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

Members Present: Ms. Norma Edith García, President
Ms. Vicky Santana, Vice President
Ms. Madeline Shapiro, Clerk
Mr. Gary Mendez, Member
Ms. Angela Acosta Salazar, Member

Mr. Marcus Gomez, Student Trustee

Members Absent: None

Staff Members: Ms. Teresa Dreyfuss, Interim Superintendent/President
Dr. Kenn Pierson, Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs
Ms. Lisa Sandoval, representing CSEA President
Ms. Marie Eckstrom, Representing Academic Senate
Mr. Colin Young, RHCFA President
Ms. Sandy Sandello (Recorder)

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Call to Order

Ms. Garcia called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

Ms. Madeline Shapiro led the salute to the flag.

C. Roll Call

All present.

D. Open Communication for Public Comment

Lisa Sandoval, representing CSEA, expressed concerns regarding layoffs, transfers and reductions of the classified personnel listed on the consent agenda for August 8. She indicated that as of that afternoon, CSEA and the District agreed to disagree on the matter.

John Frala, representing the Senate, addressed the Board on AP 2431, CEO Selection Process.
E. **Study Session**  
**Discussion on the Budget**

- **Student Success Task Force** - Vice President Gee reviewed the Student Success Task Force Report and the District’s response to the recommendations. In addition, he reviewed Rio Hondo’s priority registration. Concern was expressed by Trustee Mendez in regards to the El Monte Pledge serving solely one district when there are other under-represented schools within the Whittier Union High School District. He also expressed his concern that priority registration for the El Monte Pledge did not have a sunset date. The response was that this is a pilot program and the success rate would be evaluated to determine whether it will be offered to other districts.

**Presidential Search Process**

- **Review RFP** – The Board reviewed the proposed RFP included in the Board agenda, and made the following suggestions: include gender neutral, diversity, and that the Board President represents the Board as the liaison to the search firm. It was agreed to move forward with the RFP as revised.

A committee of three, which includes the Superintendent/President, will prepare a matrix/analysis of the received proposals and provide the Board with a recommendation of up to five firms.

The Board President reviews the matrix and provides a recommendation of up to five firms to the Board at the September Board Meeting which will be allowed the opportunity to speak to the constituent groups at a forum.

- **Criteria and Scope** – Two previous search brochures were shared with the Board. The Board suggested that revisions be made to the brochure and it be reviewed at the August 13th special meeting along with Board priorities.

- **Current and Proposed Administrative Procedure 2431, CEO Selection Process** – Dr. Kenn Pierson, Interim VP Academic Affairs, reviewed a chronological report of history involving the revision of AP 2431. (See attached)

- **Composition of Hiring Committee** - After much discussion, the Board decided to establish a sub-committee which would consist of Board President Garcia and Gary Mendez, facilitated by Interim President Dreyfuss, to determine the composition of the hiring committee and to ensure that the composition is proportionate and fair. A study will be conducted polling other college’s committee compositions. Interim President Dreyfuss will consult with the constituent groups as to the number of committee composition.
- Review Accreditation Evaluation Report (October, 2008) and Follow-up Report (September, 2009) – The Board reviewed the Accreditation Evaluation Report for 2008 and Follow-up Report for 2009 (Recommendation 6: Governance) where it states “the Board review and, if necessary, revise the Presidential hiring process established in 2002 to prevent potential disagreements with future presidential search committees.”

II. CLOSED SESSION

Trustee Garcia recessed the meeting to closed session at 7:50 p.m. and reported out the following action:

216. It was moved by Ms. Shapiro, seconded by Ms. Santana and carried unanimously that the Board of Trustees approve the Action Plan presented and discussed in regards to the Administration Determination.

- Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 59328-59338: Administrative Determination implementation from Discrimination Complaint

Pursuant to Section 54957
- PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE / DISMISSAL / RELEASE

III. ADJOURNMENT

Date of Next Regular Meeting: Wednesday, August 8, 2012, 6:00 p.m. (Rio Hondo College, Board Room, 3600 Workman Mill Road, Whittier)

Date of Next Special Meeting, Monday, August 13, 2012, 6:30 p.m. (Rio Hondo College)
Student Success Task Force Recommendations

Jan. 2012

“If we end up being successful in implementing these initiatives and discover we have done that by eliminating the least prepared and most at risk student, we will have failed. Student success can only be measured by all students being raised up to the level of success these recommendations aspire to”. (Manuel Baca – panel discussion RHC FLEX Day January 27, 2012)

1. Increase College and Career Readiness

1.1. Community Colleges will collaborate with K-12 education to jointly develop new common standards for college and career readiness that are aligned with high school exit standards.

- Ongoing partnerships currently in place (El Monte College Pledge, Early College Academy, Whittier Area Youth Orchestra, HS Outreach; RHC courses on high school campuses)
- Cal PASS Professional Learning Councils (PLC’s) in Math & Language Arts
- Expository Reading & Composition Writing (ERCW) from the CSU system implemented in the El Monte Union HSD
- ** Tech Prep articulation agreements with local high schools

RHC Response: We are comfortable with this recommendation and are already in compliance in multiple areas

2. Strengthen Support for Entering Students

2.1. Develop and implement common centralized diagnostic assessments.

- RHC has common assessments in place – a more state-centralized process depends on Chancellor’s Office
- Assessment Test Preparation – Learning Assistance Center assessments in place – we are currently evaluating these assessments by conducting pre and post test results

2.2. Require students to participate in diagnostic assessment, orientation and the development of an educational plan.

- Educational plan already tied to Pell and federal Financial Aid (not BOG)
- Mandatory assessment/orientation in place for all entering new non-exempt students; plans to expand this to all incoming students

2.3 Develop and use centralized technology applications to better guide students in educational process

- In progress and planned for implementation - New website, online schedule, sample ed plans and degree/certificate pathways

2.4 Require students showing a lack of college readiness to participate in support resources.
• We do not require students to participate in our resources, but the following programs are available to provide support for college readiness: LAC, Gateway Tutoring, Springboard, Summer Bridge, First Year Experience, FastTrack Learning Communities

2.5 Encourage students to declare a program of study upon admission, intervene if a declaration is not made by the end of their second term, and require declaration by the end their third term in order to maintain enrollment priority.

