I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Call to Order

Ms. Santana called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

Student Trustee Carroll led the salute to the flag.

C. Roll Call

All present.

D. Approval of Minutes: January 15, 2014; February 1, 2014

It was moved by Ms. Shapiro, seconded by Ms. Garcia to approve the minutes of January 15, 2014. A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:
Ms. Shapiro  Yes
Mr. Mendez  Yes
Ms. Pacheco  Yes
Ms. Santana  Yes
Ms. Garcia  Yes
Student Trustee Carroll  Yes

16. It was moved by Mr. Mendez, seconded by Ms. Shapiro to approve the minutes of February 1, 2014. A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:

Ms. Shapiro  Yes
Mr. Mendez  Yes
Ms. Pacheco  Yes
Ms. Santana  Yes
Ms. Garcia  Yes
Student Trustee Carroll  Yes

E. Open Communication for Public Comment

No comments from the public.

F. Commendations
   • Men's Soccer Team (Foothill Conference Champions); Coach of the Year, Orlando Brenes
   • Women's Soccer Team; (2nd Place, Foothill Conference)

G. Presentations
   • Sabbatical Leave (Angela Rhodes)
   • VITA Program (Jeannie Liu)

II. CONSENT AGENDA

17. It was moved by Ms. Garcia, seconded by Ms. Shapiro to approve the following Consent Agenda. A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:

Ms. Shapiro  Yes
Mr. Mendez  Yes
Ms. Pacheco  Yes
Ms. Santana  Yes
Ms. Garcia  Yes
Student Trustee Carroll  Yes

A. FINANCE & BUSINESS
1. Finance & Business Reports

2. **Authorization for Out-of-State Travel & Conferences**

   Approved the following staff members, and those Board members who could attend in the following educational conferences:

   - Eugene Blackman to participate at the 2014 Marriott School Organizational Behavior Conferenced in Provo, UT on April 3-4, 2014.
   - Jeannie Liu to participate at the 2014 Teachers of Accounting at Two Year Colleges (TACTYC) Conference in New Orleans, LA on May 15-18, 2014.
   - Dr. Mike Munoz to present at the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) 94th Annual Convention in Washington, DC. On April 5-8, 2014.
   - Tracy Rickman to participate at the Association of Public Administrators Annual Conference in Washington, DC on March 14-18, 2014.

3. **Arbitrage Rebate Compliance Report Services for Tax Exempt Bonds – Omnicap Group, LLC**

   Approved an agreement with the Omnicap Group, LLC for arbitrage rebate compliance report services for tax exempt bonds in an amount not to exceed $10,500.00 from Bond Funds and authorized the Administration to execute such contract on behalf of the District.

4. **Revenue Agreement – City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services**

   Approved the revenue agreement with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

5. **Additional Labor to Finish Installation of Audio Visual Equipment in Room 201 of the Administration of Justice Building – Audit Video Innovations**

   Approved additional labor for AVI to finish installation of the audio visual equipment in room 201 of the Administration of Justice Building in an amount not to exceed $1,456.00 from Bond Funds and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.
6. **Acceptance of Donation – Nissan 44kW Electric Vehicle Fast Charging Station**

Accepted the donation of one Nissan 44kW model CHAdeMO Electric Vehicle Fast Charging Station from Nissan North America and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

7. **Replace the Condenser Water Pump Leaking Seal at the Central Plant Cooling Tower – EMCOR Services/Mesa Energy Systems, Inc.**

Approved the proposal of $9,251.00 to replace the condenser water pump leaking seal and perform inspection of bearings and gaskets at the Central Plant Cooling Tower from EMCOR Services/Mesa Energy Systems, Inc. to be paid from Bond Funds and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

8. **Investigate Water Leak at Central Plant Hot Water Pipe Loop – D. Burke Mechanical Corporation**

Approved the proposal of $1,850.00 to investigate water leak at central plant hot water pipe loop from D. Burke Mechanical Corporation to be paid from Bond Funds and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

9. **Replace Intrusion Alarm System at Information Technology Main Server Room and Fine Art Gallery – Post Alarm Systems, Inc.**

Approved the proposal of $2,457.20 to replace the intrusion alarm systems at Information Technology main server room and Fine Art Gallery – Post Alarm Systems, Inc. to be paid from Bond Funds and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

10. **Update to the Final Project Proposal (FPP) for the “L” Tower Building as Required by the State Chancellor’s Office – Westberg + White Architects**

Approved the Not to Exceed proposal of $4,000.00 for the update to the Final Project Proposal (FPP) for the L – Tower Building as required by the State Chancellor’s Office by Westberg + White Architects to be paid from the Bond Funds and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

11. **Modification #1 for Approval of Division of the State Architect Closeout Certification Services Fees – Del Terra Group**

Approved Modification #1 to Del Terra Group’s contract for additional DSA Close-out Services in an amount not to exceed $93,600.00 for a revised total contract amount of $272,100.00 to be paid from Bond Funds and authorize the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.
12. **Modification #1 for Del Terra – Program and Construction Management Fees**

Approved modification #1 for Del Terra Group in the amount of $21,792.00 for a revised total contract amount of $1,016,792.00 to be paid from Bond Funds and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

13. **Comevo @School Online Orientation Program**

Accepted Comevo’s proposal for its @School Online Orientation™ program in an amount not to exceed $10,220.00 paid from the Student Success Initiative (SSI) general categorical fund and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

14. **Application Service Provider Agreement – College Central Network, Inc.**

Approved a subscription to College Central Network Application Service Provider program in an amount not to exceed $1,500.00 from the Bond Fund and authorized the Administration to execute appropriate documents on behalf of the District.

