

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, November 26, 2013, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (co-chair), Dr. Adam Wetsman (co-chair), Henry Gee, Philip Luebben, Sheila Lynch, Robert Bethel, Dianna Reyes, Marie Eckstrom, Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad, Sandra Rivera, Suzanne Frederickson, Valeria L. Guerrero, Darinka Becerra, Kathy Pudelko, Julius B. Thomas, Judy Marks.

Staff Members Present: Howard Kummerman, Reneé Gallegos (recorder).

- I. Call to Order – Dr. Wetsman called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.
- II. Approval of Minutes – Dr. Pierson queried the group, and consensus was to delay acceptance of the November 12, 2013 minutes until December 10, 2013 to allow members more time to review. Any corrections should be sent to Reneé.
- III. Co-Chair's Report – Dr. Pierson reported that PFC will hold an additional meeting on December 10th to focus on the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). This presentation/discussion will take about an hour and a half. A good time seemed to be December 10th at 2:30. Dr. Pierson also mentioned that the Technology Master Plan is being spearheaded by Gary Van Voorhis, and the Educational Master Plan team (TEMP) has met twice.

Julius Thomas reported that, as a FACCC member, he read an article that there was an injunction on ACCJC on behalf of the CCCF. How will that affect us for Accreditation? Will ACCJC be limited in what it can do to other community colleges? Does anyone know how that will affect us? Dr. Wetsman responded that multiple lawsuits are going on. There may be a reprieve for San Francisco Community College. We are not sure what impact this will have throughout the state on other colleges' accreditation reviews. We will know more when ACCJC releases its report in January 2014.

On behalf of the students, Darinka Becerra thanked members of PFC and others who supported the recent Student Services reorganization. Students saw a need for change on this campus with accessibility and effectiveness in Student Services. She liked that the College took the initiative to make changes. The students supported this effort. Campus politics aside, she would like the focus to be on our strengths. Even though it was uncomfortable at the last PFC meeting with the interactions during the discussion, she just wanted this noted in the record.

Dr. Pierson requested his platform as PFC co-chair for an extended comment. Reflecting back on the last PFC meeting, he did not want to finger point at anyone, nor speak for Administration or co-chair Wetsman or anyone else. His comments were based on his own observations. He felt compelled today to take some time to reflect on the buzz on campus about the last PFC meeting. Dr. Pierson read a series of comments that he heard from various sources following the last meeting: "unpleasant experience," "I felt threatened," "intense," "it was a lengthy discussion," "overly prolonged discussion," "important discussion," "heated debate," "healthy debate," "it showed the process in action," "it was a negative experience," "disappointing," "confrontational," and perhaps most concerning to him, "I was afraid to say anything."

In keeping with protocols and ground rules that were shared at PFC's first meeting in August, he felt it his duty to bring up this matter as co-chair. He noted how Dr. Wetsman has frequently commented on how good PFC attendance has been. Both co-chairs feel good about achieving what

we have this semester. We have done this by coming together for constructive discussions. Our last meeting was a departure from how our meetings are generally conducted. One of the Board members even commented that three individuals had contacted her with concerns following the last PFC meeting. Regardless of whether these were our guests in the audience or PFC members, it is concerning that the dissatisfaction rose to that level. Adam and Kenn were even called on directly at the last Board meeting to address the matter. The Board stated that they have worked very hard to restore relations on this campus and would like to assure that PFC communications do not break down. Dr. Pierson stated that both he and Dr. Wetsman agreed they could have done more to shorten the lengthy discussion that occurred last time. He also revisited the ground rules proposed on August 27th and reflected that it may be a good idea to come back to revisit them from time to time. They were as follows:

The PFC sets the tone for the campus at Rio Hondo. Through our actions and behavior, the PFC can establish a climate in which learning and educational accountability are valued, professional growth is enhanced, while our most important goal remains student success. The PFC can model civility and professionalism by working well together and handling conflict constructively. Do your preparation. Listen well. Ask good questions. Clarify for yourselves and others your most important values and priorities. Be strategic in your thinking. Be positive and supportive.”

