

RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT PLANNING FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES

Tuesday, April 26, 2016, 2:30 p.m., Board Room

Members Present: Joanna Schilling (VPAA & Co Chair), Robert Bethel (Co-Chair and President, AS), Henry Gee (VPSS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), Dr. Kevin Smith (1st VP, AS), Katie O'Brien (2nd VP, AS), Sheila Lynch (Parliamentarian), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Dr. Sergio Guzman (President, RHCFA), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Mark Littrell (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (CSEA), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), René Tai (CSEA), Sean Burton (ASRHC), , Dr. Vann Priest (Mgmt. AA), Dr. Mike Muñoz (Mgmt. SS)

Members Absent: Michelle Bean (Secretary, AS), John Frala (ASCCC Rep.), Julius B. Thomas (Faculty), William Ashby (ASRHC), Javier Cano (ASRHC)

Staff Members: Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), Ruthie Retana (Dir. Mktg.), Juana Mora (SE Coord.), Cecilia Rocha (Project/Grant Mgr., SE), Marie Eckstrom (Program Review Coord.), Barbara Salazar (Asst. Dean, SSR), Reneé Gallegos (Recorder)

- I. **Call to Order** – Robert called the meeting to order at 2:31pm.
- II. **Acceptance of Minutes** – April 12, 2016 consensus with edits on pages 4 and 5.
- III. **Co-Chair's Report** – Robert gave kudos to the Human Resource's staff who have been doing double duty lately. We have hired quite a few new faculty and staff in the last 10 months. They are to be commended for their diligence over the last year.

JoAnna reported that the District Assigned Personnel (DAP) Coordinator release time positions were announced for Staff Development (SD), Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Basic Skills. Applications are due Friday, April 29th.

Katie reported that there is a Non-Credit Retreat coming up in June. Will there be time to talk about that?

JoAnna responded that many in this room have been invited to the retreat that is scheduled for Friday, June 24th in the Board Room. The goal of the retreat is to discuss a strategy for non-credit programs at Rio Hondo, especially those that qualify for enhanced funding. There will be a small stipend of \$250 for faculty participants. Senate Exec was invited and we are in the process of reaching out for additional faculty.

Sheila reported that the incoming Senate Exec should be invited as well.

IV. New Business

- **Student Equity (SE) Funding** – Juana Mora reviewed the application process for SE funding. A rubric was developed and new proposals were collectively reviewed and scored. The recommendations were forwarded to President Dreyfuss who made the final allocations. Now we are in implementation and evaluation mode. We are putting a system in place to gather data and report progress to the state on an annual basis. We are developing an instrument to ensure we are collecting the proper data. This will be in full effect in the fall semester. More faculty involvement is needed to have equity discussions. To date we are having honest and sincere
-

conversations here at the college and putting practices into place. There are additional funds available from the state and we are hoping to gain \$200,000. If we receive additional funds, we will look at applications already in the queue that were not funded. It was clarified that the time to spend funds is June 30th. Equity runs on the fiscal year July 1 to June 30.

Henry further clarified that last year the Chancellor's Office gave us an extension of December. The majority of recipients spent all of the funds in September and October. We are asking people to spend funds before June 30. At some point there will not be an overlap. We will start again July 1st.

Robert asked when will you open up applications for the new year?

Juana responded that we have made a commitment for 3-5 years to the current proposals. Come July 1st we will continue funding existing proposals. We have to look at the data and if there is no progress made, then the committee will reconvene and discuss options. We appreciate the patience as we put processes in place. Again, we have to strengthen the data collection.

Suzanne inquired if the DSPS development workshops is for staff?

Cecilia responded that the training is for DSPS Counselors.

Adam stated two things; one is to close the gap in success and to raise everyone's awareness to have increased success. Much of the funding looks similar to things that we are already doing. Pathway to Law School is something that we are already doing. Do you have the percentages available of the new things that will help close the gap? Is it broken down that we are going above and beyond? That is the concern here.

Juana replied that one of the things was to be specific on the indicators. We evaluated course completion. As of now, we do not have the data to provide a solid answer. We want to be innovative and want to leverage the monies. We will keep everyone informed as things progress.

Mike responded that it is about addressing the disproportionate impact. We have to be cautious when you see names and services it is not just about creating new programs it is also about strengthening and scaling up services, increasing numbers, etc. It could be activities that did not exist before in a program or something that could be completely new. Some of the funding will help staff connect with potential internship sites to help shore up programs and gain new opportunities for students.