15. **Continuing Education**

Approved the following Continuing Education:

a. Johnny Pak – To instruct “Social Security Secrets, Filing for your Social Security Benefits can be Stressful” - Students will learn that the average retiree leaves thousands of dollars “on the table” simply because they don’t understand how to optimize their Social Security benefits in an informative and easy to understand offering and explore ways in which to maximize benefits. Dates of service will be February 20, 2014 – June 30, 2014. Payment will be split 60% to Rio Hondo College and 40% to the consultant.

16. **Consultants**

Approved the following Consultants:

a. Josh Hyatt – To present a staff development education program entitled “Potential and Pitfalls of E-Communication in Healthcare” at the April Los Angeles Orange County (LAOC) Regional Consortium Health Marketplace. Date of service: April 17, 2014. Payment not to exceed $225.00 from Deputy Sector Navigator Health Sector Grant.

b. Joyce P. Kaufman – To introduce faculty to service learning and give examples of how service learning (that is using the community to support academic programs) can be implemented across the curriculum; how to implement a service learning program and classes within a program; discuss the relationship between service learning and undergraduate research. Date of service: February 21, 2014. Payment not to exceed $350.00 from Title V Grant.
B. PERSONNEL

1. Academic

   a. Employment

      Part Time Spring, 2014

      Arts & Cultural

      FLORIO, Melanie

      Behavioral and Social Sciences

      GONZALEZ, Teresa

      Business

      *ALLEN, James

      Career Technical Education

      GAVELA, Robert

      Health Sciences and Nursing

      CRUZ, Janet  VALLO, Debbie

      Math and Sciences

      AFSHARI, Arya  GOMEZ, Victor

      GRYGORUK, Anna  LANGO, Brenda

      MORALES, Manuel  ORTIZ, May

      RAMIREZ, Claudia  ROMERO HERNANDEZ,

      SINGHASEN, Par  Abraham

      SKORKA, Evan  TRINH, Thanh

      Hourly as Needed Substitute, Spring 2014

      Career Tech. Education

      HUTCHISON, Phillip  KOOIMAN, Brent

      LOUIE, John

      Math and Sciences

      FOGEL, Charles  GOMEZ, Victor

      IRWIN, Erin  SARVI, Kayvon

*(minimum qualification equivalency established pursuant to CP 5165)
Reduced Workload, 2014-2015

In accordance, with E.C. 87483, Reduction in Workload and provisions of Article 6 of the Academic Contract, the following academic employees have requested a reduction in workload for the 2014-2015 school year:

ENRIGHT, Adele 80% Library
GASPAR, Georgia 74.4% Communications & Languages
HUANG, Irene 80% Physical Science
MOSHARRAF, Firouz 60% Mathematics

b. Family Care and Medical Leave

GONZALEZ, Lydia, full time instructor in Mathematics, has requested a Family Care and Medical leave, to be taken intermittently throughout the remainder of the Spring 2014 semester

GRIFFITH, Margaret, full time instructor in Arts and Cultural has requested a Family Care and Medical Leave from January 24, 2014 through February 7, 2014

2. Management and Confidential

a. Resignation

JONES, Walter, Dean of Student Services. His last day of employment was January 29, 2014

b. Family Care and Medical Leave

MAGNUS, Shari, Human Resources Coordinator, has requested a Family Care and Medical Leave to be taken intermittently beginning January 20, 2014

3. Classified


Regular Classified

LIAO, I Chen, Sr. Financial Aid Assistant, Financial Aid, 100%, 12 months, effective January 27, 2014

The following employee is being hired in the designated capacity with dedicated funding through June 30, 2014. If continued funding should not be available, 60-day notice shall be served:

NAVARRETE, Brenda, Sr. Financial Aid Assistant, Financial Aid, 100%, 12 months, effective January 28, 2014
Substitute, 2013-2014

ADKINS, Darlene, Custodian, Facilities Services, effective February 6, 2014

GARCIA, Laura, Student Services Assistant, Transfer Center, effective January 27, 2014

RODRIGUEZ, Jovan, Clerk Typist III, Student Affairs, effective February 3, 2014

b. Leave of Absence

GONZALEZ, Teresa, Student Services Assistant in Educational Partnerships, has requested a 20% leave from her classified position effective January 29, 2014

c. Family Care and Medical Leave

VILLEGAS-GOMEZ, Ayari, Clerk Typist III in the Assessment Center, has requested a seven-week Family Care and Medical Leave, effective January 27, 2014

d. Resignation

LARA, Jose, Student Services Assistant in the Transfer Center. His last day of employment was January 24, 2014

McFARLAN, Gary, Tool Room Attendant, Career Technical Education. His last day of employment was February 13, 2014.

