

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING AND FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, October 14, 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), Robert Bethel(1st VP, AS), Katie O'Brien (2nd VP, AS), Dr. Kevin Smith (Secretary, AS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian, AS), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Kathy Pudelko (President, RHCFA), Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad (Faculty), Julius B. Thomas (AS), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Suzanne Frederickson(CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Alex Ramirez (President, ASRHC), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Don Mason (Mgmt., AA), Dr. Dyrell Foster (Mgmt., SS)

Members Absent: John Frala (AS), Andrew Carpeña (ASRHC)

Staff Members Present: Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP/Support Staff), Michelle Yriarte (Recorder)

- I. **Call to Order** – Kenn called the meeting to order at 2:34p.m.
- II. **Acceptance of Minutes** – June 24, 2014, August 26, 2014, September 9, 2014 & September 23, 2014 – Kenn asked members of PFC if they needed more time to review minutes. The consensus was to return all four sets of minutes to PFC on October 28, 2014 allowing members more time to review.
- III. **Co-Chair's Report** – Vann greeted the group and had nothing significant to report today.

Kenn reminded the group of the last official word regarding Accreditation was shared at the last meeting. The campus has been informed regarding the outcome during the exit report. Transcripts have been created on the ten commendations and seven recommendations from the team. Please note these are preliminary items that were reported (emphasis on the word preliminary) that Will Llewellen reported on October 2nd. More information will be shared once it is available to disseminate.

Adam reported that he heard different interpretations of the report out on Standards three and four. One report was the team had nothing about those standards and the other interpretation was that there was a conspicuous omission. Do you have any sense which one is correct?

Kenn reported that we were prepped in advance by Will and there was nothing on Standard three and four. That proved to be true. It appeared that Will was going to read something about Standard three and then he corrected himself and said no. We were certainly prepared in advance that there wouldn't be anything on those two standards.

IV. **New Business** – No items

V. **Information Item**

- Kenn reported that the Emergency Evacuation Drill - Duck and Cover will take place on October 23, 2014 @ 10:23 am. The Statewide "Great Shake Out," will be held on October 16th. The College is not observing the 10/16 date. We are doing our

emergency evacuation drill, duck and cover exercise on the 10/23 as consensed upon at the June 24th PFC meeting when Jim Poper brought this item forward.

- BEC/BEL Training is scheduled for October 14, 2014. This in an attempt to reach out to new BECs/BELs who will be participating in the drill.
- Program Plan Update-Extension of due date of one week to October 24th-

Howard passed out a 2015-2016 Program Review Meeting schedule and a sign- up sheet if anyone from PFC would like to participate. Howard suggested that it would be helpful for people who were more familiar with program planning to participate. He spoke with Vann in regards to having two faculty members participate. Howard hasn't had the chance to speak to Sandra regarding the openings for the two classified members. He normally sends the list to CSEA and Senate and they find representative for the committee. There is room for two faculty members and two classified members to sign up today. There is room for Administrator's, SLO committee representative, IEC committee representative, Curriculum committee representative. This is a day long commitment. If you sign up for 10/31/14, 11/14/14, or 12/5/14 you will serve all day long similar to being on a hiring committee. You are there for five or six program reviews. Snacks and lunch are provided. It's a great experience to be part of this process.

Gisela asked about the program "Equal Employment Opportunity," is this a program on campus? Howard clarified that this program is part of Human Resources.

Suzanne asked for clarification on desktop services? Howard explained that this program is part of Information Technology. Desktop is their support for software, support for people that are users of desktop programs.

Kenn- notified the group that it he has been informed by Howard that 39 programs have not been opened including 2 slated for program review at the end of the month. Kenn asked the group if they wanted to know if their program has not yet been opened he would be happy to share this information with them.

- October 31-First Program Review Meeting
- Unit Plan due date- Extended to December 10, 2014
- Area Plan due date- Extended to January 23, 2014

VI. Unfinished Business

AP & BP Review (2 Items Returning)

- AP 7346 Employees Called to Military Duty - Vann asked Sandra if she had follow up on this AP? Sandra responded that she emailed Kenn and Vann to request that this item be tabled. The CSEA contract will always supersede board policies. Vann asked if there were any other comments otherwise we can move forward with this BP.