Cecilia reported that she and Juana will shore up funding and the indicators. They will share that information when it is available. The proposal summaries are not yet accessible on the website. This is another item that they are hoping to accomplish in the near future.

Mark voiced his concern about being so transparent and posting everything on the web we might have other colleges who help themselves to our new ideas.

Mike reported that out of SSSP we did fund items in the MSC, purchasing ALEX codes for the Assessment Center and Summer Bridge.

JoAnna thanked those who submitted requests. There was a lot of discussion at the Spring CIO Conference and she asked many questions in regards to how SE is integrated into overall planning. We need to prioritize funding, look for overlap, and if there are additional sources such as Basic Skills or SSSP funds that can be used. What we grapple with now is how to develop a chart, what our institutional priorities and when can we fund from different pots. This may be

something that we are bringing to PFC in the fall. We are looking at what other colleges do that we can apply here. It would also be helpful to have a funding list from SSSP too.

Program Review Executive Summaries – Marie Eckstrom provided an overview of Program Review as well as the new rubric that was used this year. The committee had a good discussion last year and found ways to improve the process. The rubric is for the committee to take a holistic look at components of a program including data analysis, SAOs, SLOs, etc.

If revision is needed, the Program Review Committee asks that it be done before the annual Institutional Planning Retreat. If significant revision is needed, that does not mean a program is bad, but they have to take a more serious look at what they are doing and present in a more meaningful way. Programs have up to one year to complete this. Instead of doing the program plans a year from now they have to submit the review again. Those who are tasked with significant revision are aware and have been receptive to the need for improvement. No one felt it was punitive.

Katie asked a question that came up at Academic Senate. For those that have to do significant revision will they be doing that on the new software?

Howard responded that he will provide an update on the software at the end of the meeting today. As for the committee, we had several discussions and it was interesting when someone didn't do their Program Review to meet the rubric, the participant(s) were telling us before they even began their presentation. Significant revision is given for specific reasons. A better effort has to be made. Marie and Howard are here throughout the year for assistance.

Marie called the committee's attention to the Institutional Planning Summary it shows you what the groups thought were the most important topics. Safety was the first one that rose to the top. In particular, improvements to the Wray Theater. Also, there was some institutional support for Banner and training in general. If you leave your current position, how will the next person know how to pick up where you left off? There is a need for "Legacy Manuals of Operation." Continuing Education has come up year after year. It is a potential money maker and we have to invest money to grow the program. It is an Institutional decision, are we poised to do this? Another item is classroom space and lab resources. Who owns them? How do we use the space? Certain programs do not have ample lab time. We need to look at this and continue the discussion on scheduling.

Robert responded that the Program Review has completed its cycle and evaluation. These programs will come back to us in the context of the Institutional Planning Retreat. How do we proceed now that it has passed?

Howard responded that we have the table groups come up with their top items. This is the first place this is shared. We are to create the Program Plans and Reviews for next year and the Institutional Goals, Objectives and action plans. This helps us update those plans. If something stands out, such as last year with the Articulation Officer position, then it becomes a funding issue and/or can be in the Program Review for the following year. Program reviews are also used during resource allocation meetings especially in staffing. Howard references the summary and if there was a top priority that is what is highlighted in red. The other ranking is determined by the number of dots that a particular item received.

Katie asked if users will be able to roll over (copy and paste) info from the Planning Software to the TK20 software?

Howard responded that when we get to the point of moving to TK20 for the SLO portion, our goal is to move anything that is in text files within the alignment of templates. If there was a rubric in SLOutions we may not be able to move it over. It will be similar to the migration from Santa Rosa to Banner. We are not going to turn off the old planning software.

Shelia reported that she thinks it is great that there has been improvement. It is great to see problems addressed and solutions put into action right away.

- **AVANCÉ Priority Registration** – Barbara Salazar went to the Priority Registration Task Force and is now here before PFC asking for consensus in support of the essential components as we target first year students. We are building the AVANCÉ program. The goal is to build upon the previous Title 5 Grant. We realize there are still gaps in the services provided to students who are in the Gateway Tutoring and Summer Bridge Programs. Services were not on going. In AVANCÉ we are trying to improve rates of persistence, basic skills, math sequencing, the summer math academy, providing a prescribed first year schedule, integrated success center and utilizing the LAC for academic support. All of this is mentored by a strong support network for students. For regulations, we are asking for the first cohort of students to have priority registration. It is essential for the students to get into these classes to stay on a prescribed schedule.

