

RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES Tuesday, November 25, 2014, 2:30 p.m., Board Room

Members Present: Dr. Kenn Pierson (Co-Chair and VPAA), Dr. Vann Priest (Co-Chair and President AS), Henry Gee (VPSS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), Robert Bethel (1st VP, AS), 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), Kathy Pudelko (President RHCFA), Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad (Faculty), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Alex Ramirez (President, ASRHC), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Don Mason (Mgmt., AA), Dyrell Foster (Mgmt. SS)

Members Absent: Andrew Carpeña (ASRHC)

Staff Members Present: Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), Reneé Gallegos (Recorder), Russell Castaneda-Calleros (Director, GCR), and Chris Guptill (Dean, Arts & Cultural Programs)

- I. **Call to Order** – Kenn called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.
- II. **Acceptance of Minutes** – Kenn reported that the minutes of October 14 and October 28, 2014 were

2 Sets of draft minutes are accessible by clicking the link below:

http://www.flipdocs.com/showbook.aspx?ID=10006268_421381

Some members reporting having difficulty with viewing flip docs on their I-pads, not receiving the attachments, or accessing embedded files when links are placed within the PFC agenda. It was also reported that using a flip doc is not ADA compliant.

- III. **Co-Chair's Report** - Vann and Kenn wished everyone a safe and happy Thanksgiving holiday.

IV. **Information Items**

- Rio Hondo Adult Education Consortium – Russell Castaneda-Calleros & Chris Guptill presented and fielded questions at the end of their update. An informational handout was shared with the members present (attached).

Russell framed the brief presentation into three parts.

1. Preparation for the consortium.
2. Multiple districts are participating.
3. Vision was agreed to by members of the consortium.

Rio Hondo, El Rancho Unified School District, Whittier Union High School District, Whittier Adult School, and El Monte Union High School are the member districts. The next layer is the partner districts which includes Tri-Cities ROP, Basset Unified District and Hacienda La Puente School District. There are seven members /partners in the consortium. Montebello decided to join the LA District partnership. The goal here is to inventory all of the Adult Ed programs.

Chris gave a brief history. The entire process was kicked off by AB86 that authorized a planning process to form consortiums centered around community college districts to explore and create

plans to address the needs of adult learners. Efficiency in the delivery of services is a key driver. We also need to work on identifying and addressing gaps. The plan is updated quarterly. Several recommendations have bubbled up, one being the need for adult learners to complete educational plans. The future of this initiative is yet to be determined but we do need to come up with a concrete plan.

Our consortium is going to submit a plan which is built from the same template. Each consortium is allowed to customize to their needs and resources of each district. The plan is submitted to a joint council of the California Community Colleges and the Department of Education. As near as we can tell, the council will put all the plans in the mix and come up with a model. There are 72 consortiums.

Julius reported that he wonders what we are doing here at RHC when it comes to Adult Ed? Is there going to be a briefing to Student Services and Counseling so staff are better informed and understand what is going on in the process and also with articulation. Counselors should be involved throughout the development of the plan.

Chris responded that Counseling is a big portion of Adult Ed. The continuum of Counseling is a high priority at every consortium. There is general acknowledgement of this at the Adult Ed level. As far as briefing everyone, when we are ready to submit the plan in March we will present to the communities. To date we have had several workshops with people from the designated service areas including specific fields including CTE and Apprenticeship. We took input from the working meetings and worked through the Deans and Directors to invite staff to participate.

Russell reported that members of the consortium would appreciate it if staff were included in the ongoing dialogue. If any groups wish for Chris or Russell to give an update please let them know when and where. Staff are the subject matter experts and have a lot of knowledge to share with the K-12 experts. We have to have defined strategies in the five priority areas including:

- Adult Basic Education (ABE)
- Short-term Career & Technical Education
- Adults with Disabilities
- Apprenticeship
- Classes for Immigrants including ESL

The consistent theme across the board is counseling. We want to be able to plan accordingly.

Adam asked if RHC would eventually be offering classes. If a class is taught at a partner school who is responsible for the transcripts? What evidence will there be that a student took a class? Do the instructors meet minimum qualifications? Will they be considered unit members and will they be responsible for SLOs? Who evaluates them? These are some of the questions.

Chris responded that no this is not the case. Again, we want to debunk the myth that Community Colleges are taking over Adult Education. The partners are coming to the table who are the experts in this area. That being said, we imagine the K-12 partners will continue to offer Adult Ed and that it compliments what we are offering here without the overlap. We need to create a bridge so there is a pathway to non-credit ESL, to credit English classes and onward to degree completion.

