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

II. **Approval of Minutes** – Dr. Pierson announced that the PFC Minutes of February 12, 2013 were delayed as previously reported. The minutes of the February 12th and today’s minutes will be brought forward at the March 12th meeting. This will allow us to put the governance discussion together.

III. **Co-Chairs Report** – Dr. Pierson reported that we are continuing the discussion after the formation of the PFC subcommittee to discuss governance, which met once. The results are the documents that you have before you today. We have forward momentum on this. We will also finalize the Program Review discussion today with Marie Eckstrom and Howard Kummerman. Dr. Wetsman had no further comments.

IV. **Superintendent’s Report** – President Dreyfuss reported on the state apportionment funding from P1 provided by Chancellor’s Office. The California Community Colleges have to report their 320 FTES report four times a year. The first report was submitted by January 15th which is called the P1. According to our P1, we estimated our credit FTES is 12,673 and non-credit is 355 FTES. The P1 funded level of credit FTES is 11,830 and non-credit funded level is 355 FTES. Thus, unfunded credit FTES at P1 is 932 FTES. So if we look at the cost to generate the unfunded FTES is about 1.5 million in faculty salary and loss of revenue from state is about 4.2 millions. As far as non-credit FTES, we need to generate additional 123 FTES to meet the cap, which is about additional revenue of $250,000. We may be able to secure from non-credit under cap. President Dreyfuss fielded the following questions:

Was the drop in non-credit due to the reduction in the labs? Dr. Pierson responded that, no the reduction in any of the labs was not claimable as non-credit with the state. This is an area where we can generate additional revenue.

How does the non-credit FTES get calculated? President Dreyfuss explained that the 320 report is a form that Judy Pearson, Director of Admissions and Records, completes and submits to the state. Judy would be the area expert to explain the actual calculations. For 2012-2013, P1 FTES reported was 13,150. Last year P2 was 13,992 FTES including non-credit of 711 FTES. We dropped 487 credit FTES based on the 260 plus section cuts this year. Judy Pearson will have to clarify if non-credit FTES are generated by those sections that do not have an actual CRN. Dr. Pierson will invite Judy Pearson and Don Mason to attend the next PFC meeting to discuss eligible non-credit courses. The conversion of the FTES count into dollars is $2,500 per non-credit FTES, which equates to about $250,000.
additional revenue that we may be able to earn for this fiscal year. That is what we will revisit and discuss.

The question was asked about the Governor’s proposal to give community colleges $300 million to take over Adult Education from the high schools. President Dreyfuss responded that we have been discussing this topic. However, there are so many problems with the proposal, K-12 districts receive close to $600 million dollars and the state is considering granting only $300 million to community colleges to assume the same scope of responsibility and administration of Adult Education. If this proposal passes, it will drain our resources.

V. New Business

**Revised Administrative Procedure**

AP 5130 Financial Aid - Dr. Wetsman stated that this AP needs to go through more screening. Specifically, we need to look at the substantive issues that need to be cleaned up to make the language clearer. The following issues with this AP are as follows;

1. Undocumented students are not addressed in this procedure and they are eligible for student aid and can apply for Cal Grant B & C.
2. There are also issues with high unit majors such as those students who participate in STEM/MESA program, Business, Nursing, and the Sciences.
3. According to this procedure, students who take pass/no pass would be ineligible for Financial Aid. This needs to be addressed, especially for those students who are taking Basic Skills courses.
4. More clarification is needed on the appeals process.
5. In paragraph IX, “Misrepresentation”, what if a student makes an honest mistake? Is there no recourse?
6. The appeals process should go to a committee when in fact this procedure states the final decision is up to the Director of Financial Aid, which goes against language in Title IV.
7. In paragraph it references that the Director of Financial Aid convenes a scholarship committee, when in actuality scholarships have been turned over to the Foundation Office.

AP 3510 Prevention of Workplace Violence & Disruption - (Back in Subcommittee) - Dr. Pierson reported that the subcommittee met on February 26th, identified some sticking points and Dr. Foster will incorporate subcommittee member's suggestions and return a draft for the PFC subcommittee to review within a two week time period.

**NEW Administrative Procedures**

AP 3810 Claims for Damages - Dr. Pierson reported that this AP was returned from last fall. Questions from PFC were given to Timothy Connell for a back to response. Dr. Pierson read his response aloud.

