

**RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PLANNING AND FISCAL COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, February 28, 2017, 2:30 p.m., Board Room**

Members Present: Dr. Joanna Schilling (VPAA & Co Chair), Robert Bethel (Co-Chair and President, AS), Dorali Pichardo-Diaz (1st VP, AS), Sheila Lynch (2nd VP, AS), Michelle Bean (Secretary, AS), Mike Dighera (ASCCC Rep.), Dr. Adam Wetsman (Past President, AS), Dr. Sergio Guzman (President, RHCFA), Jeannie Liu (Faculty), Sandra Rivera (CSEA), Dr. Jim Sass (CSEA), Andrew Gonzalez (President, ASRHC), Robert Ruiz (ASRHC), Linda Parra (ASRHC), Dr. Vann Priest (Mgmt. AA)

Members Absent: Henry Gee (VPSS), Myeshia Armstrong (VPFB), Katie O'Brien (Parliamentarian), Robin Babou (Faculty), Mark Littrell (Faculty), Suzanne Frederickson (CSEA), Dr. Jennifer Fernandez (Mgmt., SS), Lisa Sandoval (CSEA)

Additional Attendees: Howard Kummerman (Dean, IRP), Markelle Stansell (Recorder), Dr. Mike Muñoz (Dean, Counseling & Student Success), Mike Slavich (Dean, CTE/Instructional Operations), Colin Young (Online Education Coordinator)

I. Call to Order

Robert called the meeting to order at 2:36 pm.

II. Acceptance of Minutes

Meeting minutes from February 14, 2017 were accepted unanimously with no revisions, corrections, or addendums.

III. Superintendent's Report

No report.

IV. Co-Chair's Report

No report.

V. New Business

- **Strong Workforce Funding Allocation Update (Mike Slavich)** – Mike provided an update regarding funds for Career Technical Education. There are two pots of money. There's a formula for which the funds are awarded directly to the College. Rio Hondo's allocation was \$1,220,672. There was also a regional amount of money for the community colleges within the L.A. District (including RHC) that totaled for \$18 million, for which we had to apply. The handout that Mike provided included only the totals that were allocated directly to RHC, however, we will receive an additional \$2 million from the regional funds. This will help fund a project in Biotechnology, a Teacher Pipeline, Career Pathways, and a Cyber Security program as well as Cooperative Work Experience with San Gabriel Valley. This funding follows our federal Perkins guidelines with very few exceptions and we can spend this money over the next three years. Funds were available to every division that offers CTE programs. Also being funded by Strong Workforce monies is the hiring of a full-time faculty for 2 years for a new Cyber Security program and the implementation of a new Orthopedic Tech program. It was noted that work plans, guidelines, outcomes, metrics, etc. had to be submitted to the State and they have accepted our proposals. The purpose of the money is focused on moving the needle
-

with regards to FTES through outreach, activities, radio ads, etc. with the ultimate goal of increasing enrollment and completers. Another benefit of the Strong Workforce Funding is that L.A. community colleges and Orange County community colleges have teamed up using the regional funding we received to build a large server room on the Orange Coast College campus that we can all use so that the maintenance is centralized on one campus. We may receive another round of money in July, but right now we are being conservative with the budget. The funding formula is based on CTE students and FTES, the job market around us, and the job openings in our region. A question was raised regarding the possibility of hiring additional Facilities staff since concentrated efforts to bring more students on campus often result in a strain on facilities. However, this won't meet the guidelines as expenditures have to be related directly to instruction.

- **Multiple Measures – Fall Data (Dr. Mike Muñoz)** – Mike presented the preliminary results regarding multiple measures based on data collected in Fall 2016. He began by explaining the different “buckets” and how those relate to funding. The first bucket is the largest, which includes everyone that has a placement recommendation. However, just because a student had a placement recommendation does not mean that they end up enrolling at RHC. The second bucket includes students that were placed and actually enrolled at RHC, so the bucket gets smaller. The third bucket represents an even smaller population and includes only those students who were placed, enrolled at RHC, *and* enrolled or attempted math or English courses; this group is the focus of the data.

In the past, most schools have relied almost entirely on standardized testing for placement in English and math. As a result, we found that the majority of students were placing below college-level in English and math, resulting in a barrier to transfer and completion. Research has increasingly questioned the effectiveness of standardized tests as the only measure to understanding student capacity, hence the push to utilize multiple measures. In both math and English, a student's cumulative high school GPA is the greatest variable that predicts success at the community college level.

The figures that Mike presented represent the enrollment and course success for students that had been assessed, placed, and enrolled in math and/or English. He discussed figures based on Accuplacer testing only (i.e. what would have happened had we continued our current practice) as well as figures based on multiple measures (i.e. what *did* happen due to a policy shift). There was considerable discussion concerning the variables behind the final totals, including the many complex layers regarding what the figures actually represent. The group discussed students who place into transfer-level math or English but choose to take a lower-level class and therefore may skew the data. It was also noted that historically, institutions have been under-placing students by only utilizing standardized tests. As a result, students who were “under-placed” in lower-level classes were actually inflating the success rates in those courses. With the implementation of multiple measures, these students are now being correctly placed in higher-level courses, so the students who are left in the lower-level courses are those that *truly* need remediation. This in itself presents new considerations. For example, by correctly placing incoming freshman into transfer-level courses, faculty teaching such courses are now faced with a population that do not know what it means to be a college student. Similarly, for those teaching remedial courses, there is an increased challenge, pedagogically, in assisting students left in basic skills courses since this is the population most likely in need of additional support and services.