QUINONEZ, Elisa, Registration Clerk, Admissions & Records. Her last day of employment was February 4, 2014

4. Unrepresented, (AP 7130), 2013-14

a. Employment

Hourly

Disabled Students

SENGUPTA, Regina, Interpreter/Translator for Deaf

EOPS/CARE

SOFFE, Morganna, Tutor II

Kinesiology, Dance & Athletics

AGUILAR, Justin, Coach. Spec. CASILLAS, Raul, Coaching Spec
GOMEZ, Pedro, Lifeguard GONZALEZ, Faustino, Lifeguard
KIRKLAND, Robert, Asst. Train. Spec. THOMAS, Rose, Lifeguard
Math and Sciences
SERRATO, Rebecca, Tutor II

Public Safety
VIZCARRA, Jose, RTO

Student Success Retention (Basic Skills)
LASSITER CAMPOS, Shawndra, Tutor II   SUNAHARA, Elizabeth, Tutor II

Volunteers
Kinesiology, Dance & Athletics
  CRUZ, Lisette

Public Safety
CERVANTES, Jonathan   CUEVAS, Alexander
GODINEZ, Edward   HICKS, Alexander
PLASENCIA, Francisco

Students
ASHBY, William, Student Life   CANO, Jessica, Financial Aid
FLORES, Karen, Student Life   HERNANDEZ, Marielena, Public Sfty
LYMUEL, LaTeacia, Veterans Ser.   MARTINEZ, Natalie, Comm./Lang.
MENDOZA, Madeline, EOPS/CARE   RODRIGUEZ, Kimberly, Career Devp.
SAENZ, Steven, Career Tech. Ed.   SALAZAR, Phillis, Human Resources
VENEGAS, Maria, Math & Sciences

5. **Revision of Administrative Procedure 7130 (See Attached)**

a) Lifeguard service must be in attendance at a public swimming pool, During periods of use as per HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 116028. "Lifeguard services" includes the supervision of the safety of participants in water-contact activities by lifeguards who are providing swimming lessons, coaching or overseeing water-contact sports, or providing water safety instructions to participants when no other persons are using the facilities unless those persons are supervised by separate lifeguard services.

b) Effective July 1, 2014, California’s minimum wage will increase to $9.00 an hour.

*New language is demonstrated in **Bold**.*
C. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
1. Curriculum Items

   a. New Program
      The following certificate/degree has been recommended for inclusion in our offerings and catalog:

      AS-T Degree – Business Administration for Transfer
      (27-28 Units)

      *UC transfer process in progress for courses where applicable

III. ACTION ITEMS
A. PRESIDENT’S OFFICE
1. Revision of Board Policy 2310 – Regular Meetings of the Board
   (First Reading) – See Attached

   18. It was moved by Ms. Shapiro, seconded by Ms. Garcia to approve the revision of Board Policy 2310 for first reading – Regular Meetings of the Board. A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:

      Ms. Shapiro          Yes
      Mr. Mendez           Yes
      Ms. Pacheco          Yes
      Ms. Santana          Yes
      Ms. Garcia           Yes
      Student Trustee Carroll    Yes

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS
1. Building Program – An update on the Building Program was given by Jerry Quemada. The Administration indicated that in that we are near completion of the Building Program, updates will be provided to the Board every other month instead of monthly.

2. Accreditation Update – Dr. Adam Wetsman, co-chair of Rio Hondo’s Accreditation Leadership Team (ALT), updated the Board of Trustees about the status of accreditation at their meeting on February 19th. Excellent progress is being made by Marie Eckstrom, the writer of the accreditation report. The draft of Standard I has been completed, and the other standards will be completed by March 21st, the deadline for the first draft. The draft will be reviewed by all campus groups and there will be campus forums to discuss it in April and May. The report will be reviewed and approved by the ALT in June, with final approval coming from the Board in July. The standards co-chairs deserve special praise for the hard work they have done and continue to do in getting things ready for the writer.

V. STAFF AND BOARD COMMENTS
• Board Development Reporting
   o Student Trustee Carroll reported on her recent attendance at the CCLC Conference in Sacramento as well as her attendance at the ACCT Conference in
Washington, DC where meetings were scheduled to meet with the local legislators. She indicated that she attended a workshop on dual enrollment.

   o Mary Ann Pacheco reported on her recent attendance at the CCLC Conference in Sacramento where she attended the New Trustee Orientation Workshop as well as her attendance at the ACCT Conference in Washington, DC where she attended the New Trustee Academy. She attended meetings with local legislators.

• Action for Future Board Meetings – Trustee Gary Mendez requested that an agenda item be placed on the March 12 Board Meeting listing the special meetings that the Board agreed to schedule at the February 1, 2014 Board Retreat.

VI. CLOSED SESSION

Ms. Santana recessed the meeting to Closed Session at 7:53 p.m. Upon returning from Closed Session, the following action was taken.

