I. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 2:36 pm.

II. Approval of Minutes – The February 13, 2018 minutes were approved as presented.

III. Superintendent/President’s Report – Superintendent/President Dreyfuss spoke to PFC about the new funding formula simulations that were prepared by the Department of Finance and released by CCLC on Tuesday, February 20. Under the current funding formula based on number of FTES, Rio Hondo receives $69.5 million on the State general apportionment and Citrus, one of our nearby competing colleges, receives $64.5 million, a difference of $5 million in Rio Hondo’s favor. Under the new funding formula, Citrus will receive an additional $11.6 million, whereas Rio Hondo was reduced by $4.3 million. If you take into account the $11.6 million extra that Citrus is receiving + the $4.3 million Rio Hondo was reduced + $5 million less than we were receiving under the current funding formula, there now stands to be a $20 million gap between Rio Hondo and Citrus. Our underserved student population needs additional assistance, yet we have an enormously reduced State budget with which to serve them. Overall, Rio Hondo is the college that is most affected by the new funding formula.

With this new funding formula, 2018/2019 is a “hold harmless” year in which colleges are granted forgiveness, however financial reductions are imminent. Superintendent/President Dreyfuss has been in contact with the President of Mt. Sac and has also spoken to our Board Members. The hope is that we will try to form a coalition with other Districts to advocate that we should be given 3-5 years to implement this. During these trying times, we cannot be territorial and we cannot perform our work in silos; we must thoughtfully consider the campus as a whole and make sure we are doing what’s best for the College, with all departments working together. This will require careful consideration of the way in which we award degrees and certificates, as well as the way we process our BOGW and Pell Grants.

IV. Public Comments – None.

Persons wishing to address the Planning and Fiscal Council on any item on the agenda or comment on any other matter are allowed three minutes per topic. Pursuant to the Brown Act, the Planning and Fiscal Council cannot discuss or take action on items not listed on the agenda. Matters brought before the Planning and Fiscal Council that are not on the agenda may, at PFC’s discretion, be placed on the next agenda.

V. ASRHC Report – None.
VI. Co-Chair’s Report –

A. Guided Pathways

- **Meta-Majors** – A first-draft of a condensed list of meta-majors compiled based on feedback from FLEX Day that was presented to Academic Senate. This was a first-draft of the meta-majors which requires additional dialogue, including input from students. At the Senate meeting today, a motion was made to form a Senate subcommittee to look at different initiatives for Guided Pathways. Additionally, the Guided Pathways Special Assigned Personnel (SAP) will be tasked with forming an advisory group related to meta-majors. Feedback/questions from PFC regarding the meta-majors included:

  o Is “undecided” an appropriate name for a major? What about “exploratory”? One benefit of calling it “undecided” is that this is something high school students are familiar with.
  o In order to foster focused and career exploration, could an “undecided” major have an expiration date?
  o It is expected that there will be milestones that “undecided” students will need to meet, including visiting the Career Center, meeting with a counselor, doing an informational interview, etc.
  o Education as a separate meta-major seems to be narrow, especially with the robustness of our programs. One suggestion is “Education and Helping Professions” which might include majors such as Human Services and Social Work.
  o We have seen from other colleges that meta-majors are exponentially difficult to map the more that are created.

- **Special Assigned Personnel (SAPs)** – The RHC Guided Pathways Leadership Team will soon be calendaring an initial training with the Guided Pathways Faculty SAPs. Training will be ongoing so that these individuals become experts and valuable resources to their respective Division(s).

- **AB 705** – The intent of Assembly Bill 705, which was signed into law in October 2017, is to ensure that more students have access to college-level courses when they start community college, substantially increasing their chances of completing a degree, certificate, or transfer. Research has shown the existing system to bring underprepared college students up to speed can actually hurt their chances of earning a degree. AB 705 requires community colleges to use high school performance as a factor in determining course placement for college-level math and English, as well as multiple measures. Dr. Laura Ramirez is on the AB 705 workgroup and stated that language for guidance on how to implement AB 705 is currently being developed. The law dictates that districts and colleges may not require students to enroll in remedial math or English coursework. By 2019, we need to fully implement curriculum, processes, etc. to ensure students are placed directly into college-level math and English. Corequisites, supplemental instruction, tutoring, and other evidence-based practices may be used to support students that require additional assistance. However, we cannot use noncredit to serve as a sequence. The implementation of AB 705 gives us the opportunity to look at curricular pathways, corequisite models, and to build robust support systems for our students. It also gets at the heart of what’s happening in the classroom and will require that faculty are given the tools to change current practices.

Questions arose about how this will affect teacher pedagogy. Will faculty ease up on rigor simply to pass students who are ill-prepared to be in college-level courses? The hope is that this will not be the case. Professional development for faculty will be key,
because they will no longer simply be teaching content, but also building basic skills. RHC will need to identify ways in which we can support faculty so they are successful in this endeavor. Massive investments will need to be made in student support services.

As we bring faculty together to explore curricular redesign, we will also need to engage other schools to see what they’re doing. We need to be aware of how other schools are planning on implementing AB 705 and benchmark ourselves compared to surrounding institutions.

