

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, November 11, 2014, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (Co-Chair and VPAA), Dr. Vann Priest (Co-Chair and President AS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), Katie O'Brien (2nd VP, AS), Dr. Kevin Smith (Secretary, AS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian, AS), John Frala (ASCCC Rep, AS), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad (Faculty), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC)

Members Absent: Henry Gee (VPSS), Robert Bethel (1st VP, AS), Kathy Pudelko (President RHCFA), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Don Mason (Mgmt., AA), Dyrell Foster (Mgmt. SS), Alex Ramirez (President, ASRHC), Andrew Carpeña (ASRHC)

Staff Members Present: Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), René Gallegos (Recorder)

- I. **Call to Order** – Kenn called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Kenn welcomed the new VP of Finance and Business, Myeshia Armstrong, who will be serving on PFC. Members introduced themselves.
- II. **Acceptance of Minutes** – Kenn reported that the minutes of October 14 and October 28, 2014 were delayed to allow Vann and Kenn time to proofread. Both sets will be presented at the next meeting.
- III. **Co-Chairs Report** – Kenn provided an update on the two-year schedule that many have been working on since last April. It was one of the recommendations that came out of the Institutional Planning Retreat, which emerged as Academic Affairs' top priority strategic direction. A two-year schedule will enable students, counselors, deans, "just about everyone" to view a tentative schedule up to two years in advance of courses that will be offered. A sub-committee was formed in the summer that broke into nine multi-faceted work groups. The goal is to alleviate bottlenecks in the registration process for students and to improve our Scorecard's completion rates. Everyone benefits from this effort. Along the way, a two-year schedule is smarter than one year for long-term planning purposes.

We did not know how to go about this "daunting task." We created a "sandbox" environment as a technical means to look at our options with the ongoing scheduling process. There are some districts that are doing registration early, such as at West Hills College, which allows students to register for classes several semesters in advance. Students register for classes but don't pay until the semester approaches. West Hills is still working out the bugs, especially with pre-requisites. We are not that ambitious thus far in wanting to have registration early, only a viewable tentative schedule. We have focused on Spring 2015 - Spring 2017 tentative schedules. Kenn has worked closely with René Tai, Monica Francis, and Mike Slavich on the Instructional Operations timeline. Many different aspects will be tentative during this process. This process was done in concert with the pending faculty ratification of the academic calendar. It demonstrates a spirit of collaboration and cooperation among all involved. All deans and secretaries will meet tomorrow to look at the production schedule. Judy Pearson is retiring and is working on the roll overs of all affected schedules. Between January 20 and February 2, the first day of spring semester, the Deans and Kenn will look at bottlenecks closely. We will be identifying classes that are in demand. We will be

looking at this process in a new way, increasing sections here, reducing there, and looking more strategically at sequencing of courses.

Kenn fielded the following questions and comments regarding the two year schedule:

1. Will there be a disclaimer that this schedule is subject to change or won't be final until a month prior to the beginning of the semester (Sheila)?
2. Schedules are sometimes driven by faculty convenience not student demand. If you have a dean who accommodates requests, how much flexibility will there be if classes that are in demand are those sections that need to be offered in the evenings, etc. to capture those students who are available to take classes (Gisela)? From her observation there is no full time faculty teaching in the evenings. If we keep this habit, we will only attract students in the daytime.
3. How does having the times aid the students in planning? Students don't want to know their work schedules two years in advance (Kevin).
4. What is the impact of this change on Curriculum (Sheila)? This is a concerted effort that everyone should understand what we are doing here. This should have very clear cut process and timelines.
5. Can students change their ed plans? Speaking of the secretaries, have they expressed any needs? It is a stressful time inputting the schedule and having to complete two years is a lot of pressure on them (Sandra).

