choose the best timing for students and faculty. Right now we are looking at the end of October or early
November to launch the survey. The Institutional Planning Survey will go out this week to all staff. Please give us feedback especially those from PFC. We look at the results to plan for the next year and it is very helpful to have your feedback.

**Staff Development** - Katie reported that the last of the four new faculty orientations will occur this week. This is the series that she and Adam have been working on this year. RHCLA Cohort #6 and the SANFACC celebration will be held on Thursday. The Reflection and Renewal retreat will be held on Friday.

Next Friday is the math workshop we are hosting. We will have visitors from Hartnell College coming on to campus. The workshop is geared to those teaching in the math academy.

**Basic Skills** - JoAnna reported that we have not heard back from the Chancellor’s Office regarding the $30 million Transformation Grant. The request for $2 million will be submitted on Friday.

**SLOs** – Adam reported that he will be holding a workshop for SLOs next Thursday, May 19th. Faculty are invited to attend.

**Online Education** - Mark reported on the evaluation of online teaching. There will be a module added certifying online review for courses. There will be changes to the peer review form as well as discussed in negotiations.

**Student Equity** – JoAnna reported that we requested an additional $200,00 and have not heard back from the state.

V. **Announcements**

Sheila reported that the Odd Couple will being playing Thursday through Sunday in the Wray Theater. There is a male and female version available. The Student Art Show opens on Wednesday, May 18th in the Art Gallery.

Julius reported that we are establishing a student/teacher pipeline with CSULA. We are currently setting some things up and applying for a grant to support this effort. College of the Canyons is doing a similar program with CSUN that we are trying to duplicate. Julius will have more to report at a future PFC meeting. A special thanks goes out the Dr. Munoz for allowing Julius to work on this project. Looking for students to working in the education field, teaching, counseling and CTE.

JoAnna reported that this is part of the Teacher Pipeline Grant, we are one of ten colleges in the state.

Kevin reported that the President’s Office and Academic Affairs Office will fund the Grab and Go during finals week. We have scheduled 1 hour blocks of time to help distribute granola bars, water and fresh fruit to students. This is something that we are hoping will occur on a regular basis.

Myeshia announced that Felix Sarao, the replacement for Timothy Connell has arrived on campus and started yesterday. Felix comes to us from UCLA. Please stop by and welcome him. Myeshia also reported that the budget will be finalized in September.
JoAnna thanked those members of PFC who have completed their cycle of service. It is a lot of time and effort to be on PFC. John, Julius and Kevin are transitioning off, René Tai is retiring, and the student representatives are moving forward. JoAnna also announced that this is the final meeting of the semester. The meeting tentatively scheduled for May 17th is cancelled.

VI. Public Comment – No comments were made.

VII. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m. The next PFC meeting will be held in the Fall, 2016, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room
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Certification of Institutional Follow-up Report
Rio Hondo College
October 15, 2016

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Rio Hondo College
3600 Workman Mill Road
Whittier, CA 90601

This Accreditation Follow-up Report is submitted to fulfill the requirements from the February 5, 2016 letter to the Superintendent/President of Rio Hondo College, Teresa Dreyfuss.

We certify that opportunities for broad participation by the campus community were provided, and we believe that the Follow-up Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of the actions Rio Hondo College has taken in response to the request by ACCJC.

Signed

Mary Ann Pacheco, President, Board of Trustees, Rio Hondo Community College District

Teresa Dreyfuss, Superintendent/President, Rio Hondo Community College District

Dr. JoAnna Schilling, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs, Rio Hondo Community College District

Robert Bethel, President, Academic Senate

Sandra Rivera, President, California School Employees Association

Virginia Gummig, President, Associated Student Body
Statement on Report Preparation

On February 5, 2016, Rio Hondo College (RHC) received a response from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), based on its review of the Follow-Up Report the college submitted in October 2015 and the subsequent evaluation team report on November 4-5, 2015. The Follow Up Report addressed five recommendations for improvement made by the peer review team that had visited Rio Hondo College on October 16, 2014 (0.01 – Team Visit Evaluation Report 2014).

