

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES  
Tuesday, August 26, 2014, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

---

**Members Present:** Dr. Kenn Pierson (co-chair), Dr. Vann Priest (co-chair), Henry Gee, Robert Bethel, Katie O'Brien, Dr. Kevin Smith, Sheila Lynch, John Frala, Dr. Adam Wetsman, Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad, Julius B. Thomas, Jeannie Liu, Sandra Rivera, René Tai, Joey Lujan (for Tiare Barrios), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Don Mason, Dr. Dyrell Foster

**Members Absent:** Kathy Pudelko, Suzanne Frederickson, Alex Ramirez (ASRHC), Tiare Barrios (ASRHC)

**Staff Members Present:** Howard Kummerman, Reneé Gallegos (Recorder), Michelle Yriarte (observer)

- I. Call to Order – Dr. Pierson called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m.
  - II. Acceptance of Minutes – June 26, 2014 – Consensus to table these minutes until September 9, 2014 to further review and make edits.
    - Co-Chair's Report – Dr. Pierson welcomed his new co-chair Dr. Vann Priest. Dr. Pierson also welcomed new and returning members to PFC. A lot has happened over the summer. Submission of the Accreditation Report was a big accomplishment, and the Chair of the visiting team will be visiting tomorrow to develop an itinerary for the team and to answer many of the questions that we have. This meeting will also help clarify what the team is expecting to see during the visit. We have a long list of questions lined up for tomorrow.
  - III. Introductions and Welcome

Dr. Priest said he forward to a productive year, asked for patience, and reported he has been educated throughout the summer on PFC function and processes.
  - IV. New Business
    - The new *2014-2015 PFC Manual* was distributed to all PFC members and support staff. Dr. Pierson reviewed the new *Manual*, specifically focusing on the committee make-up, inclusion of new graphs showing constituent relationships in regard to the governance process, and the inclusion of AP 2510, "Participation in Local Decision Making." Dr. Pierson reported that he and Dr. Priest finalized the *Manual* on Friday after extensive effort from Reneé. Last year, the PFC leadership team had prepared a manual for the 2012-2013 year. However, BP 2510 was going through the review process, so we opted to wait on printing until the BP was finalized.
    - PFC Membership/Meetings dates are calendared as of August 21, 2014 via Outlook invitation.
    - Ground rules for PFC were reviewed with the membership. The members reviewed the *Manual*, focusing on the purpose and charge of PFC.
-

Dr. Priest reported that a common complaint that he has heard about PFC is that there is limited focus on budget development. He reported that President Dreyfuss is willing to have a conversation on PFC's role in budget development. She is looking for continuous improvement. Members were asked to forward to the co-chairs any suggestions they would like to see in regards to budget development.

- Achieving Consensus – Dr. Pierson read directly from the *PFC Manual* on the definition of “consensus,” specifically citing BP 2510, Item I.B. that speaks to this. PFC is a recommending body among which open and respectful dialogue is valued.

Dr. Pierson asked Jeannie Liu, who is new to PFC, what consensus means to her? She replied, “A majority.” She also asked how PFC has reached consensus in the past?

Dr. Priest gave a brief on Quaker consensus. When one person disagrees with the group, one has to decide if the issue being discussed is at the level that it might imperil the institution. If this is the case, then consensus stops. If one simply disagrees and it does not imperil the institution, then the Quakers stand aside with their objection. You must voice your objection, and members of the body should be respectful. Speaking out is a shared responsibility. While PFC does not operate under Quaker consensus, we all have a responsibility here.

Dr. Pierson responded that past practice at PFC has been that no consensus is reached if one person who can't live with something. He reminded the group that PFC always has the option to write a report. There has been further clarity on this process, now that the BPs and APs have been revised. Also, PFC's “Decision Making Method” was revised in 2012. To his knowledge, PFC has never completed this step in the process because items with objections have typically gone back to sub-committee.

The body felt that there are processes in place and there are other pressing matters to deal with. We can revisit “consensus” in the future.

Dr. Spieler requested that PFC material be distributed earlier. There have been times when materials are received the day before and that does not allow for sufficient time to read. The co-chairs will be meeting one week prior to PFC on Tuesdays to build an agenda. Both committed to a deadline of Thursday prior to the meeting to distribute materials.

Dr. Pierson announced that materials can also now be found on the College website. While it is still in production, you can find the last year of materials. A demonstration was provided on accessing agendas, minutes, and supporting documentation. It can be found under the “Academic Affairs” web page.

Dr. Pierson referenced pages 17 and 18, which display two diagrams, are descriptive in nature. They do not replace BPs and APs but demonstrate the relationships among constituent groups when reviewing BPs and APs. Dr. Wetsman developed early versions of these charts, and they are an attempt to show the process. There were many scenarios to display, so we chose the generic versions. Dr. Priest used the word “relationships” and that stuck. We developed the disclaimer at the top of the page, above the charts, with regard to BP adoption and AP implementation: “The chart below is not intended as a representation of the review process. It attempts to show, as simply as possible, the relationships between various governance organizations at our campus.” These charts can be a work-in-progress, and we want to make note on how to improve in future versions. The attempt was to tie them as much as possible back to the language in BP 2410.

Katie O'Brien reported that in Academic Senate there was discussion of the communication breakdown once the Board approves BPs and reviews APs.

Dr. Pierson clarified that the Board does not approve policies, they adopt them, and they implement APs. Language in the charts has been crafted very carefully to that effect. Reneé also clarified that the President's Office notifies the campus community via email on Board actions regarding any revisions to Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. District Administrators are charged with making the necessary changes and implementing the policy/procedure.