• Educational plans in place for students receiving financial aid, EOPS, DSPS, and TRIO students

RHC Response: We support much of this recommendation but recommend that the criteria for declaring an program of study be changed from term requirements to units.

3. Incentivize Successful Student Behaviors

3.1 The Community Colleges will adopt system-wide enrollment priorities that: (1) reflect the core mission of transfer, career technical education and basic skills development; (2) encourage students to identify their educational objective and follow a prescribed path most likely to lead to success; (3) ensure access and the opportunity for success for new students; and (4) incentivize students to make progress toward their educational goal.

• In progress – student pathways for transfer, CTE, basic skills
• In progress – IGETC and block scheduling to assist students complete faster
• Utilization of ESS software for enrollment management in line with these goals
• Review of enrollment priorities once this recommendation is quantified

3.2. Require students receiving Board of Governors (BOG) Fee Waivers to meet various conditions and requirements, as specified below: (1) Require students receiving a BOG Fee Waiver to identify a degree, certificate, transfer, or career advancement goal; (2) Require students to meet institutional satisfactory progress standards to be eligible for the fee waiver renewal; (3) Limit the number of units covered under a BOG Fee Waiver to 110 units.

• Nothing in progress – recommendation requires change in Title V

3.3. Provide students the opportunity to consider attending full time.

• Student pathways and block scheduling (see 3.1) will assist in helping students take more units while working
• Go Rio incentive for full-time enrollment

3.4. Require students to begin addressing Basic Skills deficiencies in their first year.

• We encourage students with basic skills needs to seek assistance through the following model programs, all of which are in early stages so no concrete data is yet available to assess their success: Fast Track Learning Communities, Jump Start, Summer Bridge, Gateway Tutoring Program
RHC response: All of the above recommendations require substantial funding and Title V revisions. They also do not address the working student and how to provide assistance for fulltime educational opportunities. Cannot implement at this time without state assistance and mandate.

4. **Align Course Offering to Meet Student Needs**

4.1. Highest priority for course offerings shall be given to credit and noncredit courses that advance students’ academic progress in the areas of basic skills, ESL, CTE, degree and certificate attainment, and transfer, in the context of labor market and economic development needs of the community.

- RHC has labor market data in place for all certificate programs, IGETC focus to ensure student degree completion, and plans to define our academic priorities when scheduling courses – these objectives will drive our enrollment strategies

RHC response: We are already prioritizing course selection based on the Chancellors directive of CTE, basic skills and transfer function.

5. **Improve the Education of Basic Skills Students**

5.1. Support the development of alternatives to traditional basic skills curriculum and incentivize colleges to take to scale successful model programs for delivering basic skills instruction.

- In progress - Summer Bridge, Math pilot program, ESL pathways, Fast Track Learning Communities

5.2. The state should develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing basic skills education in California that results in a system that provides all adults with the access to basic skills courses in mathematics and English. In addition, the state should develop a comparable strategy for addressing the needs of adults for courses in English as a second language (ESL.)

- This needs to be addressed at the state level before implementation

RHC response: Although RHC supports the recommendation, implementation relies on significant funding, guidance and change at the state-wide level.

6. **Revitalize and Re-Envision Professional Development**

6.1. Create a continuum of strategic professional development opportunities, for all faculty, staff, and administrators to be better prepared to respond to the evolving student needs and measures of student success.

- In progress - Flex Day initiatives

- In progress - Title V initiatives including a classroom development training

6.2. Direct professional development resources toward improving basic skills instruction and support services.

- Title V initiatives
• Basic Skills Initiative

RHC response: We see an opportunity to evaluate our current staff development opportunities.

7. Enable Efficient Statewide Leadership & Increase Coordination Among Colleges

7.1. Develop and support a strong community college system office with commensurate authority, appropriate staffing, and adequate resources to provide leadership, oversight, technical assistance and dissemination of best practices. Further, the state should grant the Community College Chancellor’s Office the authority to implement policy, consistent with state law.

7.2 In collaboration with the Chancellor’s Office, districts and colleges will identify specific goals for student success and report their progress towards meeting these goals in a public and transparent manner (consistent with Recommendation 7.3).

• In progress – use of current AARC and ESS Data to inform academic and service offerings

7.3 Implement a student success scorecard

7.4 The state of California should develop and support a longitudinal student record system to monitor student progress from elementary through postsecondary education and into the workplace.

• Possible CAL PASS collaboration – RHC currently participates in this program

RHC response: This recommendation resides mainly in the Chancellor’s Office and requires more guidance before implementation.

8. Align Resources with Student Success Recommendations

8.1. Encourage categorical program streamlining and cooperation.
8.2. Invest in the new Student Support Initiative.
8.3. Encourage innovation and flexibility in the delivery of basic skills instruction

• Fast Track Learning Communities; Math modules pilot program, Summer Bridge

RHC response: This recommendation awaits guidance from the state prior to implementation.

9. A Review of Outcomes-Based Funding

Do not implement outcome-based funding at this time
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REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

FOR

SELECTION OF AN EXECUTIVE SEARCH FIRM

1. INTRODUCTION
   1.1 PURPOSE OF REQUEST

   Rio Hondo Community College District is initiating a Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit proposals from qualified executive search firms interested in serving as Consultant to the Board of Trustees in the recruitment and hiring for the Superintendent/President of Rio Hondo Community College District.