The following concerns were raised by members of PFC:

- a.) There has been a significant increase over the years in the number of students who are now receiving priority registration.
- b.) At some point we need to have the larger conversation about the 15-20% jump in these numbers.
- c.) How is Multiple Measures going to affect this?
- d.) What assessment tool will be used?
- e.) Is there an evaluation piece to this?

Mike responded that Multiple Measures and Accuplacer will be used for assessment. This is not a first year program and will also help with completion, that is going to free up seats because students will not be here 4 or 5 years. Mike has been tracking the El Monte Pledge students, who are completing 60 units and transferring.

Joanna reported that the goal through a strong enrollment management plan is that we have classes for everyone who needs them. We can improve to get cohort students on track. What about all the students who are not in a cohort? The real rub is when students say I can only come from 9am -1pm. Hopefully, as we get better, in cohort needs and high demand classes, the goals will align. Right now it is the first ones out of the gate who get the classes they need.

Katie responded that when a student is in a cohort they make the commitment and follow through. There was another request that came before the Priority Registration Taskforce and the committee did not recommend moving forward on that.

Kevin reported that most of these programs require full-time students so maybe the students who can't commit because they have jobs and outside obligations, so there is an issue for the groups who can't necessarily take the classes we may be giving to students who do not need it in that way.

Sheila stated that our prescribed fall and spring schedules for *Avancé* students may make better use of afternoon time slots, which are typically under-utilized. This would help balance our overall classroom usage for the campus.

Recommendation that *AVANCÉ* students receive priority registration – [Consensus reached](#).

- **Multiple Measures** – JoAnna reported that these recommendations have been presented to Senate Exec and Academic Senate and these are recommendations that have come out of these bodies. Reviewed the RHC expectations on English and Math levels. The Math placement percentage change (38% v. 1.1 % currently) is truly surprising.

Mike clarified that the 38% is broken out by Statistics and then it breaks out my category. The percentage is still high and this will change things for our faculty and students.

Robert asked of the 1800 students how many do you not expect to be on Cal Pass?

Mike reported that we got about 45% of the students we can verify on Cal Pass plus and the rest will be self-reported. The state is working with Cal PADS and it sounds like by October that we will be able to pull from Cal PADS. This will be an interactive process and things will get shored up.

Katie reported that because have the nine year recency, if for some reason a student is not in the system, will students be required to supply a transcript? This was recently discussed at Senate Exec if we are going to require transcripts to current students.

JoAnna reported that the Counselors will conduct spot checks on transcripts to review. This will not happen at the time of enrollment.

Mike responded that the model school is Sierra College. Placement recommendation is based on a student's own self-reporting. Sierra requires their students to request transcripts. Would probably want that on file anyway so as not to penalize students. For students that have started a sequence, the state says it is a local decision. Mike's only sense is that we have to fine tune how quickly we scale up, be thoughtful in what we offer at the Educational Centers, everything should tie to completion.

JoAnna thinks that this is all related to scheduling as well as priority enrollment, we are moving so fast. She thinks for fall that we should focus on new students and then scale upward. The Scheduling issue is a big one.

Kevin voiced his concerns when you have two students and one is in remedial classes and one is in a college level class. If the students talk to each other and compare how are we going to answer that question as far as a student's placement.

Mike responded that students are in their second year and they did not start the sequence are we talking about both? You never attempted Math and are you going to be able to jump to Stats.

Mark believes that we need a procedure or an appeals process in place along with steps to outline the process. We do not want to extinguish hope. If a student gets a better deal someplace else, they will go to that other school and we don't want that.

Mike responded that he is seeking consultation from other colleges to create a benchmark. This is catching on like wild fire. The difference is we are on the forefront to set the tone because we are an early adopter school. Students at Sierra College fill out a self-reported form online and they are given the green light based on what they provided. Irvine Valley College is being very conservative. Mike agrees with Mark's suggestion and Dr. Smith in that we do not want to create a system that will have adverse impact.

JoAnna and Robert requested that Mike bring back a recommendation back to this group. It will be helpful to know how many students are affected so we know how to schedule classes. We don't want to create a tiered system.