The Commission found that the college had fully addressed one recommendation (Recommendations 5), partially addressed 3 recommendations (Recommendations 1,3, and 7), and had not addressed one recommendation (Recommendation 4). To address these deficiencies, the College was asked to submit another Follow-up Report by October 15, 2016. This Accreditation Follow-up Report was prepared by a task force at Rio Hondo College whose members followed the College’s regular review and approval process.

Response to February 5, 2016 Notification from ACCJC

On February 5, 2016, Superintendent/President Teresa Dreyfuss received official notification from ACCJC, informing her that the College had been reaffirmed and that a Follow-up Report must be submitted by October 15, 2016, which would be followed by a visit from Commission representatives. President Dreyfuss immediately notified the Board of Trustees and campus community of ACCJC’s review and formed a task force to address the remaining deficiencies. This task force met regularly throughout the spring semester to develop an action plan, finalize processes to meet the standards, and complete this Follow Up Report.

Follow-up Report Timeline

A timeline for completing this Follow-up Report was established (0.1 – Accreditation Follow-up Report Timeline). The timeline was shared with, and reviewed by, RHC administrators, Academic Senate, California School Employees Association (CSEA), Planning and Fiscal Council (PFC), and the Board of Trustees.
Accreditation / Follow-Up Report 2016

Spring 2016
- Identify Co-Chairs

Summer 2016
- Recommendation Meetings
- Evidence Collection & Assessment

March 14, 2016
Initial Committee Meeting

May 6, 2016
First Draft Due

June 30, 2016
First Draft

May 9, 2016
Draft Review

August 5, 2016
Board of Trustees Initial Review

September 2016
Review by Campus Leadership Groups

October 2016
Board of Trustees Final-Review Follow-Up Report

October 15, 2016
Submission of Follow-Up Report to ACCJC/WASC

Follow-Up Report Content:
- Recommendation 1: Institutional Effectiveness
- Recommendation 3: Distance Education
- Recommendation 4: Program Discontinuance
- Recommendation 7: Human Resources - SLO

Revised: 07/29/16
RECOMMENDATION 1

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Standard I.B and USDE Regulation 602.17 (f)
Recommendation 1 - Institutional Effectiveness

ACCJC Recommendation 1
“In order to meet standards, and to meet USDE regulations, the team recommends that the College set standards of satisfactory performance for student achievement, and evaluate itself against those standards, at the programmatic level (not just at the institutional level). (I.B, I.B.3, USDE Regulation 602.17 (f))”

ACCJC Standards I.B, I.B.3
Eligibility Requirement 11 - Student Learning and Student Achievement
The institution defines standards for student achievement and assesses its performance against those standards. The institution publishes each program's expected student learning and any program-specific achievement outcomes. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve the identified outcomes and that the standards for student achievement are met (Standard I.B.2, I.B.3, and II.A.1).

Standard I.B.3. The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information (Eligibility Requirement 11).

USDE Regulation 602.17(f)
§602.17 Application of standards in reaching an accrediting decision. The agency must have effective mechanisms for evaluating an institution's or program's compliance with the agency's standards before reaching a decision to accredit or preaccredit the institution or program. The agency meets this requirement if the agency demonstrates that it—
(f) Provides the institution or program with a detailed written report that assesses—
(1) The institution's or program's compliance with the agency's standards, including areas needing improvement; and
(2) The institution's or program's performance with respect to student achievement;

2015 Response to the Recommendation
Recommendation 1 directs the College to “set standards of satisfactory performance for student achievement, and evaluate itself against those standards, at the programmatic level (not just at the institutional level).” As indicated in ACCJC documentation, program-level standards for student achievement are used “to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission … and to make improvements.”

Rio Hondo has implemented this recommendation through refinement of its annual program planning process. The addition of program-level standards was promoted during Rio Hondo’s FLEX day on August 21, 2015 as the College kicked-off the annual planning
process (1.01 RHC FLEX Day 8-21-15-Evidence), (1.02 Flex Day Workshops – Program Level Standards), (1.03 Program-Level Standards(F15 FLEX), (1.04 Website Planning post-Program Level Standards).