Kenn responded that adjustments will be necessary. The bigger goal is to identify obstacles for students. The data flow from the Educational Master Plan will feed down student needs data as never before, showing what our students need two years down the road. It also gives the deans the ability to look at scheduling MW or TR course offerings. We can adjust and more evenly distribute sections across the board. We have to get this off the ground first and then we will tackle the curriculum issues. Kenn has already spoken to Fran Cummings to keep her in the loop on this initiative.

To address the needs of the secretaries, Kenn will be sitting down tomorrow with all the secretaries and division deans in a joint meeting to explain the new process. This represents a paradigm shift, and we all expect issues to pop up.

Judy will have all the tables rolled and built before she leaves. Yes, there is a lot of work to be done up front, but then the secretaries can go back to "business as usual" after the initial intensive period as this will be an ongoing process. We have to be more strategic and efficient when offering sections, and a two-year schedule will assist us in the process and benefit everyone. Kenn did not make any commitments regarding registration, since that falls under the purview of Student Services.

Janira reported that, from the student perspective, when they sit down with a Counselor and plan semester by semester, if Anthropology 103 is not offered down the road then it becomes complicated for students to complete. She and other students are very pleased that the College is working to turn an institutional planning outcome into reality!

Julius reported that from a Counseling perspective, for the student who is working or has a family, this change to scheduling will be very beneficial. He believes that, as we get better at this, we can better predict what the absolutes are. It will be helpful on so many levels.

Sheila reported that she thinks this is a great idea. This initiative should assist students, counselors with programming schedules, and deans to retain employees. This will also help us take a look interdepartmentally to see where the needs are as we look at degree requirements. If classes are not offered on a two year cycle then students can't graduate. That is a problem.

Rene reported that it is a big shift in how we do things. One of the benefits is also regarding faculty who are on release time. It is helpful for planning and staffing classes.

Julius reported that Counselors have heard from many students regarding Intersession offerings. There are slim pickings targeted to daytime students only. Is there any possibility of offering some sections from 4-7 p.m. in the future? Just some food for thought. Kenn responded that only daytime classes were permitted during the upcoming Intersession as we carefully evaluate the need for Intersession classes.

IV. New Business

- **Sub-committee on Instructional Equipment** - Kenn reported that the subcommittee will meet on Thursday, November 13. Howard has been sharing past information from the planning software. Some members reported that they did not receive a meeting notice. Vann reported that the ASRHC President's email is bouncing back and he needs to contact IT for assistance. Howard is estimating about \$200,000 in equipment requests for 2015-16, but this is a guess at this point in that he has not reviewed all requests in their entirety.

Vann reported that we have been planning since 2008. It seems like it was just yesterday when he opened this "can of stewed tomatoes." Vann was the first IEC chair with Howard, and they were instrumental in getting the planning process here at Rio Hondo. Vann came up with suggested improvements. If there is a request for \$50,000 in funding, the requestor should be able to justify what this will be spent on to support the request. The Deans look at the budget requests but not the plan as whole. Deans have to write to an audience to get the point across to someone that has budgetary control.

Howard and Vann chatted about some of them. IEC talked about some improvements, one being different software. One day Vann hopes that this discussion will take place.

Adam asked how the College is going to move forward in regards to the Accreditation Leadership Team. He hopes that this discussion is held soon. Vann reported that he, President Dreyfuss, and Kenn have met on this matter. They are holding off until the report comes back from ACCJC specifying the direction we need to go in writing a response. After receiving the report, we will have a team in place and develop a timeline and plan.

Howard reported that we already have a timeline in the works for the follow up and mid-term reports. This is based on the six-year accreditation cycle. We need to see the recommendations that are going forward to ACCJC. We have yet to receive them. To date, Will Llewellyn was asking for clarification on some facts so he is finishing up the report.