Julius asked for confirmation regarding AP 7346 paragraph III. Which speaks to salary - "In addition Rio Hondo may provide, on approval of the Governing Board, for not more

than 180 calendar days as part of the employee's compensation all of the following." Is that saying that if somebody is in the National Guard or serving when they are called up for duty, they can only get their Rio Hondo salary for 180 days? Julius thought it was for the year. If someone was called into Faculty and Classified get their salary for six months. Julius shared with the group that Federal law states when a person received orders, he thought they are supposed to receive salary for one year.

Adam stated that this language came from CCLC and with the assumption that the law is followed. Adam suggests that the wording Governing Board should be changed to Board of Trustees in this paragraph three for consistency.

Sandra questioned if the 180 days of compensation is on top of the military pay?

Julius stated when you are in the military and are called to active duty, you don't get your salary right. He thought active military were supposed to receive salary for the entire year. Julius is basing this on being a Veteran himself and through his own personal experience. Julius will inquire and this item will be postponed for further study.

Vann stated that AP 7346 states that active military only receives pay 30 days. Julius pointed out that the AP states that with approval of the Board an employee can get 180 calendar days of pay.

- BP1400 Acknowledged Employee Organization Rights-

Vann shared with the group this BP will be deleted from the Board Policies. Katie shared that Senate Exec spoke with President Dreyfuss at their last meeting and the thought was there is not a process for deleting Board Policies.

Kenn reported that this is the reasoning for returning this item to PFC. This is the first time we are formally deleting a BP. At one point it found its way onto the Board Agenda and it was pulled. That is why it's coming back here. Vann reminded all that the BP seems to pre date the existence of unions. It's simply obsolete. Kenn reported that it was the original language in section two that drew our attention to this, that the Superintendent/ President as the Chief Executive Officer of the Board, shall represent the Board in all relations other than to "meet and negotiate" matters.

Sandra asked why? If the Board is acknowledging the exclusive representative is it because that is already covered in contract? Why do we not need to keep this? If deleted, who would meet with the employee organizations to meet and negotiate? There are other items pertaining to bulletin board and items of that nature. Are those covered elsewhere?

Kenn asked if either Sandra or Senate has spoken to President Dreyfuss on this matter? Sandra stated that she has not and was under the impression that faculty was going to bring this forward to her. Katie reported that Senate was concerned because they did not know who was talking to the President on this matter.

Kenn reported that he understood that CSEA had spoken to Teresa about this.

Sandra reported that CSEA has not talked to Teresa about this.

Henry explained that he listen to the conversation between President Dreyfuss and Trustee Pacheco. This BP preceded the unions being on campus. That is why this policy was instituted. Now that there are unions on campus, the CBA's supersede this. So it's not necessary to have this board policy.

Rene reported that we had unions back in 2003 when this policy was revised. The date prior to 2003 was back in 1977. Why wasn't it deleted in 2003.

Kevin asked the co-chairs if there are PFC minutes available from 2003 to find out what the conversation or idea could have been back then. It was kept for some reason. This information would be helpful.

- Instructional Support Equipment Funds- Approximately \$ 425,000

Kenn reminded the group that this is the item President Dreyfuss brought to PFC at our last meeting. We created a sub-committee charged with reviewing past funded and unfunded requests for instructional equipment. Keeping in mind that deducted from this figure is the \$50-75,000 allocated for library subscriptions. Vann and Kenn discussed process at their last standing meeting. As reported at the last PFC meeting Howard is to assist us in identifying past resource requests in an easy to read fashion. We agreed it was more feasible to proceed with a representative subcommittee of this group to look at these previous requests rather than the entire PFC. Vann and Kenn agreed on this process to meet the deadline prior to Thanksgiving. Kenn reported that this will also be timely with the October 31st deadline of 15-16 Program Plans. The Subcommittee on Instructional Support Equipment Funds includes; Kenn Pierson, Howard Kummerman, Robert Bethel, Gisela Spieler, Jeannie Liu, Shelia Lynch, Suzanne Frederickson, and Alex Ramirez