Faculty members of each academic program are now setting standards for their program. The number of standards per program depends on the program type. All programs set and monitor program-level standards for successful course completion. Degree-granting programs not identified as “Career-Technical Education” also set and monitor standards for degree completion. In addition to successful course completion and degree completion, Career-Technical Education programs set and monitor standards for certificate completion (Chancellor’s Officer approved certificates), job placement rates, and licensure examination passage rates (if applicable) (1.05 RHC Annual Planning – How to Create Program-Level Standards), (1.06 Planning Software Template - Program Level Standards), (1.07 Program-Level Standards Designations).

Beginning fall 2015, as part of the College’s annual planning process, the Office of Institutional Research & Planning (IRP) now provides each academic program with five years’ data on successful course completion rates, certificates awarded, and degrees awarded. Each fall, IRP extracts these data from the College’s Banner student information system and places tables into each program’s plan in PlanBuilder, or a successor software (soon to be selected). Program faculty members access job placement rates on the Perkins CTE Core Indicator Reports page of the Chancellor’s Office website. The few programs with available licensure examination passage rates access relevant data on their respective licensing agency’s websites (e.g., National Council of State Boards of Nursing, National Registry of Emergency Medical Technicians). Faculty members also have the option of consulting external data sources (e.g., nearby community colleges, professional organizations in their field) when setting their program-level standards. With procedural consultation from the College’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and IRP staff, faculty members can now review historical data and set standards specific to their programs. Upon determining appropriate standards, faculty members document these standards in the Goals & Objectives field of their program plans. Throughout the annual planning process, faculty review their program’s performance in light of these standards and, when indicated, create plans for improvement. These plans for improving performance lead to specific resource allocation requests. Academic deans provide guidance to faculty, reviewing program standards and ultimately approving standards in their division unit plans. Faculty members have the option of adjusting standards in order to reflect empirical patterns in achievement data. Especially during the early years of implementing program-level standards, program faculty will be likely to adjust standards either upwards or downwards.

Program-level standards are also integrated into the program planning process in a way that informs the College’s institution-set standards. Program standards for job placement and examination passage have become the related institutional standards. In months to come, IRP staff will further aggregate program standards for course completion, certificates awarded, and degrees awarded in order to determine institutional standards for these achievement measures.
AccJC Response

In order to meet standards, and to meet USDE regulations, the team recommends that the College set standards of satisfactory performance for student achievement, and evaluate itself against those standards, at the programmatic level (not just at the institutional level). (I.B, USDE Regulation 602.17 (f))

Additional Response to the Recommendation

In addition to the comprehensive discussion of data that formerly took place during the creation of program plans and program review plans, the 2016-2017 institutional planning process also included an updated way to review data disaggregated at the program level. All academic programs reviewed data as described above to create a new program-level standard. While developing that program-level standard, plan team members compared data for five years against that data at the program level. The program plan teams discussed student progress in each of the indicators and determined if the program was improving.

All programs discuss and interact with Program-level standards each year. Programs that conduct the comprehensive Program Review for the planning year also have the benefit of peer discussion in the program review meetings. The group discusses the program-level standards along with all data and information about the program.

Additionally, at the Institutional Planning Retreat on April 15, 2016, participants reviewed and discussed the Program-Level standards created in the program plans and program review plans to the Institution-set standards and scorecard data of the same indicators.

Evidence

- **New 1.1 - Program Plan Template section with Program-Level Standards – standards and discussion**
- **New 1.2 - Program Review Rubric**
- **New 1.3 - Program Review Template**
- **New 1.4 - Institutional Planning Retreat PowerPoint**
- **New 1.5 - Institutional Planning Retreat participant packet**
- **New 1.6 – Institution-Set Standard Activity – Retreat 2016**
RECOMMENDATION 3

STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Standard II.A.1; II.A.2; USDE Regulation 602.17(g)
Recommendation 3 - Student Learning Programs and Services

ACCJC Recommendation 3
“In order to meet standards and comply with USDE regulations, the team recommends that the College develop a process to ensure faculty initiate regular and substantive interaction with students in Distance Education courses. (Standards II.A.1; II.A.2; USDE Regulation 602.17(g))”

ACCJC Standard II.A.1
All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution’s mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs (Eligibility Requirements 9 and 11).