Mike reported there is two parts to this initiative. We have to discuss how we communicate to students; Counselor level. Let me do multiple measures screen shots or do you open up the flood gate, how do we promote it, it should be through Counseling then we have more control.

Mike reported that he attended their first presentation today, he thinks now we are on the forefront. Using the Sierra College model, Mike thinks that the equity issue is raised. Do we want to deny opportunity to students? IVC faculty were pushing back a bit. One of the faculty brought up if you have students who earn a "C" then they are less likely to transfer. So IVC faculty studied those students and the outcome was those with a C grade had a higher level of transfer versus those who received an A. This changed their assumptions. IVC faculty got to the point that this is a better predictor.

Mike will come back in the fall with some recommendations along with a marketing plan.

Robert announced that due to time constraints, we will return all of the BP and APs listed below to our next meeting on May 10, 2016.

• **BP's and APs (7 Items)**

- AP 3510 Prevention of Workplace Violence and Disruption (PFC Sub-committee / Senate)
- AP 3540 Sexual and Other Assaults on Campus

The following APs were pulled and reviewed by Senate with suggested language in green:

- AP 4021 Program Discontinuance (Senate)
- AP 4025 Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education (Senate)
- AP 4050 Articulation (Senate)
- AP 4240 Academic Renewal (Senate)
- AP 7211 Faculty Service Area, Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies

V. Unfinished Business – No items.

VI. Committee Reports

PFC Sub-Committees

- Safety – No report.
- Staffing – No report.
- IEC – Report below.
- Program Review – Report above.
- Facilities – No report.
- Equipment & Technology – No report.

Other Committees

- Staff Development – No report.
- Basic Skills – Report below.
- SLO – No report.
- Distance Education (DEC) – No report.
- Student Equity – Report above.

IEC - Vann reported that the TK20 transition for SLOs is slated for this summer. Faculty will finish SLOs on SLOutions and next year will work with in the TK20 software. Most of the data will migrate but Howard us unsure about the rubrics. Howard wants to make the transition as smoothly as possible. There will be certain groups that will pilot the software and others will be using the old planning software for another year.

Basic Skills - JoAnna reported that the Basic Skills Initiative Grant was not funded as reported at our last meeting. There were 19 colleges that were eligible but were not funded. The state is reconsidering funding those 19 colleges out of \$30 million they have available. More information to come next few weeks. The BSI CSU Grant is in the works. We met with representatives from CSULA who is very interested. This grant will provide Basic Skills to CSU students who are in jeopardy of being dis-enrolled. 75% of students have to remediate and have one year to do it.

VII. Announcements – None.

VIII. Public Comment – None.

IX. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m. The next meeting of PFC will be held on May 10, 2016, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room.

Important Dates:

Friday, May 6, 2016, 5:30 pm, Mid-Quad – A Taste of Rio

15-16 Student Equity Funded Applications

Activity Title	Funding Amount Awarded (15 - 16)
2.7 Revised: Math and Science Support and Expansion to non-MESA Students	\$ 40,000
CalWorks Student Success Project	\$ 45,000
College/Financial Aid Information Workshops in the Community	\$ 62,329
DSPS Counseling	\$ 97,400
DSPS Professional Development	\$ 7,000
EOP&S/CARE Counseling/Classified Support	\$ 36,100
Financial Aid Support Services	\$ 156,250
Foster Youth (Guardian Scholars Program) Transportation Services (GoRIO TAP Bus Pass)	\$ 2,000
Freshman Welcome Days and First Year Family Night	\$ 5,000
Fusion - An Adult School Outreach and Connection Effort	\$ 2,000
Gateway Tutoring for G.E. Courses	\$ 60,000
Guardian Scholars Program (Foster Youth) Counselor/Coordinator	\$ 117,000
LAC Tutoring for Basic Skills	\$ 55,000
Pathway to Law School	\$ 93,000
PUENTE PROJECT - STUDENT ADVANCEMENT	\$ 4,000
Self-Discovery Assessment Program	\$ 6,000
Springboard (Math) Program	\$ 20,000
Summer Scholars Transfer Institute	\$ 40,000
Transfer Academy	\$ 29,000
Transfer Support Services for Disproportionate Student Groups	\$ 40,000
TRIO Tutoring and Study Skills Project	\$ 10,000
Tutoring for Special Programs	\$ 75,000
Veterans Services Center Adjunct Counseling	\$ 25,000
Writers' Resource Center	\$ 160,000
Total Student Equity Funds Awarded	\$ 1,187,079