Pursuant to Section 54956.8:
• CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR
  o 11400 Greenstone Avenue, Santa Fe Springs

Pursuant to Section 54956.9(b):
• CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – Anticipated Litigation (2 Cases)

Pursuant to Section 54956.9(c):
• CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – Existing Litigation (1 Case)

Pursuant to Section 54957:
• PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE / DISMISSAL / RELEASE

19. It was moved by Mr. Mendez, seconded by Ms. Santana to approve the non-reemployment of academic employee #498 and issue a non-reemployment notice effective February 19, 2014. A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:

   Ms. Shapiro       Yes
   Mr. Mendez        Yes
   Ms. Pacheco       Yes
   Ms. Santana       Yes
   Ms. Garcia        Yes

20. It was moved by Ms. Shapiro, seconded by Ms. Santana to approve the non-reemployment of academic employee #001006829 and issue a non-reemployment notice effective February 19, 2014. A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:

   Ms. Shapiro       Yes
   Mr. Mendez        Yes
   Ms. Pacheco       Yes
   Ms. Santana       Yes
   Ms. Garcia        Yes
21. It was moved by Ms. Shapiro, seconded by Ms. Santana to issue a termination notice to classified employee #001106180. A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:

- Ms. Shapiro: Yes
- Mr. Mendez: Yes
- Ms. Pacheco: Yes
- Ms. Santana: Yes
- Ms. Garcia: Yes

22. It was moved by Ms. Garcia, seconded by Ms. Shapiro to issue a termination notice to classified employee #001105243. A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:

- Ms. Shapiro: Yes
- Mr. Mendez: Yes
- Ms. Pacheco: Yes
- Ms. Santana: Yes
- Ms. Garcia: Yes

Pursuant to Section 54957.6:
- CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR
  Agency Negotiator: Teresa Dreyfuss
  Employee Organization: CSEA, RHCF

VII. ADJOURNMENT

23. It was moved by Ms. Shapiro, seconded by Ms. Santana to adjourn the meeting and announced that the next regular meeting would be held on – **March 12, 2014, 6:00 p.m.** A roll call vote was taken and the results are as follows:

- Ms. Shapiro: Yes
- Mr. Mendez: Yes
- Ms. Pacheco: Yes
- Ms. Santana: Yes
- Ms. Garcia: Yes
**WAGE RATES, SELECTED PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Represented Employees</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Training Specialist</td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanist (Professional Musician)</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Specialist</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Community Services)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Stage Manager (Community Services)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor II</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model (Fine Arts, Draped)*</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model (Fine Arts, Undraped)*</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit Training Officer</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Ambassador</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Advisor I</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Advisor II</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Advisor III</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$9.00 (as of July 1, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguards</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2 based on 500 hours of service at Step 1 level, 1,300 hours for Step 3. $1.00 per hour additional shall be paid employees upon completion of 3,500 hours in paid status in this classification effective 1/1/88.

*Interpreter/Translator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Deaf</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intern I</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern II</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in ITP</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed ITP based on test</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed ITP based on test + 5 years</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Step placement will be based on experience/certification and/or recruitment difficulties.

**Classified Substitute Pay**

Substitute rate to be hourly rate of entry level salary except former employees rehired on a temporary basis within a two-year period of their last date of service in this District shall be placed at their last paid salary step of the range of the temporary position.

**Non-Represented Employees**

| Physician (E.C. 87448) | $70.00 |
| Guest Lecturer** | 28.76 | $30.20 |
| Foster Care | 24.55 | 25.78 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>$35.08</td>
<td>$36.37</td>
<td>$37.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>$16.76</td>
<td>$17.60</td>
<td>$18.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For consultants and guest lecturers, advancement to Step 2 is based upon completion of 1,211 assigned work hours.**
I. Regular meetings of the Board of Trustees shall be held once a month on the second Wednesday of each calendar month beginning at 6:00 p.m. unless specifically changed or otherwise authorized by the Board. Regular meetings shall normally be held at Rio Hondo College, 3600 Workman Mill Road, in the Board Room unless otherwise noticed.

II. A notice identifying the location, date, and time of each regular meeting of the Board shall be posted at least ten (10) days prior to the meeting and shall remain posted until the day and time of the meeting.

III. The Board shall give mailed notice of every regular meeting to any person who has filed a written request for that notice. Notice of a special meeting called less than 48 hours prior to the date set for the meeting shall be given in a manner deemed practical by the Board.

IV. All regular meetings of the Board shall be held within the boundaries of the District except in cases where the Board is meeting with another local agency or is meeting with its attorney to discuss pending litigation if the attorney’s office is outside the District.

V. All regular and special meetings of the Board shall be open to the public, be accessible to persons with disabilities, and otherwise comply with Brown Act provisions, except as required or permitted by law.

VI. When questions of parliamentary procedure arise regarding the conduct of a Board meeting, Robert’s Rule of Order shall serve as a guide.

VII. A regular or special meeting can be adjourned to continue the meeting to a time and place certain. If a meeting is adjourned for less than five calendar days, no new agenda is required to be posted as long as no new items are introduced on the agenda. Written notice of the adjourned meeting must be conspicuously posted on or near the door of the place where the meeting was held within twenty-four (24) hours after the time of adjournment.