- Review of 4-year degree proposal

Four Year Degree Program

Kenn reported that this summer the idea of a four-year degree was discussed openly due to pending legislation (SB850) that would permit a pilot in the Community College System. This was driven to assist in support of Nursing programs that have to compete aggressively

with BA programs. When the legislation came down, it specified that degrees could not compete with UCs and CSUs. That eliminated Nursing as a possible BA degree at Rio Hondo College. Since then, we were given one submission date at the end of the month from the state, and now that date moved up to tomorrow. Kenn read directly from the Intent to Apply form that was provided. Three proposals emerged. Game Art, Automotive Technology, and Homeland Security. The form requires the signature of the Superintendent/President, Academic Senate President, and the three Vice Presidents. We were informed that there will be up to 15 degrees awarded statewide. There are no funds for this pilot from the state thus far.

Gisela asked who voted in terms of putting forward one degree. What happens if 20 colleges have proposals? Will the state impose the limited 15 and then select from the pool? She read the proposals and compared all three. The Automotive seems the most viable because of the small class size and is similar to what is already happening in that area.

Vann reported that, as a 10+1 item, the Academic Senate had a lengthy and fruitful discussion on this item. One senator called it her most favorite Senate meeting. The difficulty with the pros and cons is not knowing the criteria the state will be using. We had to select one and move forward for the Intent to Apply stage of the process.

Kenn reported that he also had a lot of discussions at the Fall CIO Conference. There is a possibility that we may work collaboratively with other Districts. Nothing is set in stone at this point because there are so many unknowns here. Some CIOs reported that they will not participate because it does not support the community college mission.

The submission form gives the Chancellor's Office an idea of what is going on out here and is conceptual at this point. We do not have to pursue this if it is not cost effective. We did not have a template. We have devoted a lot more attention than many other Colleges have at this point. We had to project without knowing very much. Kenn asked the deans for curriculum components. We knew Senate would be involved right out of the gate. The final decision will be made on December 19, which is the due date for proposals to the Chancellor's Office. The external review team will forward their recommendation to the Board of Governors. The BOG will announce in January 2015 the recipients to be awarded a pilot. The pilot program will start no later than Fall 2017.

Vann reported that Senate talked about two things. We needed to decide which program to forward and a request for more information on the fiscal impacts. Vann shared the responses from the three deans, which Senate did not have when they initially ranked the proposals. Senate did not vote but wanted to send their preference. Senators have until Friday noon to respond to a survey. Game Art and Automotive Technology received similar ranking. They essentially tied. Automotive Technology rose to the top as the preferred program to forward on earning the broadest base support across 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices among Senators. In his role as Senate President, Vann interpreted this as Senate's intent to support Automotive Technology for this opportunity.

Kevin suggested that when more information is available from the Chancellor's Office, PFC should review the proposal along with costs of the program. Will this come back to the PFC if we are selected?

Kenn reported that we can return this item once more information becomes available.

John reported that the state does not have a format on upper degree classes. There will be more information and discussion on this topic at the Fall Plenary this month. Cost estimates that are going around now are estimated at \$80 per unit.

Sheila wanted clarification on what PFC was to do here today on this item?

Vann responded that we have to be careful here because the Senate President will be uncomfortable if PFC makes a different recommendation here, overriding the desires of the Senate. Senate held a Q and A during our last meeting. They requested no presentations. Even though the rankings were close, the recommendation was to forward Automotive Technology.

Sheila voiced her concern that is not Senate's decision alone, and while the Senate's voice is very important there are other constituent groups represented at PFC. Kenn reiterated that the choice of which program to submit is a mutually agreed upon decision, which is why PFC is involved.

Katie reported that Song had prepared questions, and among counselors there was no one program that everyone rallied around.

Kenn responded that the one thing we do know for sure is that we cannot compete with CSU and UC degrees. Russell and Kenn met with Dr. Baca. He looked at the proposals and gave his opinion. Manuel felt Game Art was interesting but felt that it may be an existing threat to nearby four-year schools such as Chico State. The Homeland Security degree may not be as competitive; however, the least disruptive is the Auto Technology.