1.2 RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

   The Rio Hondo Community College District was established by election in October 1960 and encompasses a 65.6 square-mile area which includes the cities of Whittier, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, South El Monte and portions of Norwalk, La Mirada, Downey, La Puente, Industry, some unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, and a portion of the City of El Monte south and east of the Rio Hondo River.

2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PROPOSAL
   2.1 DEFINITIONS

   2.1.1 Agency – Any department, commission, council, board, office, bureau, committee, institution, agency, government, corporation, or other establishment of the executive branch of this state authorized to participate in any contract resulting for this RFP.

   2.1.2 Board – The Board of Trustees for the Rio Hondo Community College District.

   • Ms. Norma Edith Garcia, President
   • Ms. Vicky Santana, Vice President
   • Ms. Madeline Shapiro, Clerk
   • Ms. Angela Acosta-Salazar, Member
   • Mr. Gary Mendez, Member

   • Marcus Gomez, Student Trustee
2.1.3 Contractor – Any person having a contract with a governmental body.

2.1.4 Discussions – For the purpose of this RFP presentation, a formal structured means of conducting written or oral communications/presentations with responsible Proposers who submit proposals in response to this RFP.

2.1.5 May – The term “may” denotes an advisory or permissible action.

2.1.6 Must and/or Will – The terms “must” and “will” denote mandatory requirements.

2.1.7 Proposer – A firm or individual who responds to an RFP.

2.1.8 Search Committee – A group appointed by the Board of Trustees.

2.1.9 Shall – The term “shall” denotes mandatory requirements.

2.1.10 Should – The term “should” denotes a desirable, advisory, or permissible action.

2.1.11 State – The State of California.

2.1.12 District – Rio Hondo Community College District.

2.2 SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>RFP is advertised in various publications as well as being posted on the RHCCD Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Pre-Proposal Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>Deadline for Receipt of Proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This RFP is available in its entirety in electronic form at the RHCCD website [http://www.riohondo.edu/facilities/RFQ/index.htm](http://www.riohondo.edu/facilities/RFQ/index.htm) (reference RFP 2017). It can also be obtained by submitting a written request to the attention of the Director, Contract Management and Vendor Services, Rio Hondo Community College District, at the address reflected on the cover page.

Each proposer shall submit one (1) signed original response. Five (5) additional copies of the proposal should be provided. Response and copies
should be forwarded to the Director, Contract Management and Vendor Services, Rio Hondo Community College District, at the address reflected on the cover page. Under no circumstances will faxed or emailed proposals be accepted.

NOTE: Rio Hondo Community College District reserves the right to deviate from the dates above.

2.3 ACCEPTANCE

2.3.1 PROPOSALS SHALL NOT BE OPENED PUBLICLY. ONLY THE NAMES OF PROPOSERS SUBMITTING PROPOSALS SHALL BE IDENTIFIED ALOUD. PRICES SHALL NOT BE READ.

2.3.2 The proposer shall agree to a minimum of 120 calendar day acceptance period from the date of public opening.

2.3.3 Upon review and approval of the evaluation committee’s recommendation for award, Rio Hondo Community College District will issue a “Notice of Intent to Award” letter to the apparent successful Proposer. The college will provide a notice to all unsuccessful Proposers as to the outcome of the evaluation process.

2.3.4 The Rio Hondo Community College District does not provide a debriefing to unsuccessful proposers.

2.4 AWARD OF CONTRACT

2.4.1 The Contract will be awarded to the most responsible and responsive proposer whose proposal, confirming the Request, will be the most advantageous to the District for an initial contract period of one (1) year. The basis of award will be determined by evaluation of Items 1 through 3 as listed in paragraph 2.6 Evaluation of Proposals section with a recommendation of award to the highest scoring proposer.

2.4.2 The District reserves the right to enter into an Agreement without further discussion of the proposal submitted based on the initial offers received, published data in support of experience, financial or performance capability will be evaluated if such data reflects a current position and such data is submitted as a part of the response to the Request for Proposal.

2.4.3 The District reserves the right to reject any or all proposals or any part of the proposal and to waive informality and minor irregularities in the proposals received.
2.4.4  The RFP, its addendums, and the proposal of the selected Contractor will become part of any contract initiated by the District.

2.4.5  In no event shall a proposer submit its own standard contract terms and conditions as a response to this RFP. The proposer should address the specific language in the sample contract and submit with their proposal any exceptions or exact contract deviations that their firm wishes to negotiate. The terms for both of these documents may be negotiated as part of the negotiation process with the exception of contract provisions that are nonnegotiable.

2.4.6  A formal Contract will be signed by the successful proposer and Rio Hondo Community College District to perform this service.

2.4.7  The District reserves the right to enter into discussions with any one or all of the proposers after proposals have been initially reviewed. Such responses shall be subject to all provisions, terms and conditions as set forth in the Request for Proposal, unless otherwise modified.

2.4.8  If the contract negotiation period exceeds thirty (30) days or if the selected Proposer fails to sign contract within seven (7) calendar days of delivery of it, the District may elect to cancel the award and award the contract to the next highest ranked Proposer.

2.4.9  Award shall be made to the Proposer whose proposal, conforming to the RFP will be the most advantageous to the District with the highest points, considering price and other factors.

2.4.10  The District intends to award contract to a single proposer.

2.5  PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

2.5.1  The proposer should set forth, in detail, the technical and management plans by which he intends to meet each of the requirements contained in Section 2.7, Scope of Services. The proposer, in his technical and management plan, should present the information necessary for the District’s evaluation of his technical and management qualifications. The proposal will be evaluated in light of the material and the substantiating evidence presented in the proposal, not on the basis of what may be inferred.

2.5.2  Table of Contents: Proposals should include a paginated table of contents to facilitate locating the information included.

2.5.3  Technical Discussion: This section should be presented in as much detail as practical and include the following;
2.5.3 Scope of Services

2.5.3.1 The proposer should prepare a scope of services which specifically responds (in order listed) to each item specified in Section 2.7. This section should present a detailed statement of the methodology to be utilized to carry out each task and a precise description of the deliverables to be received by the District as end products of the services rendered.