VIII. Source/Reference:

ACCREDITATION LEADERSHIP TEAM (ALT)
Friday, December 4, 2013, 1:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m., Board Room

Members Present: Kenn Pierson (Co-Chair), Adam Wetsman (Co-Chair), Teresa Dreyfuss, Phil Luebben, John Frala, Karen Koos, Kevin Smith, Howard Kummerman, Russell Castañeda-Calleros, Vann Priest, Marie Eckstrom (Writer/Editor), Chedva Weingart, Gary Van Voorhis, Angie Tomasich (Support Staff), Rachel Garcia (Support Staff), Renée Gallegos (Recorder/Support Staff).

Special Guest: Dr. Bill Scroggins, President of Mt. San Antonio College

1. Opening Remarks – Dr. Kenn Pierson/Dr. Adam Wetsman- No opening remarks, in the interest of moving on to the guest speaker.

2. Dr. Bill Scroggins, President of Mt. San Antonio College, was invited by President Dreyfuss to attend the ALT meeting. Dr. Scroggins shared his perspective on completing a successful accreditation self-evaluation process. Members of the team asked questions about “do's and don'ts” regarding the accreditation process.

It has been Dr. Scroggins' privilege over the years to be involved with the completion of four institutional self-studies and four site visits—none of which resulted in a sanction. Dr. Scroggins has also served on eleven ACCJC Evaluation teams and chaired eight, most recently for Coast Community College District. He was on the College of the Redwoods site visit, which resulted in the institution’s “Show Cause.” Scroggins anticipates the College of the Redwoods being removed from Show Cause in the near future. He advised that institutions should not necessarily be afraid of sanctions. If your college receives one, you need to follow the process set by ACCJC to work your way through it.

The Four D’s
Dr. Scroggins offered a few suggestions for items that support the self-evaluation report, categorizing them as the four D’s:

   • Data – Supports the evidence cited in the Standards, sub-Standards, etc. There should be lots of data crossover. Having data at the top level is important. Data should be integrated in all the work that we do. Cite the data and provide links that are easily accessible. Show how the data is used daily at the institution, not just created specifically for Accreditation.
   • Documents – The self-evaluation narrative will refer to documents that provide evidence. Committee meeting minutes are a great example. Make all documents
Web-based. Have all documents ready on the Website prior to the visiting team’s arrival so team members have time to review. Collect notes and activate live links and layout in an organized manner. Integrate links at the end of paragraphs within the body of the documents.

- **Descriptions** - Place descriptions of the College early in the narratives. We want to put our best foot forward. Descriptions need to support the messages we want conveyed.
- **Diagrams** – Diagrams, numbers, and narratives should be easily understood and meaningful. The layout should be introduction, analysis, and graphics. There may be some duplication among the four Standards. Themes will emerge near the end of the process. A theme reader should be involved.

Major themes that Dr. Scroggins encountered in his experience that have proven to be potential “snake pits” include:

a. Rubrics provided by ACCJC
b. Program Review – Integrated planning, review, and assessments
c. Planning and Budget – Actions are based upon assessment
d. SLO’s

Everything we do should be used to show improvement. This is true of Human Resources planning, budgeting, etc. Dr. Scroggins recommended: “Document, document, document.” He suggested giving extensive details on financial stability.

Don’t lie—especially about the following:

a. 5% reserve without transfers
b. Long Term Fiscal planning with a three year minimum for future planning
c. Cash Flow/Cash Balance

Audits don’t matter much because they do not appear in Accreditation reports. It is more about making coherent decisions that are data-driven and connected to planning, and the self-evaluation report offers an opportunity to show this.

2. Resource requests have to be documented to justify staffing augmentations. Show the connection to goals, objectives, and strategic planning in the organization. The team should be able to pick up a document and see the connection and rationale. Benefits and salary are not that relevant. More importantly, an overemphasis on salary and benefits can deprive other resources from being available to meet a Standard. We have some districts, like San Francisco CC spending 97% on salary and benefits, which was a red flag. They were not providing facilities and technology upgrades, which affected Standard III b and III d. That will be a tough one for SFCC because they cannot fix those two things over night.

3. Shared Governance - This is the main snake pit. Do not refer to Title V or Education Code in this section. Colleges need to write about what their current practice is. A college can improve if they are written up. We need to be careful how we deal with this Standard. For example, the Standard might say faculty play a significant role in the design and implementation of curriculum. If you have an issue with the way curriculum is developed and approved, and someone is all upset about it and wants to write about it in the Accreditation report in order to fix it, you better write about it in terms of faculty playing a
significant role. However, academic administrators also have a significant role in the design and implementation of curriculum by Accreditation Standards. Be careful with the way you deal with shared governance issues. There is some squishy language about campus climate, involvement, etc. We have to operationalize things. We can write about issues in the report, but we need to write in Accreditation language. The Accreditation standards hold the CEO responsible to carry out shared governance. We cannot say “Well, we want to empower the Academic Senate to carry out shared governance.” That is not the way the Standards are written. The CEO is responsible for carrying out Board Policy and Procedures with respect to shared governance. Be careful how we write the response. We need to think about the way we operate and translate that into the Accreditation Standards. We want the shared governance descriptions to be on-point.