Adam knows this is not an easy decision. Senate was evenly divided. Perhaps we should go with the Auto Technologu because that is the one Senate went to, so we have a consistent voice? We can debate this here forever.

Sandra recommended setting some parameters. We have to trust here today. We cannot sincerely recommend things that do not give clear costs. There will need to be support and cost projections so we can see what the value is institutionally. There may be different issues in regards to faculty and classified staff impacts.

Rene reported that having been the Secretary for Automotive for a time, she knows that the program is extremely organized, the faculty is committed to students, they have a plan in placem, and the program is prospering. She has watched them do this over the years, and they have done a "bang-up job."

Adam is greatly concerned about the costs. To be truly honest he doesn't like any of these proposals. To spend thousands of dollars for a few students is his overarching concern. He would rather see 20 more sections of Math 50 to help students here complete their degrees and to align with the mission of the college. This is going to go forward no matter what we decide here at PFC. There is existing crossover now with Auto as it stands.

Katie suggested that we explore the Automotive Technology now with the understanding that it is purely conceptual at this point. This is not to say that PFC endorses this pilot. We will do so when it returns to PFC when there are cost analysis available. [PFC consensed to this recommendation.](#)

V. Unfinished Business

- Student Equity Plan Budget

Kenn reported that Dyrell sent out the Student Equity Budget on November 7th to Vann and Kenn. Two items to point out is the campus wide writing center and tutoring that will be funded from these dollars.

Adam reported that there is a lot of work that has gone on here. There are students who are not performing so the challenge is that it would be great to link resource allocations to students doing better. Are we going to lift up everyone? That would be great, but it is necessary to have some linkage or outcome as to why we are doing this so it helps the targeted populations. Think of equity. We think of ethnicity. One of the big things was older students—where does this help that population? He recommended making some mention of the link in the introduction to identify who we are trying to help and why is important.

Henry reported that there are six skill set areas that are identified. All will have data outcomes. When Dyrell was here, we did not pose these kinds of questions. The Student Equity Plan is going to the Board tomorrow for approval.

Myeshia reported that most Districts are required to submit expenditure reports to the state in terms of areas where funds are spent. The Student Equity Plan should demonstrate what groups will receive funds and align those with program objectives. It's very similar to the way EOPS operates.

Julius reported that there are specific pots of money that can only be spent on specific things. He believes that Dyrell spoke to this when he presented at PFC. This money has to be spent by the end of fiscal year 2014-15.

Sandra asked if there is a possibility to modify the proposed budget. With the current situation in Financial Aid, students call over there and have to wait weeks and weeks for a response, which seems very inefficient. Yet there are only 10 hours allotted to assist in this area. Will 10 hours really alleviate the need in that office? We should look at the gaps and address them. How did the committee arrive at the number of 10 hours per week?

Several members of PFC voiced their concern in not receiving the SE budget in a timely manner.

Vann reported that the push to get this to the Board was to do so before Dyrell leaves Rio Hondo. In searching his memory, Vann is not 100% certain if Senate has to formally approve this plan. It was proposed that the budget portion return to PFC on 11/25. We can formulate questions at that time and Dyrell should be here to answer these questions at the next meeting.

In the meantime, [PFC consensed to the Student Equity Plan and not to the budget component as there is a need for further clarification.](#)

VI. Information Items

- Unit Plan due date – December 12, 2014
- Area Plan due date – January 23, 2015

VII. Committee Reports

- Basic Skills – No report.
- Facilities – No report.
- IEC – No report.
- Program Review – No report.
- Safety – No report.
- SLOs – No report.
- Accreditation – No report.
- Staff Development – Shelia reported that the retreat went great. It was a lot of fun for all.
- Staffing – No report.
- Information Technology – No report.
- Technology – No report.

VIII. Announcements – No announcements.

IX. Public Comment – None.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m. The next PFC meeting will be held on November 25, 2014, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room.