ACCJC Standard II.A.2
Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others responsible act to continuously improve instructional courses, programs and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success.

USDE Regulation 602.17(g)
§602.17 Application of standards in reaching an accrediting decision. The agency must have effective mechanisms for evaluating an institution’s or program’s compliance with the agency's standards before reaching a decision to accredit or preaccredit the institution or program. The agency meets this requirement if the agency demonstrates that it—
(g) Requires institutions that offer distance education or correspondence education to have processes in place through which the institution establishes that the student who registers in a distance education or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit. The agency meets this requirement if it—
(1) Requires institutions to verify the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as—
   (i) A secure login and pass code;
   (ii) Proctored examinations; and
   (iii) New or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identity; and
(2) Makes clear in writing that institutions must use processes that protect student privacy and notify students of any projected additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity at the time of registration or enrollment.
2015 Response to the Recommendation:

In spring 2013, a campus Distance Education Committee (DEC) was formed to address pedagogical topics and concerns related to distance education, including “regular and substantive interaction” between online faculty and students. DEC membership consists of faculty, administrators, and classified staff (3.01 2015 GOVERNANCE MANUAL, p. 20).

The DEC has worked to formalize efforts at Rio Hondo College to develop and ensure high quality faculty/student interaction in distance education classes. Since 2007, faculty members have been generally guided by Administrative Procedure (AP) 4105, “Distance Education,” which outlines “regular and effective student contact by faculty and other best pedagogical online practices” (3.02 AP 4105, “Distance Education”).

In fall 2014, the DEC devised and recommended a new means of ensuring high quality faculty/student interaction in the form of a “Course Expectations Letter,” required for every section of every course offered each semester via distance education at the College. These letters enable registered students in online courses to become familiar with expectations of each online instructor—such as textbook information, media requirements, and course SLOs—as well as methods by which the instructor plans to achieve “regular instructor-student contact.” Methods of contact identified by instructors range from emails, announcements, and discussion boards to more elaborate means of engaging with students. For example, a Financial Accounting instructor during summer 2015 posted weekly announcements via Blackboard and email, scheduled online meetings with students via CCC Confer and Skype, and called students throughout the semester to address their progress, participation, and performance (3.03 Course Expectation Letter for Jeannie Liu, Summer 2015).

More significantly, the DEC has developed a three-part series of training modules for faculty members who wish to teach online at Rio Hondo College, the second of which includes specific training on regular and effective contact with students. The DEC was tasked with designing the curriculum for each of the three training modules:

- How to Use the Learning Management System (Blackboard)
- Best Practices for Online Teaching: Rio Hondo College Distance Education Best Practices
- DSPS Training Course

Completion of all three modules is now required for instructors to obtain certification to teach within the Distance Education program at Rio Hondo College. The mandatory certification process was recently negotiated as part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the Rio Hondo College Faculty Association (RHCFA) and the District (3.04 CBA Language Re: Certification). Current online faculty at Rio Hondo must complete their online certification training by September 30, 2015 in order to be assigned an online class for the following semester (3.05 Online Teaching Certification List).

In spring 2015, the DEC also developed a required form for all online instructors to sign in order to indicate their awareness of best practices in achieving regular and substantive
contact with their students (3.06 DEC Best Practices Form Final Draft). Beginning spring 2016, faculty members will sign the forms to acknowledge their pedagogical responsibility to promote regular and substantive interaction. The document will remind online instructors their syllabi must describe how regular and substantive interaction between students and instructors will be achieved in their online courses. Forms will be collected by the faculty Distance Education Coordinator, who serves as chair of the DEC.

Through these new and continuing efforts at Rio Hondo College—which demonstrate a longstanding commitment to improving the learning experience of online students—the College is working to address the ACCJC recommendation to “develop a process to ensure faculty initiate regular and substantive interaction with students in Distance Education courses.”