We also need to acknowledge there are items that need fixing in our self-evaluation report and work on fixing those items now before the team arrives. Our CEO will have the opportunity to write an update literally days before the site visit, noting all the things that have been done since the self-evaluation was written. The self-evaluation is not done when it is passed by the Board of Trustees. The CEO will be writing an update and the team chair will be reading that. An example would be bad record keeping in a given office. If you have holes in your process, write that in the report. Be true to our word. Tell it like it is. The visiting team will talk to staff and the truth will come to light. Remember, there are plenty of people who know what the practice is and won’t be afraid to say so! We can show any improvement by the time the team visits.

The question was posed to Dr. Scroggins on how to handle differences in viewpoint. For example, the faculty feel one way and the administration another. Dr. Scroggins said the Board of Trustees makes the decision as to which direction to go. He suggested regular, honest updates to the Board of Trustees on progress on the self-evaluation. There is a possibility of what is called a minority report, and we also can write letters directly to ACCJC if there are major issues. When we write those letters, the chair of the site team will receive copies. There are means to communicate if an individual, personally, or we as a group do not agree with something that his going on, and that will be noticed. However, be prepared because the team will have to hold at least two open sessions, and it is expected that the Administration won't be there. These open sessions are for the rank and file. If there is a difference of opinion, we should try to talk it out beforehand. That collaboration will show when the team comes to visit the campus. Write about that collaboration in our report. If there is an established process, then reference the steps that we went through.

A question was posed to Dr. Scroggins regarding recommendations for improvement that the College had previously received. One recommendation for improvement in 2008 had to be followed up on in 2009 within a very short, intensive time period. Finally, in 2010 we received the green light that we could proceed. This can be explained in the self-evaluation. There was about an 18-month period during which we are not able to identify any progress made in this particular area. Right around 2012 when we began getting ready for the 2014 visit, we picked up where we left and started addressing what we said we would do. Now, we are about a year into addressing this issue. By the time next summer rolls around, we should have a lot of good evidence showing progress. It was like our College took a collective sigh of relief for about 12-18 months. We know that we are
not able to cram but need to show sustainable progress throughout the year. So how do we account for that in the report?

Dr. Scroggins responded that this question leads to the final two areas of sanctions. If we have gotten a recommendation previously, and we do not fully meet the Standard now, then we will probably get sanctioned. If we have changed a key process and have not fully implemented it for at least once cycle, maybe even two, we will probably get sanctioned. Let’s say for example several years ago, we got a recommendation for Standard IV dealing with Board micromanagement. Then we changed CEOs and the CEO fixed it. Then we changed CEOs again and the problem recurred. Now we have a new CEO who is fixing it, but it is not fixed yet. We will get sanctioned. Now, remember we are going to write it honestly in the self-evaluation report and say that we are working on it. Then we have six months to fix it to fully meet the Standard or we will get sanctioned. It is not what it says in the self-evaluation. The self-evaluation is a guide for the visiting team. It is what happens on the ground in September 2014.

Dr. Scroggins added that, if we think we meet the Standard and are on the other side of the problem, then we need to be cheerleaders about it and hold a full-court press. For example, if our program review process was not intact two years ago but now we have things in motion... if we have buy in from constituent groups like Academic Senate and it is working... that is what we want to present.

How we get all this work done is another issue. He reiterated the five snake pits in the Accreditation process: Program Review, Planning, SLOs, Shared Governance, and completing the cycle on previous recommendations.

A question was raised on how much emphasis should be placed on recommendations? Dr. Scroggins said there is a part of the report that shows the status on the recommendations from before. We usually won’t write a whole lot about that because we are going to write what our current status is. The best thing to do is say, “We fixed it, and you will see in Standard such and such that we continue to fully meet the Standard.” Remember those words!

There are many different ways to get the work done. The problem is that Accreditation is so big. We need a way for people to work together. His experience has been that an institution needs to get a good organization. You have teams by Standards and teams by the eleven sub-Standards. That is a reasonably sized group to manage. We have groups working on the Mission, Institutional Effectiveness, Instruction, Student Services, Library, Human Resources, Facilities, Fiscal, Technology, Governance at the Administrative Level, and Governance at the Board Level.

The Four I’s

There are four things that need to be done, which are the four I’s.

1. Interview – Assign someone to talk to whoever “owns” the information on the Standard, as well as the users of the information. Report back with bullet points. Give the items to your writer in that manner. Get ideas. The best way to avoid getting tangled up in language/format is not to have interviewers write paragraphs.
Leave that to the report writer. Don’t come back from an interview and try to write the whole Standard. Ask, what does your unit do to meet the Standard? How do you meet the Standard? What do you think? Is your unit compliant or not?

2. Investigate – The investigator can get behind the scenes. For example, if the Academic Senate says this is their position on an item, the investigators will see if they can document this. The investigator goes out to find the evidence. The evidence is data and documentation, providing an evidence trail.

3. Identify – This is the third person of the team who comes in and says, “Can we identify that this matches this?” If the interviewer goes back and asks additional questions based on the documents, the investigator goes and looks for more information. Information is the key. Look in people’s filing cabinets, call retirees, do whatever you need to identify it.

