

## RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES Tuesday, November 10, 2015, 2:30 p.m., Board Room

---

**Members Present:** Kenn Pierson (Co-Chair and VPAA), Robert Bethel (Co-Chair and President, AS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), Dr. Kevin Smith (1<sup>st</sup> VP, AS), Katie O'Brien (2<sup>nd</sup> VP, AS) Michelle Bean (Secretary, AS), John Frala (ASCCC Rep, AS), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Dr. Sergio Guzman (President, RHCFA), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), René Tai (CSEA), William Ashby (ASRHC), Sean Burton (ASRHC), Dr. Vann Priest (Mgmt. AA), Loy Nashua (Mgmt. SS) Mark Littrell (Faculty) Sandra Rivera (President, CSEA) Herzon Alfaro (ASRHC)

**Members Absent:** Henry Gee (VPSS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian, AS), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), Herzon Alfaro (ASRHC), Reneé Gallegos (Recorder)

**Staff Members:** Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), Michelle Yriarte (Recorder)

**Special Guest:** Colin Young (Faculty), arrived 3:20 p.m.

- I. **Call to Order**– Kenn called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.
- II. **Acceptance of Minutes** – The minutes of October 27, 2015 were consensed upon with one edit on page three.
- III. **Co-Chair's Report** – Robert reported Program Review is up and running and going full speed. Kenn announced Howard would give an update on Program Review, and Colin Young would join the group at 3:20 to report on OEC (Online Education).

#### IV. **New Business**

BP/AP Review (8 items)

- BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities – [Consensus was reached.](#)
- BP 2410 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures – [Consensus was reached.](#)
- BP 2430 Delegation of Authority – [Consenses was reached](#) with one minor edit.
- BP 2435 Evaluation of Superintendent/President – [Consenses was reached](#) with one minor edit.
- BP 2510 Participation in Local Decision Making – [Consenses was reached](#) with one minor edit.
- BP 2715 Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice – [Consensus was reached.](#)
- BP 2740 Board Education [Consenses was reached](#) with minor edits.
- BP 2745 Board Self Evaluation – [Consensus was reached.](#)

Robert announced that, starting in Spring 2016, PFC would be looking at the corresponding APs for these BPs so that we can have consistent language and dates of revision on them. For the next set of BP's that come through, we will be looking at a set of BPs and APs in tandem. When we have a Board Policy revision, we can make sure the procedure that goes with it follows, and we can look at the whole subject all at one time.

Adam reported that ACCJC, our accrediting commission, wants us to periodically review all APs and BPs. Adam asked whether there is a plan to do that. This is something we talked about but need to revisit now that we are on somewhat of an "accreditation low." When we might have a little extra time, it might be a good idea to try to identify the APs and BPs that are really old that have not been recently updated.

---

Kenn responded that this is a good idea, and we will address it more in the spring semester because we are trying to finalize those in the fall that came through from the CCLC update. Howard responded that ACCJC is always more interested in the process to make sure all of them get reviewed within a certain time frame.

Adam reported that we do not have a process and suggested we can start to do them now. When we go into accreditation cycle, this will be just one less thing we have to worry about in the future.

## V. Unfinished Business

- PFC Subcommittee
  - ❖ List of Instructional Requests
  - ❖ List of Library Requests
  - ❖ Membership Update – Kenn referenced from the minutes the members selected for the PFC Subcommittee for Instructional Equipment, include Sandra Rivera, Jeannie Liu, Vann Priest, Michelle Bean, Melissa Rifino-Juarez, and Adele Enright with the help of Gary Van Voorhis, Carlos Monteros, and James Poper on call as needed.

Howard shared the resource request documents to be reviewed by the subcommittee. He handed out two documents: “2015-2016 Resource Allocation Requests - Instructional Equipment” and “2015-2016 Resource Allocation Request - Library Materials.” Some of these items could be an overlap from what the instructional subcommittee had looked at last year, since somebody might have ended up putting the same request in the program/unit plan, which then went through the area plan, because they may not have known there was a resource request coming through the process. Howard thinks there could possibly be some things on these lists we already funded through last year’s instructional equipment review process, but that’s why there is a sub-committee to review and weed out those items that either don’t fit or have already been funded.

Robert asked if all this information was extracted from the area plans.

Howard explained all these items came through the whole process last year, and the document is what was reviewed at the Institutional Planning Retreat—or at least a portion of it because the President only pulled out those items that were instructional in nature. If there was a request that was not, then she did not pull it out. This is an bridged portion of that document.

Vann reported this list has not been edited but some items have already been bought.

Howard clarified that this list has not been edited. It includes anything that was in the process that has been deemed by the President to be of an instructional nature or library-related.