VII. Committee Reports

- Basic Skills – No report.
- Facilities – No report.
- IEC – No report.
- Program Review – No report.
- Safety – No report.
- SLO's - Adam reported that he wants to begin work on some of the challenges that were reported out by ACCJC. We do not have SLO's for Continuing Education courses. Adam spoke to Chris Guptill who over sees all of the non-credit courses. He will also work with staff who are involved in the process including Mike Slavich who works with the vocational areas. We will start working on this to have the process started in case ACCJC comes back and says that this is something that we need to work on. One of the things the team reported out was they are concerned that the college does not have a mechanism in place to ensure that every single student receives a syllabus with every single SLO on it. One of the discussions that we have had and talked about in ALT and maybe even PFC is the idea of an automated process whereby we can get the information to students. In the interim, we can continue to encourage all faculty to put SLOs on their syllabi. The SLO committee will be meeting Thursday, October 16th at 2:30 to discuss some of those issues and continue work on the quality of the SLOs.

Kathy reported that faculty is asking if all SLOs need to put on course syllabi?

Kenn advised the group that they are expecting to see all SLOs on every syllabus. What we do internally to rotate certain SLOs for our assessment purposes doesn't have to affect the student. The student should be able to know all the SLOs for the entire course so they should all be listed.

- Accreditation- No report.
- Staff Development- Katie O'Brien reminded all about the All Staff Retreat on November 7, 2014. To date we have the following responses - 25 Management/Confidential, 32 Classified, 26 Faculty and 1 Board Member. The deadline for RSVP's is October 17th for planning and catering purposes. We may need to cancel our "Rio Got Talent" because we do not have enough acts. We may have an alternative activity.
- Katie also shared the Flex feedback: Summary of Flex Day Fall 2014 Evaluation & Survey-
 - Out of 209 responses, 48% were full-time faculty, 48% were adjunct, 3% were staff.
 - 97% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the configuration of our fall FLEX Day effectively met their needs. 1% disagreed and 2% had no opinion.
 - 90% agreed that the "Campus Updates" session provided valuable information, 82% thought it was engaging and productive, and 77% agreed that it would enhance their work for the college. 4% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the updates were engaging and productive and 19% had no opinion on whether it would enhance their work for the college.
 - For the Preparing for the Accreditation Visit presentation
 - 91% agreed that this provided valuable information, .5% disagreed and 8.5% had no opinion.
 - 86% agreed that it was engaging and productive, 3% disagree and 11% had no opinion.
 - 80% agreed this would enhance their work for the college, 3% disagreed, and 17% had no opinion.
 - Combining the responses for the two breakout sessions
 - 89-93% thought the session provided useful information
 - 89-94% thought the presenter was knowledgeable and engaging .
 - 71-79% would suggest a follow-up or advanced session
 - 80-90% said they could implement what they learned in their work
 - over 90% agreed that department meetings were valuable and useful to their work.
 - For our Spring 2015 FLEX Day, 19% of respondents would prefer a full day of department/work group time. 81% would prefer some combination of morning key note, breakouts, and/or departmental meetings.

10/1/14 FLEX Committee recommendations based on qualitative comments:

- Consider putting speakers in the Lobby of the Wray or have a feed in Café Rio as the theater cannot accommodate the entire campus.
 - Continue to consolidate information to have as few speakers as possible.
 - Make an effort to include entertaining and informative segments similar to Mike Javanmard's piece to keep the audience engaged.
 - Improve Power Points and presentations to promote effective communication
 - Working theme for Spring 2015 Flex Day-
Strengthen Basic Skills Across the Curriculum
- Staffing – No report.
 - Institutional Technology – No report.
 - Technology – No report.

VIII. **Announcements** – Kenn updated the group on Rebecca Green's presentation regarding Online Education Initiative (OEI). We did not find faculty to participate by the. At our last meeting Rebecca said that this deadline was impossible to meet. We had two faculty that were interested at the time but they were not able to complete the application on time. We had a conference call with Mike Munoz, Mike Javanmard, Virtual College Staff, Rebecca, Kenn, Belen and Bonnie Peters from Chancellor's Office who is connected to the OEI. Kenn requested and received an extension until October 24, 2014 to involve faculty to put their courses on the exchange for the spring pilot.

