

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING AND FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, December 10, 2013, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (co-chair), Dr. Adam Wetsman (co-chair), Henry Gee, Phil Luebben, Sheila Lynch, John Frala, Robert Bethel, Brian Brutlag, Dianna Reyes, Marie Eckstrom, Sandra Rivera, René Tai, Valeria L. Guerrero, Alejandro Ramirez, Darinka Becerra, Kathy Pudelko, Julius B. Thomas, Judy Marks, Don Mason, Dr. Mike Muñoz.

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

- I. **Call to Order** – Dr. Wetsman called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

- II. **Approval of Minutes** – There was a lengthy discussion regarding the use of names in the PFC minutes. Historically, the recorder has placed names of speakers from discussions in the official minutes which are the permanent record. This also helps when staff has to go back and research items in the archives and names help identify which constituent groups had input on a particular matter. It was noted that any member of PFC has the ability to amend or clarify statements made before the minutes are accepted by the Council. The Council is charged with conducting campus business and as such the minutes communicate the actions of the recommending body including discussions. It was the consensus of the members present to keep with this practice.

The minutes of November 12, 2013 and November 26, 2013 were consensed upon with one minor correction to the Minutes of November 12, noting a change from Valeria Guerrero to Darinka Becerra in the discussion regarding the Student Services Reorganization on page 5.

Sheila lynch brought up the item of new business vs. placement on the agenda under old business. The Reorgs were brought up at the October 8th PFC meeting but were placed on the agenda under New Business at the meeting on October 22, 2013.

Dr. Pierson clarified that the initial discussion of the Reorgs for Academic Affairs and Student Services were brought forward on October 8th following President Dreyfuss' report to PFC. It was formalized on the PFC agenda at the October 22, 2013 under New Business with a brief update from VP Gee regarding the Student Services Area. Both reorgs came forward to PFC for a full discussion on November 12, 2013.

Sandra Rivera cited our impending Accreditation Visit and it would be helpful to clarify which issues should go where on the PFC agenda to have a clearer process in place. As noted at the November Board meeting, the Board called out the co-chairs to clarify processes.

- III. **Co-Chair's Report** – Dr. Wetsman reported that it would be prudent to have a discussion on budget, reorganizations and what we call "Information Items" so we can move forward in the coming year. That way we do not spend time debating the process but rather the item itself.

 - IV. **Superintendent/President's Report** – No report.

 - V. **New Business**
-

- Facilities Master Plan – Dr. Pierson reported that the scheduled Facilities Master Plan presentation by Peter Mitsakos and Douglas Newby will be moved to a later date. Mr. Mitsakos was unable to attend due to illness and the other architect was unavailable.

VI. Unfinished Business

- BPs & APs Awaiting Further Revisions – No action taken on the BP and APs listed below. It was the consensus that more time was need to study these policies and procedures. These will roll over to February meeting for consideration.

Unfinished policies and procedures returning through process (Roll over from 11/26/13):

- 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

The following BPs and APs were brought back to PFC for review after additional edits were made in grammar, format and content.

- BP 2725 Board Member Compensation - [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 2110 Vacancies on the Board of Trustees – [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 2610 Presentation of Initial Collective Bargaining Proposals – [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 4020 Program, Curriculum and Course Development – [Consensus reached.](#)

VII. Ongoing Topics for Discussion

- **Planning Process** – Dr. Pierson reported on the Resource Request for faculty positions that were included in the unit plans which funnel up to the area plans. President Dreyfuss approached VPAA to see about addressing the challenge of filling open positions due to the imbalance in processes where classified are backfilled automatically as well as Administrators. This is for vacancies as a result of resignation, retirement or death of a faculty member. This process as it currently stands is more rigorous then it is for classified and administrative hiring. President Dreyfuss, VPAA in consultation with Howard Kummerman scanned the Dean’s requests and looked at the budget. It was determined that 12 positions could be funded.

It is not the practice of the VPAA to include every resource request for Staffing, Facilities and Technology. The Deans prioritize their request. We receive feedback from the various committees. In March of every year the results are shared at the annual Leadership Retreat which completed this year long process. VPAA convened with the Deans at a retreat to review Faculty Resource requests. He wanted the process more transparent, collegial and less departmentalized. Taking this approach a step further, both Dr. Foster and Dr. Muñoz were invited to attend. Dr. Muñoz sat with all of us as we outlined criteria including the impacts of SSI, reviewed requests generated from the Unit Plans, and had a mindful discussion focused

on faculty requests. The exercise included criteria that were beneficial to the institution on a global level as well as the benefit to a division or particular program. VPAA stressed that he could have made these decisions himself but wanted a collaborative effort. We ranked our top choices using 1's and 2's. The ranking allowed for one position for each academic Division, one for DSPS and one for Counseling.