2.5.3.2 Project Organization and Management: This subsection should include the project team proposed for this work (identification of persons assigned to individual tasks reference Paragraphs 2.6 & 3.2).

2.5.4 Explanation of any additional tasks to be performed which are deemed necessary by the proposer for successful project completion; explanation of deviations from and/or deletion of any task listed in Section 2.7.

2.5.5 Personnel Qualifications: This subsection should contain a list of personnel to be used on this project and their qualifications. Resumes, including education, background, accomplishments and any other pertinent information, should be included for each of the key personnel to be assigned for direct work on the project. The proposer should provide three references from higher education clients for which this person(s) has conducted and executive search within the last two years. The proposer should specify a contact person and a telephone number at which a contact person can be reached.

2.5.6 Relevant Company Experience: This subsection should include the following:

2.5.6.1 Your firm’s experience in recruiting senior administrators in higher education.

2.5.6.2 Three references from higher education clients that have used your firm to conduct an executive search within the last two (2) years. Specify a contact person and a telephone number at which the contact person can be reached.

2.5.6.3 Description of a typical search conducted by your firm including how many contacts your firm makes. From where do the selected candidates typically come? What happens if the search is not completed after one round of candidates? When and how can the District terminate the search? What happens if the person recruited leaves or is fired?
2.5.6.4 Your firm’s success ratio in filling search assignments, and your firm’s average time to complete assignments.

2.5.7 Cost Proposal: The proposer shall provide a flat fixed fee for the services provided.

2.5.7.1 This fee shall include all costs or expenses necessary to provide the services outlined in this Request for Proposal including travel. Travel shall be identified for each element of the scope of service (items A-H under 2.7 Scope of Services).

2.5.7.2 For evaluation purposes, the flat fixed fee will be used to calculate the total cost of conducting the search. The following formula will be used to score cost:

\[ \text{LPC/PC} \times 25 = \text{PCS} \]

Where PCS = Proposer’s Cost Score
LPC = Lowest Proposed Cost of all Proposers
PC = Proposer’s Cost

2.6 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

2.6.1 The proposal will be reviewed individually against the RFP by District Staff Members through an evaluation committee. Scores will be assigned.

2.6.2 A contract will be awarded on the basis of which proposal the District deems best suited to fulfill the requirements of the RFP. The District also reserves the right not to make an award if it is deemed that no single proposal fully meets the requirements of this RFP. The District requests the consultant provide seasoned senior personnel with a minimum 1-year experience to conduct the search.

2.6.3 The District will be the sole judge as to the acceptability, for our purposes, of any and all proposals. Proposals will be evaluated according to the following evaluation criteria:

2.6.3.1 Experience of proposer’s firm in recruiting at similar levels/firm’s overall experience in recruiting (30-points) and;

2.6.3.2 Qualifications of the specific personnel designated by the proposer to conduct the search (25-points) and;

2.6.3.3 Quality of the proposer’s performance as assessed by references (20-points); and
2.6.3.4 Total Cost of conducting the executive search (25-points).

2.7 SCOPE OF SERVICES
The scope of the work requested for the search for a Superintendent/President of Rio Hondo Community College District is as follows:

2.7.1 Needs Assessment – Working in partnership with the Board President and the Search Committee, the Contractor will determine the required set of skills and competencies, define the required experience and other characteristics necessary to meet the needs of the campus.

2.7.1.1 Support and assist, through the Board President and the Search Committee throughout all phases of the search and selection process.

2.7.1.2 Support and assist in the development and advertisement of the position announcement/brochures, including mailing of position announcement/brochures to prospective candidates.

2.7.1.3 Conduct outreach and recruitment beyond the scope and standard District practice.

2.7.1.4 Conduct confidential personal recruitment when needed.

2.7.1.5 Provide guidance and direction to the governing board during interviews, open forums, and site visits, as required.

2.7.1.6 Finalize a process with the Search Committee and Board President for interviews of the candidates during the first and second interviews.

2.7.1.7 Conduct in-depth reference checks of finalist candidates.

2.7.1.8 Assist and provide information to the Board of Trustees with the final selection and negotiations with the selected candidate as directed by the Board President.

2.7.1.9 Contractor shall be required to attend a minimum of three Board Meetings.

2.8 Contractor Requirements/Responsibilities:

2.7.2 Progress reports shall be submitted with each invoice for payment describing the status of progress of the Contractor’s Performance. The Contractor shall
submit a final summary report with the final invoice for payment within thirty (30) days following expiration of the contract.

2.7.3 Time Extensions – Request for time extensions to the contract completion date must be made in writing with adequate justification no less than forty-five (45) days prior to the end of the contract. Requested time extensions are not effective until approved in writing by the District.

2.7.4 Payment – Payment for work performed under this contract will not exceed the agreed upon contract amount. Payment will be made based on documented completion of the elements (items A-I under paragraph 2.7 Scope of Services) of the scope of services, after approval by the District, and shall be made with approximately thirty (30) days of receipt of each invoice submitted by the Contracting Party and upon approval by the District.

2.7.5 Available – Such material as pertain to this project are available for review, upon request of the District and may be used in this project, but may not take the place of items that the Contractor is required to develop.

2.7.6 Ownership of Documents – Upon completion or termination of the contract, all final documents prepared by Contractor for the District in connection with this work shall be the property of the District. Contractor’s personnel and administrative files shall remain the property of the Contractor. No other person shall have a property interest therein. At any time during the contract period, the District shall have the right to require Contractor to furnish copies of any or all data and all documents, notes and files collected or prepared by the Contractor specifically in connection with this contract.

2.7.7 Hold Harmless Indemnification – The selected contractor shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the District, its officers, agents, employees and representatives, from and against any and all costs and expenses, claims, losses, liabilities, injuries, or damages, demands and action including payment of reasonable attorney’s fees arising out of or resulting from activities performed with respect to this contract.