PROGRAM REVIEW RUBRIC (DRAFT)

	Written Discourse	Content	SLOs/SAOs	Data Analysis	Goals & Objectives
Accepted as submitted Or Accepted with suggested revision	The document is relatively free of surface-level (sentence-level) errors, and exhibits acceptable grammar and mechanics.	The document thoroughly addresses the Help Text prompts.	The document thoroughly responds to all prompts related to SLOs/SAOs.	The document exhibits thoughtful analysis of available data.	The goals and objectives reflect the trends, strategic direction, and data analysis of the program.
	The written discourse is coherent, cogent, and demonstrates unity	The document includes many relevant details and thorough analysis.	All SLOs/SAOs are addressed within the six-year program review cycle.	Inferences and conclusions drawn from the data are logical and cogent.	The goals and objectives include rationale in support of resource allocation requests.
	The discourse addresses a collegiate audience, with the commensurate tone	The document exhibits depth and is comprehensive in scope.		The data is used to substantiate assertions.	The Goals & Objectives are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Bound.
Revision Required	The document contains several surface-level (sentence-level) errors, and several errors in grammar and mechanics.	The document adequately addresses the Help Text prompts.	The document responds to some of the prompts related to SLOs/SAOs.	The document exhibits some analysis of available data.	The goals and objectives somewhat reflect the trends, strategic direction, and data analysis of the program.
	The written discourse is generally coherent, cogent, and unified.	The document includes several relevant details and some analysis.	Some of the SLOs/SAOs are addressed within the six-year program review cycle.	There are some inferences and conclusions drawn from the data analysis.	The goals and objectives include some rationale in support of resource allocation requests.
	The discourse generally addresses a collegiate audience, with the commensurate tone.	The document exhibits an adequate depth and scope.		The data is sometimes used to substantiate assertions.	The Goals & Objectives are somewhat Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Bound.
Significant Revision required	The document contains many surface-level (sentence-level) errors, and many errors in grammar and mechanics.	The document does not (or does in a limited way) address the Help Text prompts.	The document does not adequately respond to the prompts related to SLOs/SAOs.	The document exhibits little analysis of available data.	The goals and objectives do not address the trends, strategic direction, and data analysis of the program.
	The written discourse lacks coherence, cogency, and unity.	The document includes few relevant details and little analysis.	None or few of the SLOs/SAOs are addressed within the six-year cycle.	Inferences and conclusions are not (or rarely) drawn from the data analysis.	The goals and objectives do not (or rarely) include rationale in support of resource allocation requests.
	The discourse does not address a collegiate audience, with the commensurate tone.	The document lacks in depth and scope.		The data is not (or rarely) used to substantiate assertions.	The goals and objectives are not, rarely, or are otherwise inappropriately Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Bound.

(this space intentionally left blank)



INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING
2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING RETREAT
APRIL 15, 2016



PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITY RESULTS

- Review and discuss Program Review recommendations in your table group
- Agree on the top five (5) recommendations and list in order of importance
- Report out the number one choice and why it was the most important

*Number one choices are listed in orange

Group 1		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
Theatre	ILR: Address the serious safety issue plaguing the Wray Theatre (i.e. fire code violations, student safety hazards, water damage, rigging system damage, etc.)	8
Cont. Ed	ILR: The college needs to invest considerably in the program in order to make it relevant, viable, income-producing, and competitive.	3
Risk Mgmt./ Emergency Prep.	ILR: Initiate a campus wide campaign to ensure all employees and students know the protocol for each emergency scenario: active shooter, fire, earthquake, loss of power, etc.	6
Instructional Operations	ILR: Institute a campus-wide initiative to improve the quality and accuracy of the Banner data system.	6
Theatre	ILR: Augment budget to address maintenance and safety inspections.	0

Group 2		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
Instructional Operations	ILR: Institute a campus-wide initiative to improve the quality and accuracy of the Banner data system.	13
Instructional operations	PLR: Develop appropriate SAOs and collect data to begin appropriate and ongoing assessment.	3
Bookstore	PLR: Continue to emphasize the importance for faculty to submit their textbook adoptions in a timely manner. Consider incentivizing the process in various ways.	4
Economics	PLR: Consider innovative ways to include the needed lab component in economics classes: online lab, increase in unit value of courses, co-requisite lab course, etc. Or reduce class size to 35 students.	1
Risk Mgmt./ Emergency Prep.	ILR: Initiate a campus wide campaign to ensure all employees and students know the protocol for each emergency scenario: active shooter, fire, earthquake, loss of power, etc.	4

