



**Rio Hondo Community College District  
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
MINUTES – June 14, 2013, 9:30 a.m.**

**Location:** Rio Hondo College Board Room  
3600 Workman Mill Road, Whittier CA 90601

**Members Present:** Ms. Madeline Shapiro, President  
Ms. Vicky Santana, Vice President (Arrived at 9:40 a.m.)  
Mr. Gary Mendez, Clerk  
Ms. Angela Acosta Salazar, Member

**Members Absent:** Ms. Norma Garcia, Member  
Ms. Caroline Carroll, Student Trustee

**Staff Members** Ms. Teresa Dreyfuss, Interim Superintendent/President  
Dr. Kenn Pierson, Vice President, Academic Affairs / Accreditation Co-Chair  
Mr. Henry Gee, Vice President, Student Services  
Dr. Vann Priest, Co-Chair, Standard IV  
Mr. Russell Castaneda-Calleros, Co-Chair, Standard IV  
Dr. Adam Wetsman, Accreditation Co-Chair  
  
Ms. Sandy Sandello (Recorder)

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**A. Call to Order**

Ms. Shapiro called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

**B. Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Henry Gee led the salute to the flag.

**C. Roll Call**

Ms. Garcia reported absent; Ms. Santana arrived at 9:40 a.m.

**D. Open Communication for Public Comment**

No comments made from the public.

## **II. STUDY SESSION**

- **Accreditation Standard IV** – A roundtable discussion was led by Russell Castaneda-Calleros and Dr. Vann Priest, Accreditation Standard IV Co-chairs. The following topics were addressed (agenda attached):
  - **Reviewed Standard IV Language from the Guide to Evaluation Institutions** - The co-chairs referred to the Guide to Evaluation of Institutions publication to focus on specific areas of Standard IV so that all parties could review some key phrases together. It was shared with the Board that the focus for the 6/14 study session was on a few high priority items that related to Standard IV.B., given that these high priority items squarely fall on the shoulders of the Board. One board member inquired if a future study session could be devoted to Standard IV.A given the need to clarify the institution's decision making and planning process and everyone's role in these ongoing processes. Co-chairs responded affirmatively and added that some of IV.A. will be addressed in the upcoming update of the Governance Manual.
  - **Discussed the Evaluation of the CEO Selection Process** - Co-chairs referred to the portion of Standard IV that refers to the evaluation of CEO selection process and referenced AP 2431 which was created in response to the recommendation given by the visiting team in 2008. After some discussion, the Supt/President, in conjunction with Office of Institutional Research & Planning, will create a survey instrument that would be sent to members of the CEO Selection Committee. The Co-Chairs discussed and scheduled a tentative timeframe to stay on target. The proposed timeframe of: 1) deployment in late July; 2) collection of responses by mid- August; 3) analysis of data before end of August; 4) sharing the data with Board, and report out from the Board to the community by the September board meeting was accepted. From the survey results and the reporting out, a board member suggested that a "set of guidelines" for future boards to consider \*(including any new lessons learned) "be created and shared to guide future boards before starting the CEO selection processes. Also, the survey results will determine whether or not AP 2431 needs to be fine-tuned at all.
  - **Reports of other colleges that have had governance problems** - Co-chairs distributed a chart which includes the governance related recommendations given to eleven different colleges across the state of California. A board member asked why and how particular recommendations related to Rio Hondo College and the co-chairs responded by offering a few examples of why and how they did relate. This discussion quickly led to a discussion of the Board's proper role in the accreditation process which overlaps with the next section on the agenda.
  - **Appropriate Board involvement in the Accreditation Process** - Co-chairs led a discussion for what would be appropriate involvement for the Board and referred to the portion of Standard IV that refers to the Board's involvement in the accreditation process. A discussion took place on whether or not an individual board member should sit on the Standard IV committee. It was clear that there were rational in favor and against offered by the co-chairs, Accreditation Leadership Team (ALT) co-chairs, and the trustees. After extensive discussion, it was mentioned that the best resolution possible was "parallel engagement" (at least for the time being) which means that the board will be engaged in compiling evidence for Standard IV while

the members of the Standard IV committee will concurrently be engaged in compiling evidence and offering bullet pointed-language that would indicate whether standard elements are being met, partially met, or unmet.

There were a few other takeaways from this discussion. It was mentioned that it might be a good idea to have Board President Shapiro along with President Dreyfuss to contact ACCJC to see what the official word is on whether or not a board member should sit on the Standard IV committee. Co-chairs added that no one disputes whether or not the Board should be involved in Standard IV, but the operative question was how the Board was engaged in the process. One of the co-chairs cited that one College was dinged for merely informing, but not involving the Board sufficiently in the accreditation process.