VII. Unfinished Business –

A. AP 2000s

• AP 2105 – Election of Student Members – PULLED for further discussion at 3/13/18 meeting

• AP 2340 – Agendas – CONSENSUS with edits as follows –
  Section I: Change “Senate Exec” to read “Senate Executive Council” in paragraph 1. Change “Board of Trustees” to read “Board members” in paragraph 2. Change “Board of Trustees” to read “Board” in paragraph 3.
  Section II: Change “College Website” to read “College website,” making the word lowercase.
  Section III: Add “Superintendent” before the word “President” so it reads “Superintendent/President”. Change “College Website” to read “College website,” making the word lowercase.

• AP 2360 – Minutes – CONSENSUS with edits as follows –
  Section I: Change “college website” to read “College website,” making the word uppercase.
  Section II: Add “Superintendent” before the word “President” so it reads “Superintendent/President”.

• AP 2430 – Delegation of Authority to the Superintendent/President – CONSENSUS with no edits.

• AP 2431 – Superintendent/President Selection Process – PULLED for further discussion related to the ordering of XIII. AP 2431 will be reviewed at the 3/13/18 PFC meeting.

• AP 2435 – Evaluation of Superintendent/President – CONSENSUS with edits as follows –
  Section I: Add a comma after “students” so that it reads “input from staff, faculty, students, and managers.”

• AP 2710 – Conflict of Interest – CONSENSUS with edits as follows –
  Section I: Move the apostrophe in the phrase “Board member’s” to be after the word member so it reads “Board members’.”
  Section III: Change “Board of Trustees” to read “Board”.
  ***It was noted that AP 2710 is not “gender neutral” however, PFC agreed to leave this AP as-is in terms of pronouns and moving forward, make all APs gender neutral in language (i.e. using “they” instead of he/she, him/her, etc.)

• AP 2712 – Conflict of Interest & Disclosure Code – CONSENSUS with edits as follows –
  Section I: Add a comma after “any amendments to it,”.
  Section IV: Add a comma after “Government Code section 87200,”. Remove the word “designated” before the word “employees” because the word is then repeated later in the same sentence and is therefore redundant.
  Section V: Redact the phrase “by its Members of the Board of Trustees” to simply read “by the Board of Trustees.”
  Section VI-C.: Change “April 1” to read “April 1st”.
  Section XV: Add the phrase “the following:” before the list.
  Section XV-E.: Change the amount from “$440” to “$470”.
Section XXI-C.: Add the word “Executive” in front of Dean, Institutional Research and Planning; Dean, Counseling and Student Success; and Director, Human Resources.

- AP 2735 – Board Member Travel – CONSENSUS with edits as follows –
  Section I: Change “any” representatives of the Board” to read “current representatives of the Board”.
  Section II: Change “The Board participates in local and Outside of state and nationally recognized organizations” to read “The Board participates in local, out-of-state, and nationally recognized organizations.”

VIII. New Business –

A. BP 3000s – The Board Policies were distributed for initial editing as follows:

   - BP 3225 – Institutional Effectiveness – Howard/Brian
   - BP 3410 – Nondiscrimination – Brian/Robert/Juana
   - BP 3430 – Prohibition of Harassment – Brian/Robert/Juana
   - BP 3720 – Computer and Network Use – Lisa/Mike D./Sandra
   - BP 3820 – Gifts – Jorge/Howard/Dorali

IX. Committee Reports

- Safety/Facilities – The Safety and Facilities committee is working under the President’s suggestion to do an active shooter drill this semester. Dates are still being considered, but the hope is to make it as minimally invasive to faculty and students as possible. There is the potential for bigger training/drill on FLEX Day in the Fall.

- IEC – The Institutional Effectiveness Committee has been working on setting the agenda for the Institutional Planning Retreat, taking into consideration all initiatives (Guided Pathways framework), as well as updating Goals and Objectives and the Mission.

- Program Review – Executive summaries are nearly complete. Within a week or so, they will be placed back into the program review templates so that the program review participants will have an opportunity to comment. Marie Eckstrom will come to a future PFC meeting to provide a report on the overall state of the executive summaries.

- Staff Development – There is an Integrated professional development taskforce that has brought together Staff Development, Basic Skills, SSSP, and Student Equity. They are trying to find a way to better align and leverage our resources to provide more effective professional development.

- Basic Skills – At the last Basic Skills meeting, the committee talked a lot about Guided Pathways and the new funding allocation model. There was also conversation about the process of onboarding students and doing a SWOT analysis to help streamline the process.

- SLO – Adam Wetsman is looking for opportunities for training to help everyone to get the program level and course level outcomes entered into Taskstream and mapped to the institutional outcomes.

- Online Education (OEC) – A written report was provided by Dr. Jodi Senk and is available on the PFC website as a supporting document to the February 27, 2018 meeting.
- **Student Equity** – There was an e-mail that went out regarding Professional Development opportunities for faculty starting in April. These workshops will focus on what faculty can do in the classroom. We will have speakers from UCLA and UC Riverside to talk about how faculty can use different pedagogies in the community college classroom.

- **SSSP** – This Friday, March 2nd, there will be a SSSP meeting that will be 100% dedicated to a reboot of the matriculation/assessment process. A new assessment placement tool will be a channel in AccessRIO available to students and will allow students to self-identify.

X. **Announcements** – Sandra Rivera mentioned that the CSEA has had preliminary discussions about the new funding formula and that lack of parking on campus continues to be a thorn in students’ sides. A CSEA member from Admissions & Records reported that second session begins March 12 and there are currently no semester-long parking permits on campus right now.

XI. **Adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at 4:01pm. The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 13 from 2:30 – 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room.