Group 3		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
Instructional Operations	PLR: In order to ensure stability and continuity (legacy training), create a manual of instructional operational responsibilities, including explanations and instructions of the support personnel's duties.	5
Risk Mgmt./ Emergency Prep.	ILR: Initiate a campus wide campaign to ensure all employees and students know the protocol for each emergency scenario: active shooter, fire, earthquake, loss of power, etc.	11
DSPS	PLR: Increase hours of operation/availability to accommodate all hours of classroom instruction.	6

Group 4		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
Theatre	ILR: Address the serious safety issue plaguing the Wray Theatre (i.e. fire code violations, student safety hazards, water damage, rigging system damage, etc.)	11
Risk Mgmt./ Emergency Prep.	ILR: In light of recent and increasing violence on school campuses, the college should consider a blended security program, with a permanent armed security guard, who, in turn, would be responsible for training other campus security personnel.	5
Risk Mgmt./ Emergency Prep.	ILR: Initiate a campus-wide campaign to ensure all employees and students know the protocol for each emergency scenario: active shooter, fire, earthquake, loss of power, etc.	3
Accounts Payable	ILR: Consider moving toward integrated financial software processing for efficiency and compliance with the increasing number of businesses that prefer e-transfer of funds.	0
Chicano/a Studies	ILR: Survey students about their preferences concerning the scheduling of classes. Use that information across all curricular areas to increase enrollment while responding to students' needs.	2

50 in

1 of 2



INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING
2016-2017 PLANNING PROCESS
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING RETREAT
APRIL 15, 2016



Group 5 (did not make a poster)		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
Chicano/a Studies	ILR: Survey students about their preferences concerning the scheduling of classes. Use that information across all curricular areas to increase enrollment while responding to students' needs.	0
DSPS	PLR: Provide campus-wide opportunities for instructors and classified staff to learn about better supporting students with disabilities.	0
Instructional Operations	ILR: Institute a campus-wide initiative to improve the quality and accuracy of the Banner data system.	0
Cont. Ed	ILR: The college needs to invest considerably in the program in order to make it relevant, viable, income-producing, and competitive.	0

Group 6		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
Economics	ILR: Consider a large-scale, campus-wide effort in offering 8-week classes to increase success and persistence.	7
Risk Mgmt./ Emergency Prep.	ILR: In light of recent and increasing violence on school campuses, the college should consider a blended security program, with a permanent armed security guard, who, in turn, would be responsible for training other campus security personnel.	8
DSPS	ILR: Purchase camera surveillance equipment for the DSPS testing area.	4
Economics	Establish a computer lab for large class size (i.e. 45 students).	4
Accounts Payable	ILR: Consider limited use of credit/debit cards for employee convenience.	5

Group 7		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
Cont. Ed	ILR: The college needs to invest considerably in the program in order to make it relevant, viable, income-producing, and competitive.	4
Chicano/a Studies	ILR: Survey students about their preferences concerning the scheduling of classes. Use that information across all curricular areas to increase enrollment while responding to students' needs.	8
Instructional Operations	ILR: Hire a 100% secretary to work with the curriculum chair, articulation officer, faculty, administration, and current Instructional Operations staff to ensure curriculum data is uploaded to the Chancellor's Office and is in compliance with Education Code and Title V regulations.	0
Theatre	ILR: Address the serious safety issue plaguing the Wray Theatre (i.e. fire code violations, student safety hazards, water damage, rigging system damage, etc.)	1
Instructional Operations	ILR: Institute a campus-wide initiative to improve the quality and accuracy of the Banner data system. (banner training/refresher for staff)	6

Group 8		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
Economics	Establish a computer lab for large class size (i.e. 45 students).	5
History	ILR: Allocate a specific adjunct faculty office for Behavioral and Social Sciences, separate from that of the Communications and Languages Division.	4
Instructional Operations	ILR: Seriously (re)consider the efficacy of moving the office of the Articulation Officer to the Office of Instructional Support in order to address the volume and magnitude of curricular processes more efficiently so that students receive maximal articulation and curricular benefits.	7
Risk Mgmt./ Emergency Prep.	ILR: Initiate a campus wide campaign to ensure all employees and students know the protocol for each emergency scenario: active shooter, fire, earthquake, loss of power, etc.	11
Theatre	ILR: Address the serious safety issue plaguing the Wray Theatre (i.e. fire code violations, student safety hazards, water damage, rigging system damage, etc.)	6