Dr. Wetsman reported that he and Kenn had spent some time reflecting on the last meeting and saw things differently. He felt the interactions were intense and robust, but people were respectful. We can move forward in a positive way and most things will not be as challenging. The role of PFC is to have these types of discussions. One thing for the future is to clearly define our role in terms of processes such as reorganizations. That way we will know. Trustee Garcia said ‘you guys need to work on how to interact with each other and establish protocols.’ We have tried but many times they have not moved forward. One challenge with protocol is Board Policy 2510, which is also the lynch pin for the PFC handbook. We wanted to have the PFC Handbook published in August, and this has also been a challenge with respect to that.

IV. Superintendent/President’s Report – No report.

V. New Business

- New Web Design – (Carryover from 11/12/13) Gary Van Voorhis, along with David Dawson, Rachel Garcia, and Kevin Leong who were all part of the Web Design Task Force, gave an overview of the progress on the new RHC website.

David Dawson gave a brief overview of his work on the background of the mountain and river water, taking into consideration the location of the college and the name of Rio Hondo College. He used his students in his class to get feedback from the 15 designs he created. The mountains are the ones located behind the College.

It was the consensus of the group that they preferred the abstract mountains as the background for the main page. Sheila Lynch commended the team for their work on a much anticipated and much needed revamping the Website. Dianna Reyes stated that the mountain vista is outstanding. We are on a hill, and this is true to what we are known for and identifies our college.

- Funded Resource Allocation Requests for 2013/2014 – (Carryover from 11/12/13). Howard Kummerman distributed the list of funded resource Allocations from 2013-2014. These are the final funding results for Technology and Facilities requests based on available funds. It was clarified that many items have already been purchased. Bond funded items were included and

are noted on the worksheet. President Dreyfuss wanted these items included in the process. Any questions will be taken back to President Dreyfuss regarding the funding part of the process.

The following questions were asked;

- 1.) Gateway Tutoring is not Technology, so how did that get lumped in this process? Dr. Pierson responded that Peer Tutors do not qualified as staffing. They are not Classified Employees because these are not full time requests. So they appear on this list as a funding augmentation request. These would be hourly, part-time tutors.
- 2.) Are these finalized amounts?
- 3.) How do we know when the equipment on this list can be ordered? Who does the notification? Howard Kummerman responded that the Dean will be notified that they are able to order now.
- 4.) What is a request costs more now than it did a year ago when plans were submitted?
- 5.) Does this money need to be spent by the end of the fiscal year?

These questions will be forwarded to President Dreyfuss to respond.

- TEMP – (Carryover from 11/12/13). Howard Kummerman handed out documents. The first showing the Executive Team and Task Force of the Team for the Educational Master Plan. Howard and Julius Thomas are co-chairs. This idea came out of President’s Council. There will be four meetings per month, one being a leadership meeting. We are in work mode as of now since we have many pieces to look at. Our goal is to share at the May 2014 Board of Trustees meeting where we will seek approval of the Educational Master Plan. We can also use this as evidence for Accreditation, in that the Accreditation Self Evaluation Report will be written by April 2014 and we can still reference documents that are in progress noted as continuous improvement. Institutional Goals and Objectives, the objectives for SSI, and Program Plans are all part of the planning process. These are all things that we are doing on a continuous basis. This is not a requirement of ACCJC to have an Educational Master Plan. This is what we do locally as a College.

Julius commended that this needs to be seen as a living document. The EMPs in the past were cast in stone. We have to be flexible to address changes. This is why we will have a five-year plan instead of a ten-year plan. The EMP should also coincide with the recently revised Mission Statement , which addresses how we are prioritizing things now. TEMP will spend time pulling together all of the long term project ideas from the Program, Unit, and Area plans. These establish where we have been, and what we are doing now, so then we can create an outline with strategic direction. The TEMP team has met twice and begun to distribute work assignments. Howard is making graphs and assigning work to teams who will do the work and report back at meetings. If any of you have read the last EMP, it focused on construction. Now that our construction plan is almost complete, we need to focus on our educational vision in other respects.

Institution-Set Standards – Howard Kummerman reported that the IEC is working on Institutional Set Standards next week. The IEC has identified measures, and they will mirror the Scorecard as well as the Mission Statement component. We have not utilized the Governance Manual in regards to self-evaluation of committees. All Committees should self-evaluate annually. After much discussion, consensus was to have IEC develop an instrument in the near future that

would standardize the process for all. IEC will work in conjunction with Institutional Research and Planning so we can extract quantifiable data to support the evaluation instrument.