Chris responded that the certification of faculty is more stringent at the K-12 level than it is here. Records will definitely be kept. We are still discussing that aspect along with the pathways. It is very early on and these are all good questions to ask. We are looking to create a regional data

base so we can see what level a student has assessed at. The goal here is not what school a student enrolls in but that they are prepared and this gets you into RHC. That is the model that we are approaching to pathways.

Julius reported that he worked on a similar program at PCC. There was an offsite campus where they Continuing Ed was and then students transitioned to the main campus. North Orange CCD has a similar program. His next point is have we not gotten to that planning part yet? Faculty had to go through the process and meet minimum qualifications. That is our expertise and the articulation has to happen with the college and the K-12 so the transition is smooth for the students to move on to ENLA, Math and English classes. Adam and Julius are on a state board and these are some of the questions that have come up.

Russell reported that we have a consultant and we can gather questions and information via interviews. That would be very helpful.

Chris reported that if a student takes a non-credit course, just to be clear, our instructors meet the minimum qualifications and students receive transcripts. There is discussion at the state level for the Credentialing Section to create uniform requirements to teach ESL so faculty can teach Adult Ed ESL classes. That is in the works now. Chris is also working with Mike Munoz and Counseling staff regarding non-credit students. In closing, no one that is involved in the consortium is interested in centralizing Adult Ed under one umbrella. The current Adult Ed providers do not want to give up what they are delivering. This is an attempt to realign services. The budget cuts that Adult Ed took were far more draconian than what we saw at the community college level. There are big gaps that need to be addressed.

Shelia asked Dyrell in the Student Equity Plan for the group over 40, will this be a dovetail to any of the Adult Ed. items?

Dyrell reported that in terms of this specific population yes it can.

Kenn gave accolades to Russell and Chris who have been very involved in this project as well as watching legislation. They have both been instrumental in guiding us through this strange process that began a year and a half ago. Kenn reminded PFC members that Chris is also the Interim Director of Continuing Ed. so that stands to reason that he would be a part of this initiative. Maria Elena Martinez Interim Director of the Grants Office is also involved in this workgroup along with some classified staff.

Russell reported that he and Chris welcome any input that is offered. Meetings have been held on Tuesdays and we have a rotating chairmanship. We will now be meeting on Wednesdays at El Rancho at the District Office. These meetings are also open to the community.

V. **New Business** – No Items

VI. **Unfinished Business**

- Instructional Equipment – Sub-Committee Report

Kenn reported that the sub-committee has been doing a fine job in pursuing the request from President Dreyfuss. To date we have met three times. Kenn acknowledged the committee members Suzanne, Gisela, Howard, Robert, Sheila, Alex and our dynamo Jeannie who has done a stupendous job collecting the information and dazzling us all. Howard has also been instrumental in gathering part and current resource requests from the planning software.

The committee looked at resource requests for 14-15 year. Some unfunded requests were funded. PFC asked that Kenn query the Deans for input on immediate needs in classrooms. The Deans provided an itemized list and Jim Poper was consulted on furniture. We also looked at the program plan requests for 15-16 that came in as of October 27th. Each committee member took one division and followed up with questions. The list was prioritized with the top three requests from each division. It was a very good exercise as it educated others in what goes on in other divisions. President Dreyfuss asked that we put this off for two weeks and hold a special PFC meeting. We are proposing to meet on December 9 at 2:30 for a brief meeting to look at the final outcome of the work of the committee. By that time, we will also have two APs in the 4,000 level ready for review. We will keep the meeting short.

Katie reminded all that this is a sub-committee of the PFC. This is our assumption that nothing will be changed in the work that has been done.

Robert asked what the purpose of another meeting is.

Kenn replied that he was asked to delay it for two weeks and can't answer any further on the matter. He anticipates that there will not be changes made. The committee functioned very well and it was a collaborative process.

Vann reported that he will be meeting with President Dreyfuss tomorrow and will follow up.

Consensus was reached to meet on December 9, 2014 at 2:30 p.m. for a brief meeting.

- Student Equity Budget

The Student Equity Budget was returned to PFC for review.

Gisela reported some errors in Item 5.5

Dyrell clarified that the two adjunct Counselor's salaries were transposed. He will make that correction. Adjunct Counselor costs are \$67,000.

Adam reported that his general concern with is that the Student Equity Plan is supposed to help students particularly to help students over 40, Veterans and students who are not doing well. It would be nice to help students that are targeted. The idea behind this is how are you going to identify students that are not performing well?