Robert asked if we know if any of these ended up on the instructional equipment allocation from last year.

Kenn reported there was some overlap. Howard agreed there could be some overlap.

Adam asked that, since these two lists have approximately \$750,000 listed on them and we have \$600,000 (but some of the \$750,000 might actually be pulled off), is it possible that all we do is say “yes” and approve all of the requests?

Jeannie clarified that we still need to look at cost including tax and other things. Howard reported the subcommittee found last year that costs were not correct; some were much higher. There was a lot of vetting to do.

Robert asked whether the committee knows how to proceed.

Kenn clarified that scheduling the meetings of the subcommittee will go through Sandy Sandello in the same way any PFC subcommittee gets scheduled automatically by the President's Office. Committee members will need to give her their availabilities. In looking at the time frame for doing this, Robert and Kenn had discussed next spring before the committee would convene, but now it seems it could be sooner.

Howard reported that he thinks the President was hoping this would happen sooner rather than later.

Myeshia added that, looking at the library materials list, there are three items that have already been purchased in this past process. These lists really need to be updated so the subcommittee has a better idea of what they are working with. Myeshia thought it would not take very long to have an updated list within the next few days and provide that list so the subcommittee so can move forward with how they want to prioritize the requests and identify anything new that rises up through the program review process, which can be added.

Howard clarified that the program review process is for the equipment that gets put in for the 2016-2017 planning year, so unless we change that process, it doesn't fit into this particular review of last year's unfunded requests.

Myeshia clarified there is a total amount of \$609,000 that could very well fall below the \$500,000 threshold. Will we forego the remainder, or how will that work, if the requests are for the year 2016-2017. Maybe we should just think about this when we get there.

Jeannie asked about all the items that were on the list that did not get funded. Kenn suggested that the committee needs to do that work.

Myeshia said the final list we ended up with last year was a total of \$425,000, but that was based off of estimates. Once the purchases went forward and we got true data as far as requisitions and P.O.s that were issued, \$413,000 was actually spent. Then, we recently had task stools that were ordered in the current year. There are three remaining items that IT is researching, including a projector for the Health Science and Nursing Division and a USB recording system for Communication and Languages, which will take care of the remaining \$11,000.

Jeannie requested an updated list of what is on this list that has been purchased and what can be crossed off from here.

Kenn asked Myeshia if she could have the list in a couple of days. Howard asked who had the final list of what was purchased. Myeshia will have the updated list of what was purchased by the end of the week. Howard offered to send Myeshia the Excel spreadsheets to make it easier.

Robert suggested that when we do this in the future, we should put an ID # on each of these request so that we know that item #523, for example, was or was not funded. Or whether it is the same item, like more computers or more stools, which may be overlooked as an item already purchased. It may not be the same item. At present, all we have to go on is a description, and even if it is a duplication, it may not really be a duplication. This would make the committee's work a little easier to look up items.

Howard reported we could not do this in the old software, but when we go to the new software this would be great to implement as part of the new system when we start putting the resource allocation part in there.

Kenn asked what the time frame is in which to provide the updated list.

Myeshia assured Kenn that she will have the updated list by Friday.

Kenn will advise President Dreyfuss and have Sandy begin scheduling the meetings as early as next week.

Howard shared that maybe the group should give the President a reasonable expectation of what they think the time frame should be so she can understand what needs to take place.

Kenn notified the group that he will advise Sandy to begin scheduling meetings as early as next week. If members don't put their schedules in Outlook, the administrative assistants think they don't have a schedule and then think any time is open. Kenn and Robert encouraged the group to use Outlook because it is a lot easier for scheduling meetings like this.

Jeannie reported when we first met, we had a list of all the approved things but we were not sure of the costs. How do we want to deal with costs this time? Should the costs be found first before we sit down and decide, especially when we don't know if the item costs that much or not?

Robert asked if these have to be re-costed who is responsible for doing that?

Kenn suggested each of the deans can be tasked with that, or else the subcommittee could do that. Sandra shared that the list will get passed around. Secretaries will cost things out, and Carlos Monteros will do audio visual stuff. The list gets passed around.

Myeshia stated that Carlos and Gary van Voorhis, as well as Jim Poper, will be considered as resources to the subcommittee, so if there is a particular item that really needs to be honed out, they will be available.

Jeannie asked whether we should send them this list.

Myeshia reminded that if this would happen, the list will not be ready by Friday. Costing out will take a lot longer and delay the process.

Kenn asked the members of the subcommittee to decide if they need the cost on the list—if so, be aware it will delay the process.

Myeshia asked the subcommittee if they wanted the list at a later date with everything on it. Michelle stated if it was left up to the subcommittee members, we wouldn't know the specific needed for this lower cost or higher cost.