2.7.8 Public Liability Insurance – Contractor shall take out and maintain during the life of this contract, public liability insurance in an amount not less than $1,000,000.00 (one million dollars) for injuries including accidental death, to any one person, and subject to the same limit for each person in an amount not less than $1,000,000.00 (one million dollars) on account of one accident, and property damage insurance in an amount not less than $250,000.00 (two hundred fifty thousand dollars). An insurance certificate or a signed copy of contractor’s insurance will be provided to the District.
## Chronology

### Administrative Procedure 2431, CEO Selection Process (Ver. 1.0 - July 30, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Document</th>
<th>Details of Event or Document</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2006 - Mar. 15 | BP 2431 - BOT adoption | The BOT adopted current Board Policy 2431, CEO Selection, which states:  
  - "In the case of a CEO vacancy, the Board shall establish a search process to fill the vacancy. The process shall be fair and open and comply with relevant regulations." | BP 2431 document                                 |
| 2006 - Oct. 18 | CEO Search Process - BOT review & approval | The BOT developed a search process for Superintendent/President which was used during the selection process that led to the hiring of President Martínez and to the current AP 2431.  
  - The BOT unanimously approved the composition of the hiring committee, totaling 20, as follows:  
    - 7 Representatives from the Academic Senate  
    - 4 Representatives from CSEA  
    - 4 Representatives from Management/Confidential  
    - 3 Representatives from Associated Student Body (ASB)  
    - 2 Representatives from the Community | BOT minutes from Oct. 18, 2006 regular meeting |
| 2009 - Sept. 15 | AP 2431 - PFC review & formation of ad hoc committee | PFC reviewed AP 2431 at their regular meeting:  
  - PFC discussed how AP 2431 would be part of the Accreditation Follow-up Report response to Recommendation 6 on Governance, related to Standard IV—specifically Recommendation 6c that urged the BOT to "review and, if necessary, revise the Presidential hiring process ... to prevent potential disagreements with future Presidential search committees."  
  - PFC formed an ad hoc committee "to make further suggestions" for revising the presidential hiring process. Ad hoc committee members included: Russell Castañeda-Colleros, Walter Jones, Adam Wattsman, Hannah Pastrano, and Sheila Lynch. Mike Javanmard arranged and attended meetings as Academic Senate President. Sandra Rivera substituted for Hannah Pastrano.  
  - PFC minutes note: "There was consensus for the ad hoc committee to review, edit, and forward their consensus recommendation to the President on behalf of PFC." | PFC minutes from Sept. 15, 2009  
  Accreditation Follow-up Report, submitted Oct. 15, 2009 |
| 2009 - Sept. | AP 2431 - Ad hoc committee work | The ad hoc committee suggested language revisions to AP 2431 but recommended the same hiring committee composition used during the last presidential hiring process, totaling 20 members:  
  - Faculty: 7  
  - Classified: 4  
  - Management/Confidential: 4  
  - ASB President/Representative: 3  
  - Community Representatives: 2 | AP 2431 draft documents |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2009 – Oct. 3 | AP 2431 – BOT review       | As part of a Saturday Study Session/Board Retreat, the BOT thanked the ad hoc committee for their hard work and reviewed AP 2431 “as it was written, but had two changes to bring up to the members of the ad hoc committee”:
  - Article XIII, Option 2 – A board member suggested changing “Directly interview additional finalists from the candidate pool” to “Directly interview additional candidates from the candidate pool” to distinguish who exactly the Board can pull.
  - Article VIII – The BOT discussed elimination of the actual hiring committee composition numbers (7,4,3,2) and a rephrasing that would read, “The current composition of the search committee consists of representatives from the faculty, classified employees, management/confidential, ASB, and the community” without mentioning any specific numbers of representatives from each constituency group. Minutes note: “The rationale here is that it would give future trustees the flexibility to decide on numbers without being unnecessarily constrained by past practice.” |
| 2009 – Oct. 3, Oct. 13 | AP 2431 – Emails to ad hoc committee | Chair Russell Castañeda-Calleros emailed ad hoc committee members, informing them of the BOT’s proposed changes, suggesting compromise, and advocating for continued work on AP 2431 “so we could engage further in the future (at another PFC ad hoc committee meeting) if need be so that all parties involved are at least a little more comfortable with the final language of AP 2431.”
  - Ad hoc members recall having difficulty reaching consensus at the time but desired to move forward with the accreditation approval process and understood further discussion on AP 2431 would continue (Quintero, Javanmard, Jones, Wetsman, Castañeda-Calleros, Lynch).
  - Castañeda-Calleros recalls agreement that this was “the latest (NOT final) version of AP 2431.” |
| 2009 – Oct. 6 | AP 2431 – PFC update       | Accreditation Response Team (ART) members Katie O’Brien & JoAnna Downey reported to PFC that:
  - “Although there are a couple of issues still being discussed between the ad hoc and the Board, AP 2431 will be submitted in its current form but there will be an explanation under ‘Additional Plans’ in the Follow-up Report.”
  - The “Additional Plans” section states “the language [of AP 2431] reflects the latest version to date but the final version has not been officially adopted and approved.” |
| 2009 – Oct. 15 | Accreditation Follow-up Report – Submission to ACCJC/WASC | The Accreditation Follow-up Report was submitted to ACCJC, including the draft of “a revised administrative procedure”:
  - Seventeen articles outlined the new presidential hiring process.
  - The total composition of the hiring committee was not specified, simply listed as:
    - Faculty
    - Classified
    - Management/Confidential
    - ASB President/Representative
    - Community Representatives |
| 2009 – Oct. 20 | AP 2431 – Follow-up email  | President’s secretary emailed Administrative Council and division secretaries, informing them that on Oct. 3, 2009, the BOT “reviewed and received the following Administrative Procedures which are now being implemented,” including AP 2431 – CEO Selection. |
I. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the hiring of the Superintendent/President. The Board will establish the calendar and approve the structure of the presidential hiring process. The Board of Trustees will communicate to all those that participate in the selection process to conduct themselves in the highest ethical standards throughout the entire selection process (Source: Board).