S. Lynch and R. Bethel departed at this point of the meeting.

VI. Unfinished Business

- BPs & APs Awaiting Further Revisions

Dr. Pierson moved that the Unfinished Business policies and procedures be considered first, out of order on the agenda:

- BP 2340 Board Meeting Agenda (returned with Board comment from 10/9/13 adding paragraph V to be consistent with AP 2340) – [Consensus reached with the standardized reference to “Board of Trustees” being written out in full when first referenced in any BP or AP, and then noted as the “Board” in subsequent listings.](#)
- BP 2510 Participation in Local Decision Making – Returning with edits made at October 9th Board meeting addition definition of Participatory Governance and listing Participatory/Shared through policy). [Consensus reached with a follow up to convene a sub-committee consisting of Adam Wetsman, Kenn Pierson, and ASRHC student members Valeria L. Guerrero, Darinka Becerra, and Alejandro Ramirez to research the language regarding policy that affect paragraph II: “The Associated Students shall be given an opportunity to participate effectively in the formulation and development of District policies and procedures that have a significant effect on students, as defined by law.” Academic Senate will also be reviewing the list presented by Scott Lay at the workshop on October 8, 2013. *Sandy Sandello to schedule sub-committee.*](#)
- BP 2715 Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice – Returning with language change to Paragraph II – [Consensus reached with the standardized reference to Board of Trustees being written out in full when first referenced in any BP or AP, and then noted as the “Board” in subsequent listings.](#)
- BP 4020 Program, Curriculum and Course Development – Returning with language change to Paragraph III made by the Board - [Consensus reached with acceptance of the following paragraph in III: “Tracking of TMC’s will be conducted and reported to the Board on an annual basis.” All other recommended language in blue is rejected since the language is inaccurate or implicitly reflects tasks that are already performed. The specificity of the language should be listed in the AP. See attached notes for strikeouts.](#)
- AP 6850 Hazardous Materials (returning using CCLC Language) - [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 7340 Leaves – this is a return from October 22 – request for clarification on what the asterisks in L., M., N. The asterisks refer to state and federal Employment Law. Reference to “State and Federal Employment Law” has been added to the policy - [Consensus reached.](#)

New Business resumed at this point.

- BP 2110 Vacancies on the Board of Trustees - [Consensus reached with minor grammatical edits.](#)
- BP 2310 Regular Meetings of the Board - [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 2345 Public Participation at Board Meetings - [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 2431 Superintendent/President Selection - [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 2432 Superintendent/President Succession - [Consensus reached.](#)

- BP 2610 Presentation of Initial Collective Bargaining - [Consensus reached with minor grammatical edits.](#)

The review process stopped at this point of the meeting due to time constraints.

- BP 2710 Conflict of Interest
- BP 2730 Board Member Health Benefits
- BP 2735 Board Member Travel
- BP 2740 Board Education
- AP 2320 Board Meetings: Special and Emergency Meetings
- AP 2435 Evaluation of Superintendent/President
- AP 2710 Conflict of Interest
- AP 2740 Board Education (New- No CCLC)
- AP 5010 Admissions (New)
- AP 5520 Student Conduct Procedures (PFC reach consensus on incomplete version; additional pages added)
- AP 5700 Athletics

VII. Ongoing Topics for Discussion

- Planning Process – No discussion.

VIII. Committee Reports – No reports due to lack of time.

- Basic Skills
- Facilities
- IEC
- Program Review
- Safety
- SLO's
- Accreditation
- Staff Development
- Staffing
- Institutional Technology
- Technology

IX. Announcements – No announcements were made.

X. Public Comment – No public comments were made.

XI. Adjournment – Dr. Wetsman adjourned the meeting 4:02 p.m. Next meeting will be held on December 10, 2013, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., focusing on the Facilities Master Plan.