Kenn will be making personal appeals to faculty who have any inkling of interest in this project. This is an opportunity to experiment and if we don't like it we can pull it back. We really want to assist faculty in completing the application. There is compensation available from Title V. \$300 if the course is chosen for the exchange. Katie reminded the group that you still receive the stipend if you complete the application and it is not accepted. Shelia asked if there could be more incentives for this?

Kenn reported that he will be meeting with Rebecca and find out more about incentives and ways to reach out to faculty regarding this pilot program.

Kevin Smith announced that some of the questions were absurd on the application and it took roughly 3 ½ hours to complete.

Kenn thanked Kevin and praised him on a job well done!

Kenn encouraged the group to contact Kenn or Vann regarding BP's or AP's that may need to be addressed prior to each PFC meeting.

Shelia announced that Margret Griffith faculty in Arts will be interviewed on Art Bound by KCET. Shelia will send the link to the group.

Art gallery Installation – Artist in Residence: Rebecca Niederlander, What do I care? Part 1 @ RHC Art Gallery Oct 8 – Nov 6 all-day. Artist Talk and Reception will be held on November 9 at 7pm-8:30pm in the RHC Gallery

IX. **Public Comment** – None.

X. **Adjournment** – Kenn adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for October 28, 2014, 2:30 p.m., Board Room

DRAFT

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, October 28, 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), Robert Bethel(1st VP, AS), Katie O'Brien (2nd VP, AS), Dr. Kevin Smith (Secretary, AS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian, AS), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Kathy Pudelko (President, RHCFA), Dr. Gisela Spieler-Persad (Faculty), Julius B. Thomas (AS), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA), Suzanne Frederickson(CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Alex Ramirez (President, ASRHC), Janira Colmenares (ASRHC), Don Mason (Mgmt., AA), Dr. Dyrell Foster (Mgmt., SS)

Members Absent: John Frala (AS), Andrew Carpeña (ASRHC)

Staff Members Present: Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP/Support Staff), Reneé Gallegos (Recorder)

- I. **Call to Order** – Vann called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.
- II. Acceptance of Minutes – (4 sets) June 24, August 26, September 9, September 23, 2014
4 Sets of draft minutes are accessible by clicking the link below:

http://www.flipdocs.com/showbook.aspx?ID=10006268_574846

PFC reviewed the four sets of minutes one last time for clarity and to allow ample time for members to review. PFC reached consensus to accept the minutes of June 24, August 26, September 9 and September 23, 2014. The minutes of October 14 and October 28 will be presented on November 11th.

- III. **Co-Chair's Report** - Kenn reported on the work of the first subcommittee meeting on Instructional Equipment. Gisela will provide a briefing later in the meeting.

Sheila had a question and did not know where to bring it up. She asked, when Rio Hondo submits an application for a program to be developed into a 4-year Bachelor's degree program, could PFC look at the fiscal impact first? What is the price going to be for the students? Is there any possibility of talking about this before the November 12 application deadline?

Kenn reported that an application is not being filed on November 12, but rather a Letter of Intent to submit a proposal. Kenn mentioned that the 4-year idea was discussed extensively back in April 2014 at a CIO Conference. The chatter was mostly about a 4- year nursing degree because hospitals are mandating that nurses be in training for a Bachelor's program to grant them clinical experiences. Since then, legislation was passed and signed by the Governor on September 29th for a pilot project for 15 Community College Districts statewide to propose offering a 4-year degree to start in 2017. Later, we learned that the community college 4-year degree programs cannot compete with 4-year degree programs offered at CSUs and UCs. That caused us to do a reversal with Nursing as a possible program. We also learned that only one degree program will be granted to each of the 15 Community College districts that apply.