II. The Board of Trustees will establish a selection process for the consultant that ensures the consultant selected reflects the Board's expectations and values.

III. The Board of Trustees will craft and express a clear statement on the role of the consultant and ensure that this role is clearly communicated to all stakeholders so that this role is clearly understood by all (Source: Board/ART).

IV. The Board of Trustees will clearly communicate the Board's expectations and values with respect to the hiring process to the members of the search committee before the hiring process begins (Source: Board). All members of the search committee will be provided training prior to the selection process on how to best reach consensus (Source: PFC Ad-Hoc Committee).

V. The Board of Trustees or designee oversees the development of the Presidential Search Brochure and approves its content.

VI. The Board of Trustees or designee approves all advertising for the presidential position.

VII. The Board of Trustees determines and approves the composition of the search committee and (Source: PFC Ad Hoc Committee) the number of representatives from each constituent group. The search consultant will serve as a non-voting co-chair (Source: Superintendent/President) of the committee.

VIII. The current (Source: PFC Ad Hoc Committee) composition of the search committee, which is merely a description of what has been used in the past and can be changed by the Board in the future (Source: Board 10/3), is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Confidential</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB President/Representative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are not committee members, but serve specific functions in the selection process: (Source: PFC Ad Hoc Committee)
The Human Resources Officer or designee shall review the composition of the applicant pool to determine if legal requirements relating to Title V, the District's Equal Opportunity Plan, and non-discrimination have been met. (Source: Superintendent/President)

An EEO Monitor who is appointed by the Equal Employment/Staff Diversity Officer.

IX. Persons serving on the search committee participate in both the application review and search committee interview phases of the search process. Search committee responsibilities include evaluation of candidate applications, development of interview questions, determination of candidates to be interviewed by the search committee and recommendation of finalists to the Board of Trustees.

X. The search committee will try to reach consensus on all committee decisions. If the search committee is unable to reach consensus after discussion of an issue, then the majority view of the committee shall prevail.

XI. Committee members must be willing to give search committee responsibilities their highest priority. To assure equity in the process, attendance at all committee meetings is required.

XII. The Board of Trustees requires four to six unranked finalists. Before the selection process begins, the Board will specify the minimum number of candidates to be advanced by the committee (Source: PFC Ad-Hoc Committee). The Board of Trustees reserves the right to interview additional candidates in the pool. (Source: PFC Ad-Hoc Committee) The Board of Trustees interviews the finalists and selects and hires the new Superintendent/President.

XIII. Before the selection process begins, the Board of Trustees will clearly articulate to the members of the committee viable options are available to the Board if the number of finalist candidates submitted does not fulfill the required minimum number of candidates as determined above (Source: PFC Ad-Hoc/ART). These options can include:

Option 1: Ask the committee to forward additional finalists from the pool of candidates already interviewed (Source: PFC Ad-Hoc/ART)
Option 2: Draw Directly interview additional finalists candidates (Source: Board 10/3) from the candidate pool
Option 3: Cease the process and begin a new search (Source: ART)
Option 4: Accept the candidate(s) that are forwarded as finalists (Source: PFC Ad-Hoc) and proceed (Source: ART)
Option 5: Ask the committee to interview additional candidates from the applicant pool who could potentially become finalists (Source: PFC Ad-Hoc)
XIV. The Board will provide an opportunity for the Search committee co-chair (Source: Superintendent/President) to submit a list of candidates along with narratives to the Board (Source: Board) which could include the search committee members' reasons for forwarding or not forwarding candidates and perceived strengths and weaknesses of each of the candidates.

XV. The Board of Trustees requires that a presidential forum be held for the finalists in conjunction with the Board of Trustees interviews. The Board of Trustees determines when the presidential forum is scheduled. The Board determines the structure and date(s) of the forum(s).

XVI. The Board of Trustees determines the efficacy of a site visit(s) and, if necessary, determines the participants for the visiting team. The Board of Trustees also determines the structure and schedule for the site visit(s).

XVII. The Board of Trustees will evaluate the effectiveness of the updated policy with the new procedures regarding the presidential CEO Selection Process and will provide an opportunity to the committee to submit an evaluation of the selection process (Source: PFC Ad-Hoc).
I. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the hiring of the Superintendent/President. The Board will establish the calendar and approve the structure of the presidential hiring process. The Board of Trustees will communicate to all those that participate in the selection process to conduct themselves in the highest ethical standards throughout the entire selection process.

II. The Board of Trustees will establish a selection process for the consultant that ensures the consultant selected reflects the Board’s expectations and values.

III. The Board of Trustees will craft and express a clear statement on the role of the consultant and ensure that this role is clearly communicated to all stakeholders so that this role is clearly understood by all.

IV. The Board of Trustees will clearly communicate the Board’s expectations and values with respect to the hiring process to the members of the search committee before the hiring process begins. All members of the search committee will be provided training prior to the selection process on how to best reach consensus.

V. The Board of Trustees or designee oversees the development of the Presidential Search Brochure and approves its content.

VI. The Board of Trustees or designee approves all advertising for the presidential position.

VII. The Board of Trustees determines the number of representatives from each constituent group. The search consultant will serve as a non-voting chair of the committee.