4. Integrate – The integrator is the one who takes a look at the documents and says, “OK, do we meet the Standard?” Integrators are the ones to organize the information. Dr. Scroggins advised having separate people do this because people get invested in their work. At this point, we are still not writing. We are gathering information in bullet form. It is really important when we write that the tone, grammar, word choice, paragraph breaks, and writing style has a nice flow and makes sense. It may not seem important, but the self-evaluation report is the first thing that people are going to read about what we do. It really needs to come across professionally. It is like a legal brief. Stick to the Standard! The visiting team does not want to hear from our Librarians how great of a library book collection we have. They want to know, do we meet the Standard and the key points? We have an education center in El Monte. Recognize that all of those services should be available to the students that the center serves. Do we have library accessibility at EMEC? Do we have an online program? We have to apply these Standards to every instructional delivery mode, place, or type.

There seems to be a similar pattern with fiscal people. Are we planning ahead for years 2 and 3? What are we basing our assumptions on? Are we writing a logical narrative in the budget that shows that? What is the planning for cash flow? What are our Board policies on inter-fund transfers? Many times, fiscal staff are just looking at the bottom line and not thinking about the policy issues associated with those hot-button issues.

The most significant problem with self-evaluation is the language. Often, a subcommittee wants to fight about the way things are worded tooth and nail. It’s not worth fighting over if something is black or white. If there is that big of a disagreement, write both viewpoints. Say, “Here are two opinions and here is where we are at.” It may result in a planning agenda. Find ways to resolve problems throughout the process.

Howard Kummerman explained that we have followed the manuals supplied by ACCJC. On the topic of Distance Education (DE)/Correspondence Education, the manual questions are very similar to the self-evaluation manual. The question was posed to Dr. Scroggins, “Have you seen colleges that have done a good job integrating the information for the Distance Education/Correspondence Education along with the information that needs to be included in the standards and self-
evaluation questions so that it flows evenly... yet are able to give the team all of the information they need to know to show that we meet the Standard?"

Dr. Scroggins responded that, with respect to DE, there are three different places where it specifically asks how we are doing with Instructional Services Support, etc. We need to specifically call those out and write them as part of what we naturally do. These are our modes of delivery, and this is how we are meeting student needs in those areas. We need to think about DE as a separate “campus” and meet the Standards the same way. That is how the team will look at it. Dr. Scroggins advised the we not call it out as separate piece of work. We should integrate it into everything we say.

Dr. Pierson asked Dr. Scroggins at what level the four I’s should be occurring. This is theoretically what we are doing at Rio Hondo, but there has had to be some flexibility in the process with shifting duties. Dr. Scroggins advised the following:

Interview – Occurs at the sub-committee level.
Investigate – Occurs at the sub-committee level.
Identify – Occurs at the sub-committee level by the co-chairs.
Integrate – Completed by the Standard/ALT co-chairs.

Dean Koos replied that this is what is happening in Standard II. Dr. Pierson explained to Dr. Scroggins that we have the CORE, which is the Dropbox location where all evidence is housed and funnels upward to Marie Eckstrom, who is the designated Writer/Editor. In Dr. Scroggins’ opinion, the four I’s should happen before the evidence is turned over to the writer.

Russell Castaneda-Calleros posed the question to Dr. Scroggins in terms of managing our Board Members while they remain engaged in the self-study: “How have you dealt with varying levels of Trustee’s expectations among the various Board Members? How do we ensure that they are all on the same page regarding their role and the process? How has that worked out for you?”

Dr. Scroggins responded that, generally, he knows what the hot button issues are with each of the Trustees in his District. In advance of every Board meeting, he shares with them information on each of the areas where they are concerned. If they have issues with something, he meets with them or sometimes brings another staff member with him to drill down to the issue so that every time he walks into a Board meeting, he largely knows what is going to happen. We need to keep the President informed, and President Dreyfuss needs to inform the co-chairs of any issues the Board has. If there are issues, President Dreyfuss need to have those conversations ahead of time. The President has the task of keeping communication open between the Board and what is happening on the campus.

Dr. Pierson thanked Dr. Scroggins for sharing his knowledge and for making the time to be on campus with us. It is easy to get stressed and sidetracked during this process, so it is nice to hear that we are running on a similar track that has garnered Dr. Scroggins many successful Accreditations.
Dr. Pierson thanked the group for all the work that has been done through the Accreditation process. We are at the end of the semester, and there are countless hours that have been put in over the semester and throughout the 14 months that we have been collectively working on it. The workload has been heavy. Some Standards are functioning better than others. Dr. Pierson stated that he feels tension in the air and wants all members who are working on Accreditation to know that their work does not go unnoticed. He personally thanked the co-chairs and asked that they please keep Dr. Wetsman and himself informed of where they can help with other Standard committee members so they don’t feel that they have to take all remaining work upon themselves in order to bring non-functioning sub-Standard groups up to speed. Dr. Pierson and Dr. Wetsman will do what they can. They can only twist arms so far, but they would like to be more involved from this point forward in helping the co-chairs. On behalf of the District, Dr. Pierson thanked the co-chairs for their hard work and effort but reminded them, “It is going to require another long haul to the finish line.”

3. ALT Meetings – January through July 2014 ALT Meetings will be held from 1:00 p.m.-2:30 p.m. on January 30, February 27, April 3, April 24, May 22, June 26, and July 24, 2014. There will not be a meeting in March due to Spring Break. It was the consensus of the team to “set these dates in stone.” Members are encouraged to schedule around the dates. Renée will send out the meeting notices now to populate the calendar.