**ACCJC Response**

_In order to meet Standards and comply with USDE regulations, the team recommends that the College develop a process to ensure faculty initiate regular and substantive interaction with students in Distance Education courses. (Standards II.A.1; II.A.2; USDE Regulation 602.17(g)) It should be noted that the deficiencies related to USDE Regulations (602.17(f) in Recommendation 1 and 602.17(g) in Recommendation 3 have been resolved._

**Additional Response to the Recommendation**

In spring 2016, renewed discussions were conducted regarding how to ensure faculty were sufficiently trained on what constituted regular and effective contact in distance education courses, and that the college could verify that faculty implemented this practice when teaching their courses. Through the collective bargaining process and development of a new peer review and training process, the College has put in place processes to ensure faculty meet their obligation for regular and effective contact in the following ways:

1. Developed a comprehensive Regular and Effective Contact Form which will be submitted by online faculty once per year prior to teaching an online class. ([New 3.1 - Regular and Effective Contact Form](#)).
2. Committed to training faculty in each division to effectively evaluate online education courses, including regular and effective contact. These trained faculty will serve as peer reviewers for faculty who teach online.
3. Developed a comprehensive Peer Review Results Form ([New 3.2 - Peer Review Results Form](#)) detailing the criteria for faculty teaching online, and the results of that online teaching evaluation during the peer review process.

The Online Education Committee (OEC) will develop and implement the training program during the Fall 2016 term for all peer reviewers.

The Regular and Effective Contact Form ([New 3.1 - Regular and Effective Contact Form](#)) will be added as an appendix in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) to ensure faculty teaching online courses complete and are aware of all requirements of regular and effective contact in their online courses.
The College has also added language in the CBA to ensure online courses are evaluated during the regular evaluation process by trained peer reviewers as part of ongoing efforts to support faculty in complying with distance education requirements. The following is language that will appear in the 2016-18 Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Rio Hondo Faculty Association and the Rio Hondo Community College District (3.3 – RHCFA Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 24.8):

24.8 Regular and Effective Contact

24.8.1 Faculty teaching online will submit the Regular and Effective Contact Form once per year per class prior to teaching an online class.

24.8.2 Each division will designate faculty trained in reviewing online courses for the purpose of peer review. Such training will be done by the Online Education Committee.

The College believes that by developing and implementing these processes, it fully satisfies the recommendation and the College is now fully compliant in Recommendation 3.

Evidence

- New 3.1 - Regular and Effective Contact Form
- New 3.2 - Peer Review Results Form
- New 3.3 – RHCFA Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 24.8
RECOMMENDATION 4
PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE
Standard II.A.6.b
Recommendation 4 - Program Discontinuance

ACCJC Recommendation 4
“In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the College develop procedures that outline how students will complete a program of study (other than CTE) when the program is discontinued. (II.A.6.b)”

ACCJC Standard II.A.6.b
When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

2015 Response to the Recommendation
Administrative Procedure (AP) 4021, “Program Discontinuance,” contains provisions to ensure that the needs of students in any discontinued program are addressed. In fall 2013, review of this existing procedure was begun to expand its scope to encompass both vocational and academic programs. Throughout the next several months, faculty members of Academic Senate and deans from Academic Affairs collaborated to revise the procedure. On March 17, 2015, Academic Senate accepted the agreed-upon revisions, and the Planning and Fiscal Council reached consensus on April 14, 2015. The revised procedure was presented to the Superintendent/President, and then to the Board of Trustees as an information item at its May 13, 2015 regular meeting.

To ensure that affected students can complete their program of study, a Program Discontinuance Task Force will create a timeline that must include procedures to allow those students to complete. The responsibility to devise the plan for students rests with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the dean of the impacted division. The plans may include selection of alternative courses at Rio Rondo College or at other community colleges.

ACCJC Response
“In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the College develop procedures that outline how students will complete a program of study (other than CTE) when the program is discontinued. (II.A.6.b)”

Additional Response to the Recommendation
The Academic Senate and deans from Academic Affairs collaborated once again to revise the AP. The Academic Senate on April 19, 2016 approved the agreed upon revision, and the Planning and Fiscal Council reached consensus on May 10, 2016. The procedure was presented to the Board of Trustees as an information item at its June 8, 2016 regular meeting.