Kenn mentioned that, while legislation was going through the process, members of the Rio Hondo Community—administrators and some faculty—began developing ideas for potential 4-year

degrees. It was also previously discussed at Deans Council as well. Kenn shared with Vann and President Dreyfuss this morning the three proposals that have percolated up (Automotive Technology, Homeland Security, and Digital Arts with a sub-specialization in Game Art). One of the three can be proposed to the State once Academic Senate weighs in. Part of the agreement requires local Senate approval for Districts submitting a proposal. There is no funding available from the state at this time to support the 15 4-year degree programs. We are beginning to have these discussions now on the financial impact.

Sheila reported that there is concern on the approach that will be taken in terms of deciding which proposal moves forward. It cannot be a popularity contest. Hopefully, the strengths of the proposals and the supporting data will assist in the decision making process.

Kenn requested that Reneé send the outlines of each proposal to Vann, who will then discuss them at the next Academic Senate meeting on November 4, 2014. Kenn also requested cost projections from the three Deans who submitted proposals. Any proposal that moves forward would be housed in the respective Division.

Don gave a short overview on the Homeland Security proposal. Right now, there are many for-profit schools offering a Homeland Security degree/certificate, which is counter intuitive to what it is designed to do. If someone wanted to do the analysis of First Responders, that is what this degree is designed to do. The other caveat is: Where is the job market? Homeland Security is a growing field and is in high demand.

Kenn reported that the Homeland Security idea percolated up in the summer through the efforts of Deans Flores and Mason and faculty member Tracy Rickman. While the Homeland Security proposal was presented as a first draft, along with those from the other two programs, we were not informed of the state's limitation of "one proposal per district" until recently.

Kenn reported that last spring we formed a consortium for Adult Ed and were watching legislation. This is another instance where the idea precedes the law and specifics. There was funding this year to help plan. The District did not receive any money for this. Chris Guptill and Russell Castaneda-Calleros will be invited to give an update to the PFC on Adult Ed. It is a massive undertaking and they can speak to it more concretely.

IV. **New Business**

- **Student Equity Plan-** Dyrell Foster gave an update on the Student Equity Plan. The last plan had been developed in 2005, so the Student Equity Committee basically started from scratch. Dyrell provided two additional handouts: 1) California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Student Equity 2014-15 Expenditure Guidelines, dated September 2, 2014, which outlines acceptable and unacceptable uses of Student Equity Funds for FY 2014-2015 2) an additional document prepared by Jim Sass from IRP titled "Campus Based Research." Dr. Foster clarified that we are not targeting reentry students at this time. Some members of PFC voiced their preference for having a re-entry program that could be housed in the Career Center. Dyrell reported we are not going to develop new programs or processes to recruit students. We are going to ramp up our efforts in how we can assist existing services to help our students. We cannot supplant funds spent on other District costs, such as on faculty salaries or on generating FTES. We can spend on items that provide student support.

A budget is being developed now and can be shared at the next PFC meeting. No dollars have been spent on the planning portion of this process. We have used existing staff to complete the plan thus far. President Dreyfuss will forward the Student Equity Plan to the Board on November 12, 2014 for approval.

Dyrell also reported the challenges with collecting accurate data on our students. There may be discrepancies, in that our student population does not mirror that of our surrounding community. We have an influx of students who do not identify themselves or who are bi-racial. Our numbers reflect a 10% in the “unknown” category.

Dyrell is unsure how the Chancellor’s Office is going to assess outcomes in regard to colleges reaching established benchmarks, etc. There have been some cost savings because funds were available at the start of this fiscal year (2014-15). This is why we need to get the plan approved now. If we don’t spend the money, it may be looked at unfavorably. The Chancellor’s Office has not stipulated what will happen with unused funds.

Dyrell went on to explain the types of activities that will be funded with these dollars. We will be working with tutors along with the Basic Skills Committee to increase services. He hopes to have the budget portion finalized by the end of next week. This information can be shared at the November 11 PFC meeting, which Dyrell will not be able to attend. He will pass this information on to Vann and Kenn. Dyrell has met with the Vice Presidents and with President Dreyfuss to keep them informed of our progress.