In allotting funding for the 12 positions, it was understood that from this point forward, these positions will not be competing with new positions and will be taken out of the competitive process for the 14-15 year. Almost automatically, full time positions will be filled when they become vacant. The one caveat will be if there is not a need for the position. Should Program Review decide there is not a need, there is a program reduction or there are extenuating circumstances, it would be within the existing process to ensure the position is still viable. This would include is a program was suspended.

Any other requests that Deans submit will be considered a new position and move forward through the competitive process for the 14-15 year. The score sheet for staffing which Howard Kummerman presented at a previous PFC meeting will include heavier weighting this year only if it is a replacement position. January 17, 2013 is the deadline for Area Plans. VPAA will be meeting with the Deans individually for one hour to review Unit Plans which reflect Program Plans. This will help him gain perspective in completing the Academic Affairs Area Plan.

Sheila Lynch requested clarification as she reported this information above was previously leaked and she has heard different iterations. Hearing from VPAA may have cleared some confusion in that 12 full time faculty positions will be funded. If there are other full-time vacancies, that will be considered by the Staffing Committee but there is no guarantee of funding. These positions will be viewed as new positions except they will be weighted heavier. What is not clear to me is one of the announcements that I heard that we are going to start filling replacements that will be ongoing from this point forward? So a hypothetical - let's say next year in Arts we have four vacancies. Only one gets funded, what happens to the other three positions?

VPAA clarified that if your Dean is moving positions forward in the Unit Plan, he will move it forward in the Area Plan. Each Division ranked positions in their Division and that has some bearing as well. If someone retires or dies it will be filled automatically from this point forward meaning Fall 2013. The others will go through the competitive process and will be allocated according to availability of funds.

Julius Thomas cited the recent retirement of Nilsa Rivera in Counseling. Dr. Muñoz responded that her retirement does count. He checked in to it. Any faculty that retire now will be filled. He wanted to make sure that we all have the same understanding. Someone who retired a year ago those positions will have to go through the competitive process. The line in the sand has to be drawn and we move forward with this process.

VPAA clarified that there are always going to be special circumstances that come up from time to time. Last year we did not hire anyone and it may be possible to hire more faculty plus the retirements this year.

Marie Eckstrom commented that she is concerned about the impetus that created this decision. What is the reason for the departure from the way we have done faculty hiring? Does anything in Program Planning come to PFC?

VPAA responded that all 12 of these positions would have been included in the Planning Process. He hopes that this body looks at this move as a positive.

Adam Wetsman responded that having this protocol in place we have an established number, a good baseline. As we retire or leave, we fill those faculty positions. This has been a big challenge in the past. He is concerned that this has not gone through our standard process – program plan, unit plan, area plan and then to committee for review. The Deans and the Administration have made a unilateral change and has not taken into account data for what we need for staffing at this institution. Unfortunately, DSPS is not here to confirm this or not. DSPS lost a full time faculty member, BSS lost 5 with Lazaro, Henderson, Sutow, Gallego, and Carreon. Essentially, BSS is giving positions up to other divisions as they are filling 100% of the vacancies in DSPS and only 20% of the vacancies in BSS. We are not considering student contact, WSCH or the number of sections. Nursing has 2/3's of their student contact coming from part-time faculty and a little over 40% comes from full-time faculty. This is not to say full-time are better than part-time in student contact. Full-time faculty are expected to do SLOs, Program Planning, etc. What we have done here is have special circumstances and that is what this is. This is not data driven, and as a comment for the record we are not following the planning process. That is the concern. We need to address these and Adam is concerned that we are not getting all these things based on data. We should have these discussions in PFC or in the Staffing Committee. We have not looked at where the needs are institutionally.

Dr. Pierson responded that this is not a departure of the Planning Process. Faculty write plans and submit them to their Dean. Faculty participate in the review of the program plans and should be reviewing what gets forwarded. Data is part of the package that moves through the process. VPAA feels that he is being accused of not following the process. He repeated that he does not like to make these types of decisions alone. He likes to be collaborative. The example was bringing Dr. Munoz into the discussion with the Academic Deans. It just seemed like the smart thing to do. I look at things institutionally and what will benefit our students, hiring 12 full-time faculty will help with that effort. This is the global thinking. We defined criteria, read off the chart that we had and had a frank discussion on impacts. Me as the Area Plan Manager for Academic Affairs has the responsibility to get the 1,000 foot view. He was a dean for five years and to his recollection even having this conversation has never been done.

VP Gee completely disagrees with Adam Wetsman. Making comparisons between Departments is not really accurate. There are departments that serve all the divisions such as DSPS and the Student Health Center. Two full-time faculty have been serving the entire campus in DSPS for years. It is not fair to use that as a comparative.

Kathy Pudelko comments that she has sat on the Staffing Committee before. In her Division we are surprised and stunned that we are getting one position filled and its for Water Polo. Adam tried to give us a comparison. It is great that we are all getting one. DSPS serves everyone and you are right about that. Counseling deserves five positions but we are discussing this openly. She likes VPAA's plan and we have to work through this together.