For example:
“A claim is for restitution. Restitution can be a claim in the form of money, repairs or both. There are all types of claims. There are claims regarding student records that are handled through Kenn Pierson. There are claims regarding employment and salary records that are handled through Yolanda Emerson and Chedva Weingart. There are trip and fall insurance claims. There are student athlete injury claims. There are vehicle accident insurance claims. There are property damage claims from acts of GOD to sports events. There are probably more claim types that I have never heard about.”

Mike Javanmard has concerns about transparency to the public as taxpayers. Some claims are not public record. It says that on the fifth bullet down there are claim forms. Where can you pick one up? Shouldn’t we see a sample of the form? Tell us how much money is paid to legal counsel to process claims? Who is handling negotiations? Who is working on construction claim issues?

Dr. Wetsman asked whether anyone else sees the need to have the forms come to PFC to pass this AP. The Claims for Damages AP provides an outline on how to complete the process. Perhaps there can be a sentence added on where to pick up the required forms, but he doesn’t see the relevance to place that in the AP. It was clarified that under letter C it does specify where a person can pick up the required documents. Mike Javanmard requested to table this until the March meeting so he can view the actual claim form and return this AP to the next PFC meeting in March.

AP 5010 Admissions (New) - Mike Javanmard responded that this is another AP that he has concerns about, especially with the drop deadline.

1. Shouldn’t this come to Academic Senate because this is a mutually agreed upon AP before coming forward to the PFC? All the items in bold establish the procedures, but where does Senate get to weigh in on this?
2. Other concerns raised were that local practice can be inserted into the AP and it’s not reflected in this draft.
3. The title is general and should be more specific.

Marie Eckstrom requested that if background on why the change is needed to BPs and APs is given to us at PFC, it would be clearer to us if there are changes to laws or if there were some problems that maybe are not obvious to us. John Frala pointed out that there are high school students that attend RHC and they need to have their parent's permission to attend classes. Marie cited paragraph two of the procedure and read it aloud.

1. Is the revision because of students who come from another country?
2. Does the Director of A & R validate transcripts?
3. There are some schools that are not accredited. What if a student has a Ph.D. from another country and registers for ENLA classes? Do they have to have their transcripts evaluated by an outside agency?
4. What if a student is under 18 and does not have a diploma?

Usually PFC is provided with the old AP attached during the review process and that is helpful. After hearing the concerns, Dr. Wetsman will add this AP to the Academic Senate agenda for proper vetting and return this AP to the next PFC agenda.

VI. Unfinished Business

- Program Review Executive Summary – Marie Eckstrom/Howard Kummerman gave an overview of the executive summary.

Colin Young asked about positions in Facilities Services that are crucial to operations on the campus. He has been on the Staffing Committee for many years, and these positions are never funded. We have added more buildings to the campus, yet we are working with less staff. When the HVAC goes out we, rely on one Plumber. We only have one Audio Visual Technician and are also down custodial positions. There are other positions that get funded and these never do. Marie Eckstrom responded that Facilities is severely underfunded. Sandra Rivera reported the composition of Facilities staff – 2 General Maintenance Workers, 1 Plumber, 16 Custodians, 5 Groundsmen, 1 Locksmith, and 2 Utility Workers. The department is in dire need of equipment and staff. We have added more square footage including the two educational centers with no increase in staff. Staffing should be in relation to square footage of our buildings.

Howard responded that this should be included in the Facilities Master Plan. It was suggested by several members of PFC that we have a master top level of set services for the campus. Some needs outweigh others and should not receive equal billing. After Program Review is completed, those resource requests go up from program plan to unit plan, to the area plan. Each category goes to the respective resource request committees – Technology, Faculty Staffing, Classified Staffing, and Facilities. There is also a concern that there is no formalized planning process for hiring Administrators. Positions are opened and filled.

Marie Eckstrom responded that IEC is working on refining the criteria and weighting to add more points to something that shows up consistently in program review. We have a Maintenance Department, but we hear maintenance requests repeated in many of the program reviews. Technology is very similar. The Math department has been short changed because other divisions have been given more over the years. They do not have lab equipment and do not have the necessary software that other sister colleges have, and we are losing students as a result.

Marie Eckstrom would like to hear comments after the discussion two weeks ago when Program Review was discussed. What about substandard documents and processes in Program Reviews? I would like to throw that out to PFC. How do you feel about going towards a system similar to Accreditation where programs that need improvement have to come back sooner than 6 years? Some program reviews are too short, others too long or vague. Sometimes, 6 years later, we get the same program document with different dates and no changes have occurred. If there are OSHA requirements for certain requests, those should be weighted differently because it is a safety and/or compliance issue.
Howard reported that final adoption of resource requests will come forward through the regular process: President’s Council, Administrative Council, and PFC for consensus. We should look at the program review summary and can bring that forward as a separate issue maybe after spring break.