The following questions were asked:

1. Is there a possibility of looking at administrative support, counseling, or even part of the Dean’s salary to carry out these responsibilities (Adam)?
2. Can we spend on the Summer Bridge program (Adam)?
3. What is categorized as direct student support—does that cover materials and student transportation (Katie)?
4. Do we have the latitude to increase classified staff in Financial Aid, for example (Sandra)?
5. For programs such as ENLA, the books available for check out in the Library are very limited. Is there a possibility of increasing copies to service more students (Sandra)?

Dyrell responded that some funds will be spent on salaries, which as of right now include Financial Aid, tutoring, and counseling, to provide additional support. We can expand Summer Bridge. We can spend monies on direct student support as long as it is for high risk populations. Again, it is a lot of money to spend and we are almost half way through the year. Dyrell is passing the baton to Henry Gee once the plan is in place, due to a promotional opportunity elsewhere. There have to be priorities instituted to run efficiently.

Henry clarified that we can’t charge Dyrell’s salary to these funds. However, if we hire a Student Equity Project Manager, we can charge that employee’s salary to this budget. There will be more to come on this topic at a later time.

- **Subcommittee on Instructional Equipment** – Gisela reported that one meeting has been held to date. The charge of this committee is how to spend \$425,000 in one-time funds. Our deadline for a recommendation to President Dreyfuss is November 26, 2014.

Vann and Kenn talked about having a general discussion with PFC to give guidance to the subcommittee. Originally, the committee was going to look at what was not funded last year. Those request have already been prioritized. This year’s requests have yet to be ranked and are due on October 31. We can go with what was not funded and see what is in the program plans this year to compare. The committee had some questions here, and that is where we left off our discussion. Kenn had an idea regarding recurring items/themes. Is there one consistent

item that has surfaced that may be considered one large project that would benefit the institution as a whole? An example came to mind is that, last funding year, three different divisions requested document cameras. It seemed to be an emerging need across campus. Looking at the needs of all classrooms on campus, purchase of document cameras is an example of a project that could benefit students campus wide. Kenn is not advocating for document cameras but merely using this as an example.

Sheila reported that we do not have a contingency plan for equipment that breaks, becomes outdated, or simply disappeared. These types of items are not typically mentioned in the program plans. Many of our supply budgets were cut in the past year or two, which is something to consider since supply costs keep rising.

Adam suggested that his classroom is in dire need up updated technology. The Deans can solicit input from the faculty as to what needs to be fixed before further damage occurs. He recommends that we get one complete list from the Deans on classroom needs.

Howard responded that, hopefully, these needs should be in program plans.

Adam replied that faculty put items in the planning process every year and nothing happens. If we collect this information ASAP, then we will have a more accurate picture of needs.

Kenn reported that he tries to marry requests to the program/unit plans. One thing that is apparent in program planning is there are some really simple, quick fixes that departments need such as glass equipment. We are not talking about paper and pencil supplies but those that support instruction.

Sandra reported that if we look at technology, we must standardize it. We also have a lot of equipment that is on its "last legs." She had one request but is uncertain where it should go. The signage equipment that services the entire campus is at the breaking point. If that belongs in a program plan, who should that belong to? The existing equipment was purchased by Facilities through the Bond, but it has always been housed in the Library.

VPAA recommended that this would not be a "No man's land item." The equipment is housed and maintained in the Library, therefore that is what program plan should request its replacement.

Sheila likes the thought of Elmos in some classroom but not in others. To piggyback on the standardization theme this is the reason having the Dean's input is critical in this process. There will be different needs in different areas.

Kenn will query the deans to confer with their faculty about immediate classroom needs and report back to the subcommittee.

Suzanne requested that the Student Service deans be included in this action. All agreed.

- **AP & BP Review (5 Items)**

- BP 2716 Political Activity – [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 3200 Accreditation (New Business) – [Consensus reached.](#)
- AP 3200 Accreditation (New Business) – [Consensus reached.](#)
- AP 2712 Conflict of Interest and Disclosure – [Consensus reached.](#)
- AP 5130 Financial Aid – this item was pulled at the request of CSEA President for further review. Katie O'Brien was directed to send her additional suggestions to Yvonne Gutierrez-Sandoval and Monika Acosta in Financial Aid.