VIII. The current composition of the search committee, which is merely a description of what has been used in the past and can be changed by the Board in the future, is as follows:

- Faculty
- Classified
- Management/Confidential
- ASB President/Representative
- Community Representatives

The following are not committee members, but serve specific functions in the selection process:

- The Human Resources Officer or designee shall review the composition of the applicant pool to determine if legal requirements relating to Title V, the District’s Equal Opportunity Plan, and non-discrimination have been met.
• An EEO Monitor who is appointed by the Equal Employment/Staff Diversity Officer

IX. Persons serving on the search committee participate in both the application review and search committee interview phases of the search process. Search committee responsibilities include evaluation of candidate applications, development of interview questions, determination of candidates to be interviewed by the search committee and recommendation of finalists to the Board of Trustees.

X. The search committee will try to reach consensus on all committee decisions. If the search committee is unable to reach consensus after discussion of an issue, then the majority view of the committee shall prevail.

XI. Committee members must be willing to give search committee responsibilities their highest priority. To assure equity in the process, attendance at all committee meetings is required.

XII. The Board of Trustees requires four to six unranked finalists. Before the selection process begins, the Board will specify the minimum number of candidates to be advanced by the committee. The Board of Trustees interviews the finalists and selects and hires the new Superintendent/President.

XIII. Before the selection process begins, the Board of Trustees will clearly articulate to the members of the committee what options are available to the Board if the number of finalist candidates submitted does not fulfill the required minimum number of candidates as determined above. These options can include:

  Option 1: Ask the committee to forward additional finalists from the pool of candidates already interviewed
  Option 2: Directly interview additional candidates from the candidate pool
  Option 3: Cease the process and begin a new search
  Option 4: Accept the candidate(s) that are forwarded as finalists and proceed
  Option 5: Ask the committee to interview additional candidates from the applicant pool who could potentially become finalists

XIV. The Board will provide an opportunity for the Search committee-chair to submit a list of candidates along with narratives to the Board which could include the search committee members’ reasons for forwarding or not forwarding candidates and perceived strengths and weaknesses of each of the candidates.
XV. The Board of Trustees requires that a presidential forum be held for the finalists in
conjunction with the Board of Trustees interviews. The Board of Trustees
determines when the presidential forum is scheduled. The Board determines the
structure and date(s) of the forum(s).

XVI. The Board of Trustees determines the efficacy of a site visit(s) and, if necessary,
determines the participants for the visiting team. The Board of Trustees also
determines the structure and schedule for the site visit(s).

XVII. The Board of Trustees will evaluate the effectiveness of the CEO Selection
Process and will provide an opportunity to the committee to submit an evaluation
of the selection process.
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Recommendation 6: Governance

The team recommends: the college develop a formal and cyclical review of governance committees and processes to ensure integrity and effectiveness, and communicate the results as a basis for improvement of campus decision-making; the college administration develop a plan to clarify the reporting pathways for the various governance bodies exemplifying the linkages between the unit plans, program review, and the resource allocation process. (I.B.6, IV.A.5); the Board of Trustees participate in professional development that introduces Board members to best practices regarding board/campus relations, ethics, trusteeship, accreditation process, and strategic planning; the Board review and, if necessary, revise the Presidential hiring process established in 2002 to prevent potential disagreements with future presidential search committees (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.i, IV.B.1.j); and the college and the Board of Trustees reach agreement on policies and practices that govern the development of accreditation materials. (Standards IV.A.4, IV.B.1.i)
FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Submitted by
Rio Hondo College
3600 Workman Mill Road
Whittier, CA 90601-1616

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

October 15, 2009
RECOMMENDATION 6
GOVERNANCE
For a more complete list of activities that demonstrates a long-standing history of professional development, please refer to the Conference Attendance for the Board of Trustees 2008-2009 (Ref. 6b.7).

The Board has also directed the Superintendent/President to work with staff to craft an updated board policy, BP 2740 (Ref. 6b.8) which concerns board reports on professional development activities. The proposed additions to the existing policy are currently undergoing the campus review process which provides all constituency groups the opportunity to participate effectively in the formulation of district policies and procedures, as is mandated in BP 2410, Section IV (Ref. 6b.9).

**ADDITIONAL PLANS**

The Board will continue to be engaged in professional development activities in the recommended areas and in other areas as necessary. The Board will evaluate the effectiveness of the new policy regarding board reports on professional development activities at the end of the first year of implementation.

**Recommendation 6c - the Board review and, if necessary, revise the Presidential hiring process established in 2002 to prevent potential disagreements with future Presidential search committees (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.i, IV.B.1.j)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE RECOMMENDATION**

The Board has reviewed the administrative procedures that are part of the existing Board Policy (Ref. 6c.1) that inform the Presidential hiring process and has identified where existing procedures can be clarified and improved. The Board, in collaboration with the President and campus stakeholders, took a critical look at the presidential hiring process and has suggested new procedures that can complement existing procedures. These new procedures are listed in the Analysis of the Results section below.

**ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS ACHIEVED TO DATE**

During the months of April, May and July, Board members held pre-Board meeting workshops to discuss the recommendations made by ACCJC (Ref. 6c.2). The Board discussed recommendations related to new procedures at a working session at the May 2009 and July 2009 Board of Trustees meeting. (Ref. 6c.2 and Ref 6c.3).

After receiving input from the campus stakeholders, and discussing the presidential hiring procedures that are part of this policy during the accreditation working sessions in May 2009, and July 2009, the Board drafted a revised administrative procedure. An ad hoc committee was formed from members of the Planning Fiscal Council in September, 2009.
to make further suggestions. After reviewing these recommended changes, the Board made the following suggestions:

I. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the hiring of the Superintendent/President. The Board will establish the calendar and approve the structure of the presidential hiring process. The Board of Trustees will communicate to all those that participate in the selection process to conduct themselves with the highest ethical standards throughout the entire selection process.

II. The Board of Trustees will establish a selection process for the consultant that ensures the consultant selected reflects the Board’s expectations and values.

III. The Board of Trustees will craft and express a clear statement on the role of the consultant and ensure that this role is clearly communicated to all stakeholders so that this role is clearly understood by all.