4. Readjusting the Timeline - Dr. Pierson spoke about the possibility of readjusting the timeline for completion of the first draft. He asked to take a realistic look at where we are with the Standards material. It is looking like February is not realistic for a first draft. Marie Eckstrom stated she has very little to pull from to write about, and it is not realistic that we can meet the February date. The report needs to be of quality, and we need to have a report that can be vetted, suggesting a first draft due date of March 21. Marie will have a better idea once more info is added. Standard IV is the only Standard that has uploaded any information to date. Marie has already met with Russell. Marie is going to have to make the rounds and sit with all the co-chairs to review the information submitted and to clarify questions, etc. This is going to take time. Each Standard will undoubtedly have to make revisions and upload them. Marie sees these meetings happening in February if not before.

It was decided the first draft of the self-evaluation report will be due March 21. ALT members can review it over a two week period before the April 3 ALT meeting, which is when we will discuss it. This leaves only six weeks until the end of the Academic year to hold campus forums and take the document through the vetting process by all constituent groups. It was noted that it took one month for the Mission statement alone to go through the vetting process.

Are all co-chairs going to work in January? Even with the best of intentions, realistically, January will not be a productive month. Some Standards co-chairs will work and some won’t. We are not planning to have an ALT meeting in January. Marie will be doing some writing and making notations of evidence. She wants to meet with the co-chairs to ensure there is no disconnect with what they are meaning and how she is writing. That will be a better use of her time and far more productive. We will still need to search for additional evidence and allow time for that, as well. It needs to match up the numbering etc. Just get the stuff in so it can be worked on.
Dr. Pierson asked Howard and Angie to revise the timeline as well as develop a vetting schedule for planning purposes. Dr. Wetsman asked between the first draft and the start of the vetting process that ALT should look at the report before it goes out for public consumption. It could be that we say that we need to emphasize these themes, etc., so we may not want to start the vetting process until the end of April for that reason. Diagrams also need to be standardized and the actual content should have a nice flow to it. We want to have the most final draft before going through the vetting process. When we do that, we may want to wait until early May. We do not end school until late May, so it may not be a problem. It will go to the Board at the same time, and the final version of the report will go to the Board in the Summer.

5. Moment with Marie - Marie asked that she would like to meet with the co-chairs after any revisions are made to each Standard narrative. The co-chairs and Marie can dialogue to ensure clarity of the document. Then, they can revise what was written and resubmit by uploading to the CORE. Marie had no further comments.

6. Responses to 2008 Self Evaluation – Howard/Angie – We discussed the recommendations from the previous self evaluation, our response, and follow-up reports. Angie put packets together for the co-chairs and in Dropbox via a spreadsheet. Templates have been uploaded. The matrix should help ensure that we cover the former recommendations and update the Commission on their status.

7. Detailed Reports from Standards Committees 1-4:

- **Standard I - Institutional Mission and Effectiveness—Gonzalez and Kummerman, co-chairs**

  Howard Kummerman reported that Standard I has all bullets populated for Standard and Sub-Standards. They will review them again before putting them into the template. They are in the final stages of the four I's. Estimated time to give to Marie will be two more weeks.

- **Standard II Student Learning Programs and Services – Smith, Koos, and Gee, tri-chairs**

  Karen Koos reported that the co-chairs need more time. Standard II Committee has been meeting on Fridays. They have things close but are waiting to tie up a few loose ends. Henry Gee is working on part B. Karen Koos and Kevin Smith are working every Friday on Accreditation work. They will hand off items to Marie in pieces.

- **Standard III Resources – Dreyfuss, Frala, and Leubben, tri-chairs**

  President Dreyfuss reported that she, Vice President Leubben, Jim, Gary, and Chedva have been meeting frequently. They are beginning to write and format into templates. They are targeting to have complete things by the end of January. The IT plan is the most complete of all the plans under Standard 3. They are waiting for the Facilities Master Plan.
that will be listed as a reference, but they do not have to wait on this to proceed. John Frala and Yolanda Emerson are working on the Human Resources segment.

- **Standard IV Leadership and Governance – Priest and Castañeda-Calleros. co-chairs**

Russell Castaneda-Calleros reported that Standard IV’s goal is to have items completed by the end of the semester. It was helpful to meet with Marie to clarify what is still needed to fill in the gaps. It would be helpful to hear from Marie when they are on track.

Kevin Smith reported that he has not decided whether or not to work in the month of January. He has given up a lot of time to work on Accreditation. Dr. Pierson reviewed the rationale behind connecting a faculty member and an administrator(s) as co-chairs of each Standard. None of us expected to be at this point at the end of the semester. We are working to resolve this issue. Dr. Pierson agreed to take into consideration the workload of co-chairs who are faculty members not assigned to work in January. He will also query faculty co-chairs to see what their plans are for the month of January. He asked everyone to be patient as we work through this concern, and he reminded the group, “We are all in one boat here with Accreditation.”

8. ACCJC Proposed Changes to Standards (for 2015) – Did not discuss due to lack of time.

9. Announcements – No announcements were made.

10. Next Meeting Date – January 30, 2014, Board Room