The Board asked for two things. First, the Board asked that the ALT Chair reports given at each regular board meeting include a little more detail regarding questions raised, challenges faced, and progress made with the accreditation self-study process in general. Second, the Board asked for the Standard IV Co-chairs provide a little more detail as to what concerns are raised and what progress has been made at the Standard IV committee meetings. In particular, the Board is eager to learn if there are any areas in Standard IV where the College or the Board is not meeting a particular standard element. The overarching message here is that the Board would rather know sooner than later if there are serious deficiencies related to Standard IV that need to be addressed.

- **The Board Code of Ethics statement** - The Board reviewed BP 2715 which contains the Board's current ethics statement. It was agreed that the Board should review the ethics statement at least annually. One suggestion was to add a footnote that the ethics statement was "reauthorized on a certain calendar date". Another suggestion was to add a brief reference to the type of censure used by the board in case of a violation of the code- which in this case would be the censure associated with Robert's Rules of Order - the Board's chosen method of handling the Board's official business.
- **Ongoing Board Professional Development – Cohesive Strategy** - The Co-chairs distributed a brief summary of board development-related activities including workshops, conferences, and seminars attended during the 2012-13 year. A few board members offered suggested edits to the summary. While this list served as a good starting point, the co-chairs reminded the Board that the standard language makes reference to a board development "program" that suggests strategic thought is given to the type of training and development that is chosen by the Board. It was asked if there is a BP on board development, and the response was "yes".

One board member in particular referred to a model referenced at a recent CCLC conference where a suggested "program" of development was recommended to the Board. This "program" would make particular types of training available to board members at certain times of the year so that all board members could receive the same training and eventually all be on the same page in terms of professional development.

The clerk of the board reminded trustees to renew their commitment to mentioning board development activities during their "around the horn" comments at the end of their regular board meetings. Furthermore, trustees were invited to share any workshop programs, brochures, or flyers to the clerk so specific training could be referenced. In this way, all board development activities can be properly documented as evidence for accreditation purposes.

- **Board Goals** – The Board reviewed the existing goals and will discuss future goals at their next scheduled special Board Study Session / Retreat.
- **Board Self-Evaluation** – The Board sub-committee, Trustee Acosta-Salazar and Trustee Santana reviewed the proposed self-evaluation instrument which had been compiled by various instruments used through the last few years. After discussing with the Board, several edits were made. Trustee Acosta-Salazar will revise the document to include the edits and forward to the Board to complete their evaluations. The tabulated evaluation responses will be discussed at the Board Retreat. In addition, the Board will discuss Board Roles and Responsibility as well as Board Protocol at a future study session.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Shapiro adjourned the meeting at 1:12 p.m. and announced that the date of Next Regular Meeting would be held on Wednesday, July 10, 2013, 6:00 p.m. (Rio Hondo College, Board Room, 3600 Workman Mill Road, Whittier)



## **Proposed Agenda with Action Items**

**for Special 6/14 Board Meeting on Accreditation**

### **I. Review Standard IV Language from Guide to Evaluating Institutions**

- Highlight key parts of Standard IV relevant for today
- Have a brief discussion and address any questions on Standard IV Language

### **II. Discuss Evaluation of CEO Selection Process**

- Refer to part of Standard IV that mentions CEO Selection Process
- Reference and review AP 2431
- Attach a timeframe
- Decide on assessment instrument/format: such as survey or focus group discussion and input.
- Place a deadline (September board meeting?)

### **III. Reports of Other Colleges That Have Had Governance Problems**

- Distribute and review a chart which summarizes other colleges and the types of governance-related problems and ways to address them

### **IV. Appropriate Board Involvement in the Accreditation Process**

- How does the Board envision appropriate participation in the institutional self-evaluation and planning efforts?
- Refer to BP 3200

### **V. Board Code Of Ethics**

- How often does the Board revisit the Code to see if it needs to be updated?
- How does the Board address consequences for behavior that violates the code?
- Refer to lessons learned with other colleges as needed

### **VI. Ongoing Board Professional Development - Cohesive Strategy**

- Moving beyond laundry list to strategic approach
- 

*Other topics to be discussed later in the day:*

#### **Board Goals and Objectives (covering the 2013-14 year)**

#### **Board Self Evaluation (covering the 2012-13 year)**

- Refer to part of Standard IV that mentions self evaluation
- Subcommittee members discuss assessment instrument
- Agree to a timeframe (including the 12-13 AND 13-14 evaluations)
- Place a deadline on 12-13 evaluation (October board meeting?)
- Schedule 2013-14 evaluation so it is completed on time next year