Mike Munoz commented that he guesses what is uncomfortable is the comparison of using the percentage logic and we have to look at impact logic. We have had a vacancy in DSPS for the Acquired Brain Injury position and with Veterans coming home and SSI it is a slippery slope. There was a bad policy in place prior to this point to let 36 full-time faculty positions pile up unfilled and now we are finding a pathway out of it. He would hope that in the future we will look and recognize what this is going to do for the college as a whole.

Other questions that were fielded included:

- 1) Is this decision a departure from policy?
- 2) Was there ever a policy established?

- 3) Was the consideration taken on a global level?
- 4) Can we get together as PFC and discuss the remaining positions from 13-35?
- 5) How do we know about funding of positions for next year. If the President gives the directive how do we ensure they are actually hired?

Vann Priest commented that Mike and Sheila used two phrases 1) the impact these positions will have and 2) the global perspective for the college. Vann is wondering if the discussion with the Deans, the impact and the global thinking. How did the group come up with an end result that that each division will be granted funding for one position. Maybe Physical Education doesn't need any positions?

VPAA did not ask the deans to rank positions. The ranking occurred naturally as it was based on input from faculty and staff in the program and unit plans that moved forward. This is what the conversation was based on the day of the Dean's retreat. President Dreyfuss asked to see the outcome of our meeting. She Howard Kummerman and I met and she gave the directive.

Don Mason reported that if we can all consense on this it will be a positive thing for the college. When the Deans met, I will speak for my division once this is established we took a severe hit about 40% of the Division. I will say this really. Kenn Pierson is collaborative and transparent like an x-ray machine. If there is a piece that there need to be a discussion what I do what to let you know there was a discussion based on the unit plan. Our Division is called AJ but it is Public Safety. The position that we were authorized is for an EMT instructor. We used touch points, market data, global perspective looking into the future of where the needs are. Tracy Rickman provided tons of data that the EMT Instructor is a priority not another AJ instructor. Even if we used the same there was no promise when we walked out of there. Be nice to have but if we don't hey nice playing. It was a surprise. We should not get testy and lose everything, rather let's look at the positive and move forward. The Superintendent/President made the call. Faculty were heavily involved in the process. Celebrate the victory and don't get caught up in the politics of my sandbox is bigger than yours. I would hate to become stagnated in discussion at the expense of positions being filled.

Howard Kummerman reported that the when he heard the first time that the Deans met, the Deans did not know if the positions would be funded because they had no idea on the policy decision. As President Dreyfuss' role as President, she is charged with the making the decision on hiring. She wanted to start with something that is already in the process. What would be most important and equitable. That was her thinking. Yes, going forward when a position becomes vacant, we will fill it. This is not a perfect situation but we need a starting point. If there is a vacancy in a discipline, it will be filled, but what if it makes more sense in another area? The problem is we never reallocated funding years ago so now we are left with this backlog. We still have an issue there but at least we are moving forward.

Brian Brutlag commented that he commends Adam for his commitment to the process. We often fear that the authority that you have the directive to eliminate the remaining positions. This fear that we are having is valid because we do not want this to become precedent setting and practice. He believe this was the point that Adam was trying to make.

Adam Wetsman reported that we determined that we had 14 positions that would go through the unit plans and funnel up to the area plan. The committee would look at the 14 positions to fill. Now, fast forward to this year. It was decided that the first 12 positions will be dispersed one per each division. So when the claim that the process has not changed is untrue. Yes it has been a collaborative effort but it has changed the practice. I am not making judgment on PE, DSPTS, BSS. The point is the process that we used before has changed. It has not gone through the participatory process that has been in place for years. What Brian eluded to is that

this is not the same process and by that what will happen next year? I think we should go through the staffing process that Howard and his team have diligently tried to refine. Maybe each division gets one but at least it went through the process.

Kenn Pierson responded that rather than looking at honest reassessment of our divisions and needs, PFC would like greater clarity in how we budget. To his dying day Kenn will say that the planning process has not changed. He reiterated that he could have chosen to make the decision alone, but he does not operate in this manner. President Dreyfuss gave him the opportunity and he thought about the institution's best interests across the board. It ended up that each Division would benefit with one position each. Now that we are doing Educational Master Plan we can assess which division(s) should shrink and how we should grow others based on market data and needs. He plans to take all of these forces into consideration.

- TEMP – No report.
- Institutional Set Standards – No report.

VIII. Committee Reports – No reports given due to lapse of time.

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

IX. Announcements

X. Public Comment

XI. Adjournment – Dr. Wetsman adjourned the meeting at 3:58 p.m. The next PFC meeting will be held on February 11, 2014, 2:30 – 3:30, Board Room

KP/AW/rdg