Rio Hondo College Website Design Project

Design Review
November 2013

Background

- Interact Focus Group Study
 - Students, High School Juniors, Working Adults, Community Members
 - Seventy-four participants
 - Identify Navigation and Areas of Interest – “PODS”
- Website Task Force
 - RHC Faculty, Staff, and Administrators
 - Navigation
 - Design

Goals of the Project

- Accessibility & Multi-Language Support
- Leverage RHC Colors and Themes
- Broad-Based and Inclusive Process
- Modern/Updated Interface
- Distributed Content Maintenance
- Navigational Improvements
- Responsive Design for Multiple Device Types
- Transportable

Project Phases

- Phase I (March, 2013 – July, 2013)
 - Taskforce Formation
 - Site Review
 - Navigation
 - Identifying Content Editors and Publishers
 - Choosing a Designer
- Phase II (July, 2013 – Current)
 - Design Creation and Selection



**INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING
2013-2014 PLANNING PROCESS
RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUESTS**



FINAL FUNDING – TECHNOLOGY, FACILITIES, ADDITIONAL BUDGET REQUESTS

Unit	Program	Requested Item	Amount
Administration of Justice	Administration of Justice	Remodel of the AJ Annex.	\$2,000,000 Funded State/Bond
Arts & Cultural Programs	Visual Art	Painting racks and Ventilation System for two Visual Art classrooms.	\$10,000 Funded
Behavioral & Social Sciences	Behavioral & Social Sciences	Ceiling Mounted Projectors	\$5,200 Funded
Business	Accounting	Technology related to facilities (e.g., Smart classrooms, etc.)	\$90,000 Bond
Career Technical Education	Automotive Technology	Transmission Tester	\$50,000 \$40,000 Funded Bond
Counseling & Student Development	Career Center	Database software	\$5,000 Funded
Facilities	Operations	Solar and hard wired light posts	\$300,000 Funded State Bond / Edison Fund
Health Sciences	CNA	Instructional space will be identified, and furniture and equipment installed	\$10,000 Funded
Health Services	Health Services	Medical Services Cart	\$6,000 Funded
Information Technology	Information Technology	Computer Hardware	\$200,000 May cost less Funded Bond
Information Technology	Information Technology	Computer Hardware	\$135,000 Funded Bond
Library & Learning Support	Library	Desensitizer / resensitizer P122-3515	\$10,000 Funded One Time
Library & Learning Support	Student Success & Retention	Student Worker Classification – Gateway Tutors and Peer Mentors	\$7,500 Funded
Math & Science	Math & Science	Replacement Laboratory chairs	\$69,600 Funded Bond
Physical Education	Fitness Center	Fitness equipment	\$200,000 Funded Bond



EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN (EMP) TIMELINE

April 5, 2013	Educational Master Plan Kick-off at Institutional Planning Retreat <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Mission Statement Review▪ Educational Philosophy/Strategic Directions▪ Institutional Standards
May – November 2013	Mission Statement Revision <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Establish Mission Statement Task Force▪ Campus Review▪ Board of Trustees Approval
October 22, 2013	Establish Campus Leadership for Educational Master Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Executive Team from President's Council▪ Task Force for Educational Master Plan from Planning Fiscal Council
November 7, 2013	First meeting of TEMP <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Establish meetings & timeline<ul style="list-style-type: none">- TEMP will meet four times a month. One meeting will include entire leadership team.▪ Discuss EMP content workflow
February - March	Campus & Community review of Draft Educational Master Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ ASRHC -▪ Academic Senate -▪ President's Advisory Committee -▪ Campus Open Review Sessions -▪ Administrative Council -▪ CSEA Executive Committee –▪ Board of Trustees Workshop -
April 11, 2014	Institutional Planning Retreat <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Review and finalize EMP
May 14, 2014	Board of Trustees Approve Educational Master Plan

Revised 11/25/13



Educational Master Plan

Leadership

Executive Team – President’s Council

- Teresa Dreyfuss – Superintendent / President
- Kenn Pierson – Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Henry Gee – Vice President, Student Services
- Philip Luebben – Interim Vice President, Finance & Business
- Adam Wetsman – President, Academic Senate
- Sandra Rivera – President, CSEA

Task Force for the Educational Master Plan (TEMP) – Planning Fiscal Council (PFC)

- Co-Chair – Howard Kummerman
- Co-Chair – Julius Thomas
- Faculty – Dianna Reyes, Jim Newman, Michelle Pilati
- Administrators – Don Mason & Philip Luebben
- Classified Employees – Gina Bove & Jim Sass
- Students – Valeria Guerrero & Cristhian Lin-Calbos

Support Staff

- Jim Poper
- Gary Van Voorhis

Rvsd.11/25/13