Accurate placement is a very important issue, and the hope is that multiple measures will assist us moving forward. It was noted that for a student who places three levels below transfer-level, statewide they have only about a 7% chance of ever completing a college level math class.

This is clearly a progression issue, and there are many exit points along the way as the student attempts to reach college-level coursework.

- **Online Education (Colin Young)** – A six-hour introductory training session on the Canvas learning management system was offered to faculty in January 2016. It was noted that this session covered only a small portion of the functionality of Canvas and that the college should consider holding additional workshops to help faculty make the best use of Canvas. Feedback from the Online Education Office staff, at present, is the only source of information as to how well faculty are adjusting to the transition the college made during the fall of 2016 from Blackboard to Canvas. It was observed that more than anecdotal feedback is needed to determine the needs of our faculty who use Canvas and that perhaps a survey could be conducted to assess faculty needs for training and support with Canvas. The OEC chair will discuss these suggestions with the OEC committee at the next committee meeting.

One of the things that was also piloted in the Fall and was put into the faculty contract was peer-evaluation of online faculty. There has been a substantial focus on making sure there is regular, effective, and substantive faculty-initiated contact so online courses are not simply “correspondence courses” (which goes against Title V). In the last few years, it has been heavily stressed in the online instructor certification how to properly teach an online course and how to initiate contact with students, including regular announcements, e-mail correspondence, discussion boards, and timely feedback on assignments. To ensure these standards are being met, ACCJC would ideally like an administrator to go into the class to act as a monitor, but this is contractually negotiated. Therefore, the compromise is the peer-evaluation system when a full-time faculty member is up for review (for part-time faculty the Dean will review). Similar to the way in which instructors are evaluated for regular courses, peer evaluators have the ability to indicate a rating of “non-satisfactory” if it is found the instructor is not actively engaging with students. As a reminder, each Dean has right of assignment and may choose not to allow faculty to teach online courses if (s)he is not receiving satisfactory reviews.

To teach online courses at RHC, a faculty member must take a three-part module for online instructor certification which includes best practices, how to teach on Canvas, and compliance (DSPS). Interested faculty should speak with their Dean to inquire about certification as well as dates/deadlines pertaining to completing the modules.

The Online Education Initiative (OEI) is a statewide exchange in which a student from any college can take a class through the exchange that is not offered at their school. RHC is starting to participate in the exchange in Fall, offering a minimum number of seats which will have a different CRN. It should be noted that the logistics are still being worked out.

- **BP Review – Chapter 1**
 - *BP 1100 – Rio Hondo Community College District – **Consensus with edits.***
PFC members noted the incorrect name of the Pico Rivera location (to be changed from Pico Rivera Educational Center to Rio Hondo Educational Center at Pico Rivera)
 - *BP 1200 – District Vision, Mission, Values Statement – **Consensus with edits.***
Members agreed to strike sections I and II entirely, as well as remove the red text under the ‘MISSION’ section (IV). Edits regarding capitalization and general formatting (i.e. line breaks) were also agreed upon.
 - *BP 1300 – Legal Counsel – **Consensus with edits.***
Members agreed to change “an attorney(s)” to simply read “attorneys” in section I. In section III, it was agreed to add the word “legal” before “opinions”.

- *BP 1310 – Employee/Trustee Liability for Judgments – Consensus with edits.* Members were divided on changing the wording of ‘Board Member’ to ‘Trustee’. This was left as ‘Board Member’ for consistency sake, since a multitude of other BPs reference ‘Board Member’. Members agreed on the removal of the second half of part A (“acting within the course and scope of his/her employment as an employee, Board Member, or former Board Member of the Rio Hondo Community College District”) as well as various formatting issues regarding capitalization.
- BP 1500 – Special Rio Hondo Awards – *Return next meeting.* It was noted that portions of BP 1500 read more like an AP. Robert and JoAnna will attempt to move some of the text to an AP format.
- **Template for Committee Report Updates** – It was suggested that a brief template be developed and provided to Committee Chairs, requesting a written report of Committee activities. The template will be brought to PFC for review at the March 14, 2017 meeting.

VI. Unfinished Business

- No Items

VII. Committee Reports

- No reports.

PFC Sub-Committees

- Safety
- Staffing
- IEC
- Program Review
- Facilities
- Equipment & Technology

Other Committees

- Staff Development
- Basic Skills
- SLO
- Online Education (DEC)

VIII. **Announcements** – No announcements were made.

IX. **Public Comment** – No public comments were made.

X. **Adjournment** – Robert adjourned the meeting at 4:01pm. The next PFC meeting will be held March 14, 2017, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., Board Room (*meeting scheduled earlier in the month due to Spring Break holiday*)