V. **Unfinished Business**

- **AP & BP Review (2 Items) returning from 10/14**

- AP 7346 Employees Called to Military Duty – [Consensus reached.](#)
- BP 1400 Acknowledged Employee Organizations Rights – [Consensus reached to delete this obsolete BP.](#)

VI. **Information Items**

- First Program Review Meeting – Vann announced that the Program Review Committee is in need of one more faculty member to attend the meeting on November 14th. He asked for volunteers. No one responded. He will reach out to all faculty via email. The first program review meeting will be held on Friday, October 31, 2014.

Sandra asked for clarification on the program reviews for this year. Howard responded that there are 17 program reviews going through the process this year. He has a schedule posted on the IRP website.

- 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 – Howard reported that the IEC is reviewing new software IEC. There were some reports of the software crashing the day before plans were due. That sometimes happens when there are multiple users in the system. The IEC discussed two additional types of software today and will look at one more. We are looking for software that ties unit plans as well as linkages to Accreditation Standards.
- Program Review - Howard reported that most program plans are submitted, but there are a few pending.
- Safety - No report.
- SLOs – Adam reported that the SLO Committee met last week. They discussed the preliminary recommendations made by the Accreditation Team. The committee also discussed the process for updating SLOS and the SLO website. They are going to continue to work on issues related to SLOs.
- Accreditation – No report.
- Staff Development – No report.
- Staffing – No report.
- Information Technology – No report.
- Technology – No report.

- VIII. **Announcements** – Henry reported that the Student Equity Committee has been an outstanding committee under the leadership of Dyrell and Juana Mora. The Committee is a cross-representation from all constituent groups. Dyrell will be moving on to a Vice President of Student Services position at Moreno Valley Community College. Jobs were posted today by HR to fill Dyrell's position, and it is Henry's hope that we will have a new Dean and Director of A & R in January 2015.

If we backtrack a few years ago when he brought a reorg forward to PFC, it was not received very well. This year going forward, Henry has shared with Vann and Kathy today that he may bring another reorg forward due to SSSP, Student Equity initiatives, and filling the vacant position of Dr. Walter Jones. He has solicited feedback from SSPLC, who were asked how to align our services. SSPLC had questions. Are we meeting the needs of our students. Henry did not influence organizational perspectives, preferring that the process be organic. When Henry submits his area plan in January, that will be a part of the planning process. He wanted to put this out there now so there are no surprises.

Adam commented that one thing that he noticed was that in the Announcement for the Director of Admissions and Records, the position is downgraded in salary. What was the rationale behind this decision?

Henry responded that the Board approves job descriptions and salaries. We based this on the ACCCA salary survey. Our A & R position is ranked 7th based on grouping among single-college districts. Out of 40 college districts, we want to align in the top 15 and want to be competitive in terms of salary, but we do not want to be in the top 10. Judy Pearson, our current A & R Director, will be retiring in December.

Sheila asked about the current Student Services org chart. What is the rationale to fly the Dean of Student Affairs if Henry is intending on a reorganization? Why are we hiring first and doing a reorg second? You might have duties that will change. Wouldn't it make more sense to have an interim in the meantime? How do we know we have the right candidate if we don't know what the job is going to look like down the road?

Henry responded that both positions are too important not to fill now. By the time this goes through the process of hiring, he has no idea what the structure will look like. As it is now, Dr. Jones' position has been vacant for almost 2 years. Henry is hoping that we will attract qualified individuals.

Robert asked who will be taking over the compliance office duties after Dyrell leaves?

Henry responded we are required to have Compliance duties at the College because of Title IX, as well as Student Conduct. Our structure is unique. At similar colleges, compliance belongs under the Finance & Business umbrella or under Human Resources. I do not know what we are going to do with that. Henry believes this does not belong in Student Services or Academic Affairs. Many times when Dyrell conducts investigations, we contract with attorneys. There will be more to come as things progress

- IX. **Public Comment** – No comments.

- X. **Adjournment** – Vann adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m. The next PFC meeting will be held on November 11, 2014, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room.