Now included in the procedure is a detailed outline of measures to be undertaken by the college. The plan will include the following actions:

1. Identify and contact students in the affected major, degree, and or certificate program.
2. Award degrees and certificates to students who have already completed but not petitioned.
3. Identify courses at the college and at area colleges that each student must complete.
4. Confirm which faculty teach the college’s courses identified in 3.
5. Appoint a faculty member as program coordinator during the discontinuance process.
6. Confirm sufficient counseling support exists for each student.
7. Develop Admissions and Records procedures to ensure students enroll in the college’s courses identified in 3.
8. Identify similar programs at area colleges.
9. Determine if completed courses will transfer so that a student may complete the program, degree, and/or certificate at the area college.
10. Establish the length of time needed for each student to complete.
11. Develop a schedule for each student so that he/she is ensured of timely completion.
12. Create a program-wide timeline for final discontinuance of the affected program.
13. Communicate the action plan to affected students as well as program faculty.
14. Communicate the action plan to the community and external agencies and licensing groups where appropriate.

The college now has an administrative procedure for program discontinuance that clearly delineates how students in an affected program would complete their program of study.

Evidence

- New 4.1 - AP 4021 Program Discontinuance
- New 4.2 – Academic Senate Agenda April 19, 2016
- New 4.3 – Academic Senate Minutes April 19, 2016
- New 4.4 – Planning and Fiscal Council Agenda May 10, 2016
- New 4.5 – Planning and Fiscal Council Minutes May 10, 2016 (Minutes to be approved on Sept. 13, 2016)
- New 4.6 – Board of Trustees Agenda June 8, 2016
- New 4.7 – Board of Trustees Minutes June 8, 2016
RECOMMENDATION 7
HUMAN RESOURCES - SLO
Standard III.A.1.C
Recommendation 7 – Faculty Evaluations on SLO Work

ACCJC Recommendation 7
“In order to meet standards, the team recommends all evaluations for faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)

ACCJC Standard III.A.1.c
The College faculty and the SLO Committee are active in production and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) data. The College faculty is committed to ensuring the students are learning and assessing this data from developed SLOs that have been infused into the courses.

2015 Response to the Recommendation
Rio Hondo College is committed to meeting all accreditation standards and addressing all recommendations from the Commission in a timely and responsible manner. Recommendation 7 from the Commission’s February 6, 2015 action letter noted that the College must take additional actions relating to student learning outcomes.

The District is governed, in part, by the Educational Employment Relations Act, which specifies the actions institutions can take with respect to the relationship between a college and the representative agent for the faculty union, in this case the Rio Hondo College Faculty Association (RHCFA) and the California Teachers Association (CTA). The current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) was settled in May 2014 and subsequently ratified by both the RHCFA membership and the Rio Hondo College Board of Trustees. This agreement, which runs from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2016, does not allow for reopeners unless the parties mutually agree.

In March 2015, the District requested that the Rio Hondo College Faculty Association (RHCFA) reopen the bargaining process relating to SLOs. Subsequent communication between the District and CTA indicated that the RHCFA was not willing to bargain SLOs at that time. Therefore, Rio Hondo College cannot legally take corrective action relating to SLOs prior to submitting the Follow-up Report by October 15, 2015 (7.01 Letter to Rio Hondo College CCD re ACCJC Rio Hondo Faculty Association, April 6, 2015).