IV. The Board of Trustees will clearly communicate the Board’s expectations and values with respect to the hiring process to the members of the search committee before the hiring process begins. All members of the search committee will be provided training prior to the selection process on how to best reach consensus.

V. The Board of Trustees or designee oversees the development of the Presidential Search Brochure and approves its content.

VI. The Board of Trustees or designee approves all advertising for the presidential position.

VII. The Board of Trustees determines the number of representatives from each constituent group. The search consultant will serve as a non-voting chair of the committee.

VIII. The current composition of the search committee, which is merely a description of what has been used in the past and can be changed by the Board in the future, is as follows:

Faculty
Classified
Management/Confidential
ASB President/Representative
Community Representatives

The following are not committee members, but serve specific functions in the selection process:

- The Human Resources Officer or designee shall review the composition of the applicant pool to determine if legal requirements relating to Title V, the District’s Equal Opportunity Plan, and non-discrimination have been met.
• An EEO Monitor who is appointed by the Equal Employment/Staff Diversity Officer

IX. Persons serving on the search committee participate in both the application review and search committee interview phases of the search process. Search committee responsibilities include evaluation of candidate applications, development of interview questions, determination of candidates to be interviewed by the search committee and recommendation of finalists to the Board of Trustees.

X. The search committee will try to reach consensus on all committee decisions. If the search committee is unable to reach consensus after discussion of an issue, then the majority view of the committee shall prevail.

XI. Committee members must be willing to give search committee responsibilities their highest priority. To assure equity in the process, attendance at all committee meetings is required.

XII. The Board of Trustees requires four to six unranked finalists. Before the selection process begins, the Board will specify the minimum number of candidates to be advanced by the committee. The Board of Trustees interviews the finalists and selects and hires the new Superintendent/President.

XIII. Before the selection process begins, the Board of Trustees will clearly articulate to the members of the committee what options are available to the Board if the number of finalist candidates submitted does not fulfill the required minimum number of candidates as determined above. These options can include:

Option 1: Ask the committee to forward additional finalists from the pool of candidates already interviewed
Option 2: Directly interview additional candidates from the candidate pool
Option 3: Cease the process and begin a new search
Option 4: Accept the candidate(s) that are forwarded as finalists and proceed
Option 5: Ask the committee to interview additional candidates from the applicant pool who could potentially become finalists

XIV. The Board will provide an opportunity for the Search committee-chair to submit a list of candidates along with narratives to the Board which could include the search committee members’ reasons for forwarding or not forwarding candidates and perceived strengths and weaknesses of each of the candidates.

XV. The Board of Trustees requires that a presidential forum be held for the finalists in conjunction with the Board of Trustees interviews. The Board of Trustees determines when the presidential forum is scheduled. The Board determines the structure and date(s) of the forum(s).
XVI. The Board of Trustees determines the efficacy of a site visit(s) and, if necessary, determines the participants for the visiting team. The Board of Trustees also determines the structure and schedule for the site visit(s).

XVII. The Board of Trustees will evaluate the effectiveness of the CEO Selection Process and will provide an opportunity to the committee to submit an evaluation of the selection process.

By implementing each of these new procedures, the District will be in a better position to fulfill the spirit and substance of the presidential hiring policy. In addition, these new procedures will minimize the likelihood of miscommunication, misunderstanding, and confusion that occurred in the most recent presidential hiring process.

The Board will draft, discuss, and approve the aforementioned procedures which will accomplish three outcomes: 1) complement the existing procedures in the presidential hiring process; 2) clarify the areas in need of explanation; and 3) minimize the chance of miscommunication in the future. The board meeting minutes will reflect these discussions and the updated policy with the new procedures will be included as evidence. The updated policy and procedures will be added to the updated Board Policies and Administrative Procedures which will be made available to the entire campus on the campus website (Ref. 6c.4).

Since the Board of Trustees has already directed the Superintendent/President to work with staff to craft additional administrative procedures, the proposed additions to the existing procedures are currently undergoing the campus review process which provides all constituency groups the opportunity to participate effectively in the formulation of district policies and procedures, as is mandated in BP 2410, Section IV (Ref. 6b.9).

ADDITIONAL PLANS

The above procedures have gone through multiple rounds of review and analysis including valuable input from the campus community; the language reflects the latest version to date but the final version has not been officially adopted and approved. The Board is committed to maximizing communication and collaboration with all parties upon implementation of the updated presidential hiring policy with these new procedures. The Board will evaluate the effectiveness of the updated administrative procedures regarding the presidential selection process after implementation.

Recommendation 6d - the college and the Board of Trustees immediately reach agreement on policies and practices that govern the development of accreditation materials. (Standards IV.A.4, IV.B.1.i).

RESOLUTION OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Board and the Administration reviewed the events related to the process by which the accreditation materials were developed in 2008. Upon thorough review and extensive discussion of these activities, an agreement was reached to use the
Superintendent/President as the intermediary between the District and the Board of Trustees.

**ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS ACHIEVED TO DATE**

The Superintendent/President will foster a collegial working relationship between the Accreditation Team and the Board by acting as an intermediary for communication. In this role, the Superintendent/President will present all written draft accreditation materials, authored by various campus constituents, to the Board of Trustees and, similarly, provide all groups with any input, feedback, or substance that the Board wishes to provide the District accreditation team.

This method of communication would help ensure that communication between the District and Board is consistent, focused, and clear. This would directly address the recommendation to reach agreement on policies and practices that govern the development of accreditation materials.

The Board will draft, discuss, and approve an updated version of Board Policy 3200 that will establish the Superintendent/President as the intermediary between the district and the Board in the development of accreditation materials (Ref 6d.1).

Because the Board of Trustees has directed the Superintendent/President to work with staff to craft an updated policy, the proposed additions to the existing policy are currently undergoing the campus review process which provides all constituency groups the opportunity to participate effectively in the formulation of district policies and procedures, as is mandated in BP 2410, Section IV (Ref 6d.2).