- Discussion of Governance – Dr. Wetsman stated that PFC members were sent a set of 5 simple flow charts. We want to delineate the processes on APs, BPs, and Governance. We generally know the process we have in our heads, but there are areas that are ambiguous and not written down. When outside agencies such as the Accreditation team or a new CEO come to campus, they should be able to see how our process works. Dr. Wetsman provided a series of flow charts with different possibilities, which was an outcome of the PFC sub-committee that met a week and a half ago. The subcommittee is Teresa Dreyfuss, Kenn Pierson, Adam Wetsman, Sandra Rivera, Beverly Reilly, and John Frala.

This is how we generally agreed the process works. The process is driven by the President of the College, who is responsible for governance, and the Board is responsible for the President. At all levels, it is the President that is in charge. Except in certain circumstances the President is responsible for the revisions to be placed on the board agenda. The President is responsible to make this happen. All other committees provide input, make suggestions, etc. The President is not directly named in here but has the charge.

In reviewing the 5 flow charts, the question arose regarding the minority report when consensus is not reached at PFC. The co-chairs of PFC are charged with the write-up and should send the report to the Board and the President at the same time. The PFC handbook speaks to this process. The problem is our current practice has been to have the President forward to the Board. But what if the President disagrees and does not deliver the report in a timely manner? Practically speaking, the VP of the College is not going to forward to the Board and go against the President. We are assuming that with this process. We are also assuming that the President of Academic Senate has the email addresses of all our Board members. There are still items that need to be clarified.

The vision here is if we can consense on these visual diagrams, then we can write them in APs and BPs that will reflect the flowcharts. AB 1725 specifies the relationship between the Academic Senate and District – mutual agreement prevails unless you have significant exposure to litigation or harm. The district is a mutually agreed district. That means that we should theoretically agree on various issues that are 10 + 1, including degrees and certificates, educational programs, governance, faculty roles, program review, budget, procedures, etc.

**Consensus was reached on the 5 flow charts presented:**
Diagram #1 – Key
Diagram #2 – Board Policy Proposed Revision (Not Senate purview)
Diagram #3 – Administrative Procedure Revision (Not Senate purview)
Diagram #4 – Board Policy Proposed Revision (Senate purview)
Diagram #5 – Administrative Procedure Proposed Revision (Senate purview)
Diagram #6 – Governance Manual Process

Dr. Wetsman will consult with Academic Senate Leadership to prepare a written proposal for the next PFC.
VII. Committee Reports
- Basic Skills – No report.
- Facilities – No report.
- IEC – Howard Kummerman reported that IEC has met two times this month. The first meeting we addressed Accreditation Standard I. First meeting that we had this month we also talked about the planning retreat agenda on April 5th. The 2012-2013 ranking of facilities and technology requests has been completed. Teresa has made decisions on requests that have been funded with one time funds. Staff can complete requisitions now on those items that were funded.
- Program Review – Reported on earlier in the meeting.
- Safety – Dr. Wetsman reported that Jim Poper attended Academic Senate and gave a status report on the next steps regarding the shooter on campus incident.
- SLO’s – John Frala reported that Matt Koutroulis has sent several reminders to Divisions that SLOs are being reviewed. Check with your division representative on the SLO Committee.
- Accreditation – The next Accreditation Leadership Team (ALT) meeting is on March 7th at 1:00 p.m. in the Board Room.
- Staff Development – No report.
- Staffing – Howard Kummerman announced that there will be four Staffing Committee meetings held in the next two weeks. This week the presentation meetings for Classified and Faculty positions will be held. Next week will be the calibration and scoring meetings. Scoring will take place online.
- Institutional Technology – John Frala reported that Rudy Rios has gone back to review the comments from Senate which is creating a subcommittee on Distance Ed. ITC Committee will split into two groups. One will focus on Institutional Technology, which includes classroom technology, lighting etc., and the other will focus on Distance Education that will relate to Accreditation. Ongoing institutional concerns with online teaching standards.
- Technology – No report.

VIII. Announcements – None.

IX. Public Comment – None.

X. Adjournment – Dr. Wetsman adjourned the meeting at 3:54 p.m. The next PFC meeting is March 12, 2013.
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