However, the contract negotiations process is set to begin in November 2015. The current CBA allows for the RHCFA to sunshine a proposal for the 2016-2019 CBA in November 2015. The District may respond within two months. The teams can then begin the bargaining process in early 2016. While negotiations are a dynamic process, indications are favorable that an agreement will be reached on this matter. Both the District and the RHCFA have indicated a willingness to fulfill all requirements for accreditation.
ACCJC Response

In order to meet standards, the team recommends all evaluations for faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (IIIA.1.c)

Additional Response to the Recommendation

Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. The Rio Hondo College Faculty Association and the Rio Hondo Community College District signed a tentative agreement on April 29, 2016. The agreement was subsequently ratified by both parties and took effect on July 1, 2016. A few provisions relating to student learning outcomes were modified by the agreement (New 7.1 - RHCFA Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 5.3.8) that now reads as follows:

5.3.8 Faculty shall be responsible for listing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in their syllabi, for entering SLO assessment data in the appropriate software package, and for engaging in dialogue and writing assessment reports with other faculty for one semester each academic year. SLO data must be entered every year by June 30. Faculty evaluations shall be based, in part, on whether a unit member provides SLO data and engages in the SLO process. However, the result of the assessment (i.e., whether high or low levels are achieved) shall not be used as a basis for evaluation.

The previous collective bargaining agreement did not require part-time faculty to participate in the SLO process, but this has been changed, meaning that all faculty will be required to engage in SLO work. The previous agreement also did not require tenured faculty to be reviewed on participation in the SLO process. This has also been changed so that their participation in the SLO process is part of the peer review evaluation process.

All faculty are now required to participate in the SLO process and all faculty are now evaluated based upon that participation. Tenured faculty undergo periodic peer evaluation. In addition to other components of this evaluation, they are specifically evaluated based upon their participation in the SLO process (New 3.2 – Peer Review Results Form). Other faculty (part-time, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track) also engage in peer review. In addition, these other faculty undergo administrative evaluation. SLO work is a component of this second form of evaluation (New 7.2 – RHCFA Unit Member Evaluation Form).

In addition, all classified employees agree to provide and assist with appropriate services and/or activities that support student learning. This has been included in the Classified Performance Review Form (New 7.3 – CSEA Classified Performance Review Form).

Rio Hondo College has now completely met the standard set forth in Recommendation 7.
Evidence

- New 7.1 - RHCFA Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 5.3.8
- New 3.2 – Peer Review Results Form
- New 7.2 – RHCFA Unit Member Evaluation Form
- New 7.3 – CSEA Classified Performance Review Form
### 2016-2017
### Institutional Goals & Objectives DRAFT

**Goals** – what we will achieve to accomplish our mission.
**Objectives** – measurable steps to reach our goals.
**Action Plans** – detailed work assigned to individuals that they will complete to achieve our objectives.
**Indicators** – measures that we evaluate to know if we have achieved our objectives.