Julius B. Thomas reported that in the past, there has been a breakdown in the Counseling Office in regards to communicating changes to staff. With this in mind, Dr. Pierson reiterated that PFC members must renew our obligation here today to return to our constituent groups and communicate information received at PFC to our respective groups. That is part of the responsibility of serving on this committee.

- AP & BP Review  
Attached are Board Policies / Administrative Procedures that have been revised (2 items):

- BP 3050 – Institutional Code of Ethics - [Consensus reached with one edit](#):

Dr. Priest reported that the sub-committee made up of himself, Dr. Foster, Robert Bethel (who sat in for Kathy Pudelko), President Dreyfuss, Yolanda Emerson, Sandra Rivera, and Trustees Pacheco and Santana met during the summer. At the conclusion of this meeting, the Trustees were onboard with the proposed language. They agreed with the sentiments in section V.

Sandra Rivera reported that, in the discussion, the Board members agreed that the Code of Ethics should not be used for the purposes of discipline but is intended as a philosophical approach. In the discussion, the two Trustees agreed. One of the board members was very clear that there were behaviors that could not be captured in policy due to culture and individual beliefs. Language would need to be added to the "Workplace Violence" Board Policy to detail behaviors that were not acceptable, leaving this policy as a policy of philosophical aspirations. The "Workplace Violence" plan will address specific behaviors.

Paragraph V was proposed to read as follows:

*"As a further demonstration of commitment to high ethical standards, employees of Rio Hondo College aspire to be guided by the following values statements. ~~They~~ ~~These~~ are intended as guidelines and aspirations to be used for educational rather than and not enforcement disciplinary (PFC) purposes, with our own conscience as the first and most salient means of evaluation: (Board subcommittee 7/11/14)."*

- BP 1500 – Special Rio Hondo Awards - [Consensus reached](#).

## V. Unfinished Business

- Accreditation Update – Dr. Pierson reported that The Accreditation Team Chair will be

on campus tomorrow for a pre-meeting. We will keep this body informed of plans as they are developed. There is discussion on the next accreditation visit beyond this one. Dr. Priest, Dr. Pierson, and President Dreyfuss will bring this topic up at the next ALT meeting on Thursday. We may decide that the configuration of the ALT Team will be comprised of a different configuration. While it was a good idea to have lots of faculty involvement, the last two years have been very intense for the faculty members involved. Dr. Pierson is not sure that anyone would want to commit at this point in time as faculty members involved for six more years. We should definitely continue to gather evidence. Certainly this group will have input.

- EMP Update – Dr. Pierson reported that the Educational Master Plan (EMP) was adopted by the Board on July 11, 2014. The Board also took action on the Information Technology Plan and the Facilities Master Plan. The EMP is a living document that will be revisited in increments of years 1, 3, and 5. Any program or unit plans should align with the EMP. The document is available online on the College web site. The Academic Dean will focus on tying their unit plans to the EMP at a retreat in late September.

Dr. Spieler reported that the search box function on the website does not easily locate the EMP. We will follow up with Gary Van Voorhis.

Robert Bethel discussed the topic of the one-year timeline. When will that work begin? Howard responded that we had a conversation with President Dreyfuss on this very topic, as well as at the first IEC meeting. Essentially, we are targeting spring for the work to show up. IEC is reviewing the strategic goals and objectives.

Dr. Pierson reminded PFC members that PFC originally had a sub-committee comprised from members of this body overseeing work on the EMP. Very little was produced, as a result of this sub-committee's work.

Robert replied that is the point he is making. Should the changes originate at PFC? If so, then we should be tasked with this now so we will be ready in the spring. Speaking on the topic of plans, this body should be involved in all of the master plans. It seems that they were all developed separately, and at least from his viewpoint, none are connected to each other.

Howard responded that the EMP and the IT plans are connected in the way in which Gary Van Voorhis wrote the IT document. There was input from the academic divisions in crafting that document. The Facilities Master plan was an update from the previous one and probably did not have the connection we desire.

Dr. Pierson responded that things could have been done better. We were limited on time, and the PFC sub-committee did not perform what they were tasked to do. Dean Green, Gary Van Voorhis, and the Distance Education Committee met a few times and looked at how strategic directions impacted the Master Plan. However, there was not enough time to have enough meetings. That is partly why we made a commitment to have the 1, 3, and 5 year review of the plans. The EMP should be the foundation for all the other plans.

Robert requested that these plans all be reviewed at the same time.

VP Gee agreed, but noted we are also required to send the Facilities plan update to the state on a set schedule, so that does impact the timeline. This time around we will have more eyes involved with reviewing the plans.

VI. Committee Reports – No reports, except from IEC and Staff Development, which were the only committees that had met.

- Basic Skills
- Facilities – Sheila Lynch voiced her concerns about those areas that do not fall into a specific program or unit plan. At the last meeting we discussed the possibility for the need of a sub-committee? Do we need to place this item on the next agenda? Who would chair such a committee?
- IEC – Howard reported that IEC held their first meeting and is implementing 2014-15 plans. At the same time, we IEC is reviewing the past plans and reviewing how we will update. Institutional Set Standards are important to the Federal requirement for Financial Aid purposes, as well as SSI and other state mandates. Howard announced that the Institutional Planning Retreat is tentatively scheduled for April 17<sup>th</sup>. Please let Howard know if there are conflicts.
- Program Review
- Safety
- SLOs
- Accreditation
- Staff Development – Katie announced that the half-day, all-staff retreat will be held on November 7<sup>th</sup> from 11 a.m. to the late afternoon at the Clarke Estate. Now that FLEX Day is over, the Committee will focus on this event.
- Staffing
- Information Technology
- Technology

VII. Announcements – No announcements.

VIII. Public Comment- No comments.

IX. Adjournment – Dr. Pierson adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m. The next meeting is September 9, 2014, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room