Dyrell responded that tracking outcomes is going to be our biggest challenge. This has been identified and we will have to work closely with the committee, IRP and IT. We can pass this on to Juana Mora who is the co-chair of this committee. We have built in some costs for research and IT support.

Henry responded that yes we will have to evaluate annually, however, he doubts that will be the case during the first year. We still have some hiring of staff to complete.

Sandra questioned the role of a facilitator/coordinator. This position would fall under the unrepresented positions under the AP. Sandra will follow up with Gisela who has a similar set up for the MESA program.

Henry acknowledged Dyrell's work since this is his last PFC meeting. Tomorrow will be his last day here at RHC. As for Student Conduct issues, Sandra Salcedo will be the intake person who will forward to Mark Matsui who is assuming this duty. For compliance issues, Sandra will take complaints and forward to Henry.

VII. Committee Reports

- Basic Skills – No report.
- Facilities- No report.
- IEC – No report.
- Program Review – No report.
- Safety – No report.
- SLOs- Adam reported that the SLO committee met last week and is addressing the concerns that came from the ACCJC. They will be working on those for the next several months as we await the ACCJC report in late January. The committee is on a good path to have things worked out in the next couple of months. RHC is hosting an SLO work shop on campus on March 6th. Alyson Cartagena has been working with this committee and various faculty from community colleges.
- Accreditation – Kenn reported that the evaluation report was received after our last PFC meeting. There are more details in the report and it was configured a little differently. The team wrote recommendations on GE SLOs, how RHC assesses SLOs, SLOs on syllabi and development of non-credit SLOS.
- Staff Development - Katie reported that the FLEX Committee enhancing Basic Skills Across the Curriculum did not receive a lot of workshop geared to theme for the spring FLEX Day. Staff Development is open to other workshops. The Teaching Learning Institute will host a workshop "Enhancing Basic Skills across the Disciplines on January 27, 2015 from 8:30 – 3:00 p.m. in LR 128. The evaluations from the all staff retreat were very positive which is what President Dreyfuss was going for.
- Staffing – No report.
- Information Technology – No report.
- Technology – No report.

VIII. Announcements

Unit Plan due date – December 12, 2014

Area Plan due date – January 23, 2015

IX. Public Comment – No comments were made.

X. Adjournment – 3:30 p.m. Special meeting December 9, 2015, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room

PERSPECTIVE AND EXPECTATIONS FOR THE
RIO HONDO REGION ADULT EDUCATION CONSORTIUM

A consortium is defined in Merriam Webster Dictionary as “group of people, companies, etc., that agree to work together.” That would be my vision for the Rio Hondo Region Adult Education Consortium, a group of independent local agencies agreeing to work together to expand and improve services to adult learners—not a *merger* of agencies.

- Each agency would bring its resources and expertise to the table.
 - The strengths of each agency could be used to enhance services to learners in other agencies.
 - The strength of each educational “system” (K-12 adult schools, community colleges) can be used to enhance services regionally. (For example, flexibility of programming and scheduling in adult schools and additional support resources such as research and development, marketing, etc. available through community colleges)
 - The strengths/expertise of some agencies could fill a “gap” identified in another agency.
 - Strategies will be developed to create seamless transitions into postsecondary education or the workforce, address gaps in programs or services, accelerate a student’s progress toward academic or vocational goals, enhance professional development, and leverage resources that will benefit adult learners.
- Information sharing among agencies would allow agencies to learn from each other and therefore improve services within an agency and among agencies.
- Common needs would be determined, leading to shared professional development, curriculum sharing, coordinated counseling services, etc.
- As information is shared, it will be determined whether an alignment of assessment, curriculum, data systems, etc. is needed, or whether an awareness and coordination of current assessment, curriculum, systems, etc. is sufficient.
- In order to serve adult learners, collaboration needs to take place among K-12 school districts as well as between K-12 and community college.
- Joint professional development, by program area or support service, could be used to introduce new concepts and strategies to all agencies, maintaining a level of quality throughout the region. This is also an important component to information sharing and awareness among agencies.
- System level resources could also be shared in order to provide comprehensive services and professional development—OTAN, CalPRO, cccc.edu, etc.
- Additional stakeholders should participate in collaborative efforts in order to add expertise, resources, services, and a broader view of adult learner needs.

Funding/governance implications:

- Adult schools and community colleges need to be funded separately in order to maintain their base program and be able to act as independent agencies with expertise and resources with which to share and collaborate.
- Local control needs to be maintained—use of funding, personnel, program focus should be determined by local school administration and locally elected school boards.