#### Goal 1: Rio Hondo will continuously improve its effectiveness as an institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RHC will evaluate the status of accreditation standards on an annual basis.</td>
<td>Accreditation Standard Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RHC will institutionalize an evaluation process of governance, campus initiatives, and campus processes to ensure continual improvement.</td>
<td>Three categories for evaluation: committees and councils (participatory governance), campus-wide initiatives (or changes in the ways that services are offered), and campus processes (e.g., resource allocation, budgeting, awarding staff development funds). The evaluation process will include document review, self-evaluation, and discussion/review of the results. Each of the identified entities for evaluation will rotate on a 6-year cycle. A year-end institutional effectiveness report will be prepared with evaluation results for the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase staff development opportunities and participation rates for classified employees.</td>
<td>Participation numbers and post-training evaluations. Enhance the ability of at least 75% classified employees to effectively serve the institution and its students by June 2019. Aim for a minimum of 85% of responding participants to indicate an enhanced ability to effectively serve the campus and/or students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The College will increase external visibility, outreach, and community engagement.</td>
<td>Community Perceptions Survey, increase in high school enrollment, Community Focus Groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2: Rio Hondo college will optimize its resources to achieve fiscal responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Devote resources to improve physical plant, technology, equipment, and water infrastructure that will serve the district needs.</td>
<td>Spending increase for physical plant, technology, equipment, and water infrastructure. Survey campus to gauge improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maximize specific state funding to enhance sustainability efforts by working with local utility companies, vendors and staff to achieve greater efficiencies through utility incentives and cost savings measures.</td>
<td>Reduction in utility bills including gas, electricity, and water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The college will pursue external resources and support opportunities that align with institutional priorities that impact student success, completion, and/or transfer.</td>
<td>Number of funding requests. Number of Awards received. Evaluation to determine if the funding received make an impact as stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase FTES and enrollment by 2% by June 30, 2017.</td>
<td>Efficient Scheduling Increased Enrollment FTES Credit and non-credit (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal 3: Rio Hondo students will achieve their educational goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The college will increase successful course completion by 0.5%, three semester persistence by 1% and 30-unit completion by 1% for students annually until 2020.</td>
<td>Scorecard Institution Set Standards&lt;br&gt;NOTE: Course completion rates are based on approximately 120,000 students, 0.5%≈600 students. Persistence rates are based on cohorts of approximately 1000 students, 1%≈10 students. 30 Unit completion rates are based on cohorts of approximately 1000 students, 1%≈10 students&lt;br&gt;NOTE: Because the CCCCO has access to data for all community colleges, their Persistence and 30 Units rates tend to run higher than our internal ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The college will increase the annual transfer rate by 1% by 2018-2019 and by 1.5% by the 2019-2020 academic year. These annual transfer rates will be the proportion of students who transferred out from the previous year’s fall enrollment.</td>
<td>CSU, UC, ISP, OOS transfer data&lt;br&gt;NOTE: A 1% increase would mean transferring out 950 students (a 151 student increase from last year), if our Fall enrollment stays consistent. A 1.5% increase would mean transferring out about 1000 students each year (a 200 student increase from previous years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The college will increase the rate of students completing basic skills course sequences by 1% annually through 2019.</td>
<td>English, ENLA, Reading and Mathematics completion rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The college will increase the number of degrees and Chancellor’s Office approved certificates awarded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The college will increase assessment, orientation, education plans to first-time in college students and at risk/follow up services to probation students, basic skills students, and students with undecided majors.</td>
<td>Participation numbers for Academic/Progress Probation Services, Counseling/Advisement Services, Education Plan Services, Initial Assessment Services Placement, Initial Orientation Services, and Other Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increase equitable results for disproportionately impacted student groups: Latinos, males, veterans, foster youth, DSPS. (See Student Equity Goals for specific objectives for each group)</td>
<td>Access, Course Completion, ENLA and Basic Skills Completion, Degree and Certificate completion, Transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BP/AP Review Process

Policies & Procedures

Step 1 - CCLC/New
- CCLC revisions update OR
- Constituent request for new BP/AP

Step 2 - President Review
- Review and distribute to VPs/HR

Step 3 - VP/HR Review
- Review/solicit feedback from SMEs (SS, Senate, Finance, HR).

Step 4 - President’s Cabinet/Council
- Administrative Council Review
  - All edits incorporated

Step 5 - PFC
- Review by PFC and recommendation made to the President for final revision

Step 6 - Board of Trustees
- 1st Reading
- 2nd Reading
**Board Policies & Administrative Procedures Review Timeline**

**Review Cycle – Annual and Comprehensive Chapter Reviews**

**Goal 1:** Six Year Review Cycle of all policies and procedures - aligned with accreditation visits

**Goal 2:** Annual Review of policies and procedures incorporating biannual legal updates issued by CCLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Year Review Cycle</th>
<th>Summer Term</th>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Spring Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17 Chap 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18 Chap 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19 Chap 4</td>
<td>Steps 2, 3 Presidential/VP/HR Review</td>
<td>Step 4 President’s Cabinet President’s Council Administrative Council Review</td>
<td>Steps 5, 6 PFC and Board Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20 Chap 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21 Chap 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22 Chap 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Review Cycle**

* If needed for catalog updates, all reviews occur in fall semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCLC Fall Legal Updates*</th>
<th>Summer Term</th>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Spring Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 6 Board Review of updates, as needed</td>
<td>Steps 2,3,4, President/VP/President’s Cabinet/ Admin Council Review</td>
<td>Steps 5, 6 PFC and Board Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCLC Spring Legal Updates</th>
<th>Summer Term</th>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Spring Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps 2, 3 Presidential/VP/HR Review of spring updates</td>
<td>Step 4 President’s Cabinet/ Admin Council Review</td>
<td>Steps 5, 6 PFC and Board Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>