Myeshia asked about the need to have the deans weigh in. For instance, for Health Science and Nursing, there are two basic GERI mannequins. She didn't think anyone on her team would be able to get that price. Robert agreed that it made sense to have each list price reviewed by their areas.

Rene stated that the Deans are not experts in the price of computers. However, Robert clarified they would know or have an idea who actually requested and they get updated pricing because that's where they came from originally.

Katie asked whether we are talking about two different separate sets of items. Because there are some things that we will need Jim and Gary to see.

Myeshia recommended that when the subcommittee gets together, they can separate some of those more specialized items that should go to the departments.

Vann asked that he would like to have a clean copy. The cost can come second. He would like to see what exactly we haven't purchased and what still needs to be purchased.

John stated some of the stuff that was costed out originally might be replaced with something different that would be cheaper or more expensive. Costs generally change in a year quickly.

Jeannie stated that she would need to put the other items from last year that were not funded but on the subcommittee list. She would need some time between getting Myeshia's list to put those items in there. If Jeannie could get the list Friday, she could add those items Monday or Tuesday. Once the subcommittee gets the list, she will incorporate those other items that weren't funded to create a master list. The subcommittee could meet and rank that list, assuming that the costs are close to what they should be. The subcommittee will get those costs vetted out and evaluate those items.

Howard commented that this is a good example for why we all need to make sure that the original requests have very accurate numbers, even if it is something new or updated, it is easier to say, "OK, here is the updated price versus being way out of the ballpark originally, which a lot of them were last time." We should just reemphasize this point.

Kenn reported he had tried to do that on the front end of the unit plans with the deans. For instance, with the Arts and Cultural table saw that was listed at \$3,000, he would tell the dean, "Don't give me a round number. A round number always gets rejected. I know the saw does not cost exactly \$3,000. Try to tell me exactly what that cost is."

Jeannie stated the subcommittee can still plan to meet Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. Kenn stated he will advise Sandy about the meeting.

Howard asked Jeannie about the list in which she was going to merge the list of what did not get funded last time. What would be on the list that did not get funded? What is the original source of that list--would that be from what the deans provided, or from the program plans from the previous year?

Jeannie clarified that there were multiple lists because last time, in addition to the list from Program Review, the subcommittee also went separately to ask the deans if there was anything they wanted now. So there was a priority list; the deans prioritized each area as priorities 1,2,3's. Jeannie has that all categorized so the subcommittee can look what the deans prioritized. We tried to fund all the number ones, so all the twos and threes are left, as well as what was left over from Program Review.

Robert asked if these items weren't in these program plans, does that mean they are no longer priorities. The subcommittee members will have to go back to the deans and ask. Jeannie offered to email the deans to see if the items are still a priority.

Rene replied to Jeannie that she likes her idea of numbering/identifying the items because there are things on the current list that look very much the same and we don't know whether they are or not.

Howard stated we will put a unique identifier for next year's 2016-2017 spreadsheets and make sure the identifiers are in the software itself.

Sandra asked about computer rotations. Are there monies to provide the computers through the computer rotation? Because we have a number of requests for computers here. Maybe some can be taken out if there is already money for computers.

Kenn suggested that Gary could address that, as an advisor to the subcommittee.

## VI. Committee Reports

### PFC Sub-Committees

- Safety - No report
- Staffing - No report
- IEC- See below
- Program Review - See below
- Facilities - No report
- Equipment & Technology - See below

### Other Committees

- Staff Development - See below
- Basic Skills - No report
- SLO - No report
- Online Education (OEC) - See below

**OEC-** Colin gave a brief update on the Online Education Committee's recommendation to move from Blackboard and switch to Canvas. Faculty can start building their classes in Canvas starting in January. Training will take place in January and February. There will be three trainers with Sable Cantus being the main trainer, assisted by Zulma Calderon and Gabriela Olmos from the Online Education Office. They will be training faculty in January and February and hopefully deans as well.

Sergio explained there will be a certain number of training dates in January and some in February to catch up with those who did not attend in January. We have 90 possible spots to provide stipends of \$350 for the ones that attend the five hours of training, including questions and support. They also need to have certification for online teaching. Once the 90 stipends are funded, we will use FLEX credit for training hours.