Group 9		
Program	Recommendation	Votes
DSPS	PLR: Provide campus-wide opportunities for instructors and classified staff to learn about better supporting students with disabilities.	6
Cont. Ed	PLR: Formalize and widely distribute a survey instrument to determine needs and desires of the community.	1
Cont. Ed	ILR: The college needs to invest considerably in the program in order to make it relevant, viable, income-producing, and competitive.	2
Risk Mgmt./ Emergency Prep.	ILR: In light of recent and increasing violence on school campuses, the college should consider a blended security program, with a permanent armed security guard, who, in turn, would be responsible for training other campus security personnel.	0
Theatre	ILR: Address the serious safety issue plaguing the Wray Theatre (i.e. fire code violations, student safety hazards, water damage, rigging system damage, etc.)	5

2 of 2



PFC, April 26, 2016
Enrollment Priority Consideration for AVANCE

The Enrollment Priority Task Force met on 4/14/16 and has the following recommendation:

In an effort to ensure that AVANCE Students are successful in persisting and completing during their first year it is recommended that RHC provide Tier 2 priority registration status to all AVANCE students. AVANCE students must have completed the requirements for Fall and Spring as outlined on the attached "Priority Registration Recommendation: AVANCE" handout.

The priority will be for one year for each annual cohort. The recommendation is to begin in Fall 2016 registration and pilot for 5 years.

Enrollment Priority Groups by Tier

Enrollments on the first day for each priority group.

Group	Tier	SP16 Day1	FA15 Day1
Veterans	1	82	102
Foster Youth	1	42	37
CalWORKs	1	85	103
DSPS	1	255	320
EOPS	1	491	365
Graduation Transfer Certificate ¹	1.5	44	-
Athletes	2	188	194
Honors	2	30	46
ASRHC	2	7	8
MESA	2	89	68
TRIO	2	29	33
PUENTE	2	22	21
Pathway to Law ¹	2	11	-
HS Service Area ²	2	n/a	454
HS Non-Service Area ²	3	n/a	419
TOTALS		1375	2170

¹GTC and Pathway to Law received priority for the first time in Spring 2016.

²Services Area and Non-Services Area HS receive priority in Fall only.



Priority Registration Recommendation: Avance

Program: Title V Grant - Avance Program

Timeframe:

- Priority recommendation to begin with Fall 2016 registration as a 5-year pilot
- One-year priority registration (Tier 2) for each annual cohort

Program Summary:

Rio Hondo College's new Avance Program is funded by the recent (2015-2020) Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI) award from the U.S. Department of Education and is designed to significantly build upon the work already established by the previous (2010-2015) Title V grant.

In providing a comprehensive and integrated first-year (opt-in, pilot) program, Avance aims to achieve these four overarching objectives to improve the rates of student success and completion:

- Increased persistence during first Fall-Spring-Fall sequence of semesters
- Increased completion of the basic skills Math sequence within first three semesters
- Increased degree/certificate/transfer completion
- Targeted professional development for faculty

Benefits for Students:

The Avance Program's key activity components include:

- **Summer Bridge – Math Academy** (*college acculturation, campus networking, intensive math preparation, and math re-assessment for potential higher math placement*)
- **Prescribed/Guaranteed First-Year Schedule** (see Table 1 below)* (*ensures students enroll/complete/persist in required and guaranteed courses during first-year*)
- **Student Success Center** (*integrated instructional and student service support*)
- **Faculty Professional Development** (*enrichment for addressing high-risk populations*)

*Table 1: The Prescribed First-Year Schedule:

Fall Term		Spring Term	
Math	4.0 units	Math	4.0 units
English (035 minimum level)	3.5 units	English	3.5 units
Counseling 101 (or other Lifelong Learning course, as advised)	3.0 units	General Education course (2017 only)	
		First-Year Seminar Course (NEW - beginning 2018)	3.0 units
General Education	3.0 units	General Education course	3.0 units
	13.5 units		13.5 units

Student Requirements:

Table 2: Student Requirements for Priority Registration through *Avance* Program:

Fall Registration	Spring Registration
SSSP Core Requirements (application, assessment, orientation, and educational plan)	4 SSSP Follow-up Appointments (with Counselor or Success Coach)
English Assessment (English 035 or higher)	
Summer Bridge – Math Academy (program registration and ½ day Pre-Session attendance)	Summer Bridge – Math Academy (two-week program participation)
<i>Avance</i> student contract	<i>Avance</i> student contract (renewed)
Prescribed Schedule (Full-time enrollment)	Prescribed Schedule (Full-time enrollment)
	“Course Performance” Checks by Faculty (“satisfactory” progress on initial Fall courses)
	2 Success Workshops (facilitated by FYSC – LAC Success Center)

Number of *Avance* Students:

Table 3. Fall and Spring Priority Registration Projections for *Avance* Program:

Data Sources: RHC_A&R (Spring 2016 Registration Dates), RHC_IT (Registration Code Data for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016), Banner/Cognos (Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 Course Enrollment Data). Prepared by Carolina Lepe 3/15/2016.

<i>Avance</i> Cohort	# of Students	Priority Fall Registration		Priority Spring Registration	
		Projected %	Projected #	Projected %	Projected #
2016-2017	200-275	42%	84-116	45.3%	91-125
2017-2018	300-375	42%	126-156	45.3%	136-170
2018-2019	400-475	42%	168-200	45.3%	181-215
2019-2020	500-575	42%	210-242	45.3%	227-260
2020-2021	600-675	42%	252-284	45.3%	272-306

The data (Table 3 above) indicates that there will be *minimized impact on all other student populations* in providing (one-year) priority registration for *Avance* students because the majority of *Avance* students would receive priority registration for Tier 2 or higher without *Avance*. On the other hand, *priority registration for Avance will be essential for those students who will not qualify through any other means*; this will ensure that they are able to enroll in the prescribed course schedule, which is a critical component of the program.

Data Methods:

- Because *Avance* will recruit from Summer Bridge students, the 2015 Summer Bridge students served as the proxy group of similar students. For analysis, the group was limited to those 2015 Summer Bridge students who registered for at least 12 units in fall 2015 since full-time enrollment is a requirement for *Avance* participation. This reduced the list of students from 310 to 183.
- The next step was to identify those students among the 183 who received priority registration on Tier 2 or higher status (e.g., DSPS, Foster Youth, feeder high school) for the fall 2015 and/or spring 2016 semesters. These students would not need priority registration from *Avance* and were separated out to avoid duplication. The remaining students would need to qualify for priority registration through *Avance* (Table 3).

Rev. B.S. 04/19/2016

Discussion Points- Multiple Measures Pilot Program

Overview

- Current Practice places the majority of students below college level
- Our first interaction with students conveys mistrust and the message of inadequacy
- Cut scores are inconsistent and impacts students of color disproportionately
- LBCC data- Accuplacer is a good predictor of placement or how a student will test. Not necessarily a good predictor of what a student knows.
- Takeaways - GPA a better predictor because it is based on longitudinal data, not just a snapshot in time.
- Success rates in college level courses about the same without the long cycle of basic skills classes (and costs)
- Transfer rates also affected data results
- Statewide Academic Senate recommends using multiple measures - students identified through MM are more likely to succeed
- RHC expectations:
 - College level English – using MM: 47.8% (current RHC assessment: 36.5%)
 - College level Math - using MM 38.4 (current RHC assessment: 1.1%)

Questions/Recommendations

1. How many students will this apply to? (all incoming students or just district high school students?)
 - a. District students approx. 570 students/all new students would be closer to 3000 (but not all students will enroll in math or English so closer to 1800)
 - b. *Executive Board recommendation – all incoming students*
2. Recency of GPA
 - a. Data supports 9 years
 - b. *Executive Board recommendation – accept 9 years*
3. Accept Self-reported transcripts?
 - a. Reviewing all transcripts a challenge for counselors due to volume
 - b. Data supports students self-report honestly
 - c. *Executive Board recommendation – accept self-reported transcripts and do spot checks next year to check for accuracy*
4. One-year Pilot Program
 - a. Propose to re-assess all students placed using MM in fall 2016 in spring 2017
 - b. *Executive Board recommendation – re-assess Fall 2016 success rates in spring 2017 to determine if changes will be made*