Colin reported most faculty were certified for Spring 2016 with a deadline of December 30<sup>th</sup> if they wanted to teach online. All but a handful of faculty finished. Those that did not finish are not teaching online until summer or fall but were aware of the deadline. The Academic Senate approved future dates for certification, so the District and Faculty Association may want to work on these. There will be rolling deadlines; if someone wants to teach online in fall, they have to be certified by April 30<sup>th</sup>. If they want to teach in spring, they have to be certified by September 30<sup>th</sup>, and summer by February 28<sup>th</sup>. There is an exception if there is an emergency hire; they would need to get certified within the semester and begin teaching online. Several weeks ago, ACCJC showed up and commended the College on its online certification and also with the course expectation letter that students can look at to see the expectations of online courses before they enroll. Rio Hondo is part of the Online Education Initiative (OEI). The broad plan for the future is for students to be able to enroll in online classes taught on the exchange. For example, if someone from San Francisco City College wants to take American Government online, they can enroll through Rio Hondo. We are part of the OEI, which is going to be using Canvas. Rebecca Green and Colin Young attended the first OEI consortium meeting in October, and by Spring 2017 Rio Hondo will start to offer courses on this exchange. Colin then addressed other minor questions regarding other aspects of online teaching.

**Program Review** – There are fourteen programs that are currently going through Program Review. Program Review had its first meeting last Friday on the first three of the fourteen. This was the first time that the committee utilized the new system that Marie brought to Academic Senate and PFC, where we talked about setting up a rubric to either accept the Program Review as is or indicate that it needed minor review or major revisions. The Executive Summary will go through a secondary review process before it is sent out to each of the groups, then after the committee is finished reviewing all the groups, the summaries will come to PFC, the Institutional Leadership Retreat, and Academic Senate. Tomorrow the committee will have program review for three of the programs going through. We will be completed with the peer review portion of the Program Review by the second week of December. All the Program Review Executive Summaries will be placed back into the plans online, so the programs can provide their responses to the Executive Summaries.

Robert asked when these get presented at the retreat, will the specific recommendations be presented.

Howard replied yes they will be presented as part of the summaries. The goal is to provide support. The committee put in place last week, as a pilot, the rubric so program members and committee members will all know more what the Program Review Committee expect. Once this rubric is fined-tuned, we will have it for next year to give out to everybody.

**IEC** – IEC is working to move forward with the process of the Institutional Goals and objectives by forming the work groups. Last week was the first meeting on Institutional Goal #2, and members have done a great job. Other groups will be moving forward with more recommendations. Next Monday, a group will review Goal #1, and on Wednesday Goal #3. Each of the groups should have a follow-up meeting before the end of the year. IEC is also working on revisions to the climate survey. We decided in 2014 we will do this survey every two years. A new climate survey will come out in April or May of 2016.

**Staff Development** – The Fall 2015 Staff Retreat is titled, "Enrollment & Student Success: We're All in This Together." About eighty-five people are registered to be there; half are folks who did not attend last year. The retreat will be held at Pico Park on Beverly Blvd. in Pico Rivera. Also, as the results from the campus wide survey, Sandra Rivera met with President Dreyfuss along with other classified staff to talk about professional development meetings for Classified Staff. Katie had a follow-up with President Dreyfuss, and they came up with the following recommendations. The classified will attend a half-day FLEX like event for classified staff professional development. The President agreed that we can try this in the fall, and if it seems worthwhile to continue. We can do it every year or perhaps every semester. One of the focuses will be to find out what is new in terms of processes and information with key offices, such as Accounting, Admissions & Records, Counseling, and Financial Aid. They are looking for dates that are reasonable. Sable also wanted Katie to mention that there will be some Tech workshops at the end of the semester.

John shared his experience at his fifteenth Academic Senate Plenary event. There is a new book out that is going to the Board of Governors in the next couple of days. The Senate has come up with a handbook of effective practices for Accreditation. It is a thirty- two page book that has been put together by Senate with all new standards. We did a whole day intensive review. We should get it back by January 2016. There will be a lot of explanation that will fill a lot of holes that we had when we were recently going through Accreditation. Napa College is the first college to submit under the new Accreditation standards, and that was done last month. Everybody is now looking to find out what is going on and what ACCJC has put into it. Last year after our Accreditation visit, there was a lot of talk that faculty were saying that we need to have yearlong committees and not wait until the last year before the Accreditation visit.

- VII. Announcements**– Kenn announced all Region 8 college Vice Presidents of Instruction will meet with Deputy Sector Navigators and Sector Navigators from the various sectors in January 2016. Also, at the recent CIO conference in San Diego, the Vice Presidents took a vote of no confidence on ACCJC, calling for a different format for accreditation. This followed the lead of the CEOs, who also voted in this manner. John stated our Chancellor's Office took a vote of no confidence, as well.
- VIII. Public Comment** – Adam announced that the Chancellor's Office recommended accepting the task force recommendations on accreditation to move away from ACCJC and perhaps move to WASC, which is the umbrella origination of the ACCJC. This will take place at the Board of Governors meeting that will take place at Mt. SAC.
- IX. Adjournment** – Meeting adjourned 3:54 p.m. The next meeting will be held November 24, 2015, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room