San Bernardino Community College District
Study Session of the Board of Trustees
114 S. Del Rosa Drive, San Bernardino, CA 92408
Thursday, September 23, 2010 – 4:00 p.m. – Board Room

1.   **CALL TO ORDER – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

2.   **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The San Bernardino Community College Board of Trustees welcomes public comment on issues within the jurisdiction of the District. Comments should be limited to five (5) minutes per speaker and twenty (20) minutes per topic if there is more than one speaker. At the conclusion of public comment, the Board may ask staff to review a matter or may ask that a matter be put on a future agenda. Members of the Board, however, may not discuss or take legal action on matters raised during public comment unless the matters are properly noticed for discussion and legal action. Finally, be advised that District personnel and processes are available for further communication.

3.   **ACCREDITATION REPORT REVIEW**

4.   **ADJOURN – The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be Thursday, October 14, 2010.**

CRAFTON HILLS COLLEGE
11711 Sand Canyon Road
Yucaipa, CA 92399

<College Logo Here>

FOLLOW-UP REPORT

This report summarizes progress on Evaluation Team Recommendations made during the October 6-9, 2008 site visit to Crafton Hills College.

October 15, 2010

Presented to the Board of Trustees for Review on September 23, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement on Report Preparation

This Follow-Up Report addresses the seven recommendations noted in the January 29, 2010 action letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) that continued Crafton Hills College (CHC) on Probation. It shows that since February 2009, Crafton Hills College faculty, staff, and administrators have made focused evaluation and improvement in the following areas a top priority:

- Integrated planning and program review processes and quantitative effectiveness measures
- Long-term fiscal plans and access to financial information
- Data reliability, access, and training
- Participation in planning and decision-making

In addition, it shows that the District has fulfilled the following requirements:

- Development of the District program review process
- Development of the District strategic plan
- Development of the District strategic plan for technology
- Development of the District human resources plan
- Clarification and communication of the District resource allocation process

This Report was prepared by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and the accreditation consultant. (The latter is a former community college ALO and experienced planning, program review, and accreditation consultant who was hired by the District in late May 2009 to work with the campus and the District in developing responses to the recommendations, help draft the Report, and help establish structures and processes to ensure continued progress.) Prior to submitting the Report to the Board of Trustees, the ALO solicited input from faculty, managers, classified staff, and students by various means. The Crafton Council, which is the highest-level shared-governance body on campus, was asked to review the accuracy of and evidence in the draft; members suggested no changes. In addition, feedback regarding the accuracy and clarity of the Report was solicited directly from the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Student Senate, the management team, and the Accreditation Committee in presentations by the Accreditation Liaison Officer, who also held two well-advertised open forums in which she solicited questions and comments about the draft Report. Total attendance at all presentations and forums was 56, including 26 faculty members, seven managers, 12 students, and 11 classified staff. The draft was also emailed to the entire campus community, which was asked for feedback regarding its accuracy and clarity, and posted on the CHC Accreditation website. The feedback received through all these means was incorporated into the final draft of the Report where appropriate (see documents RP.01.01-RP.01.06).

The final Report was approved by President Gloria Harrison and was submitted to the Board of Trustees for review at its meeting on September 23, 2010.

_____

Gloria M. Harrison   Date
President, Crafton Hills College

Certification of the Follow-Up Report

This Follow-Up Report is submitted for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's ongoing accreditation status.

We certify that this Follow-Up Report accurately represents the status of the College with respect to the Commission recommendations it has been asked to address.

Signed:

Gloria M. Harrison	Date
President, Crafton Hills College	

Dr. Cheryl Marshall	Date
Vice President, Instruction and Accreditation Liaison Officer,	
Crafton Hills College	

Scott Rippy	Date
President, Academic Senate, Crafton Hills College	

Karen Peterson	Date
President, Classified Senate, Crafton Hills College	

Kaylee Hrisoulas	Date
President, Student Senate, Crafton Hills College	

Certification of Board Review of the Follow-Up Report

We certify that the San Bernardino Community College District Board of Trustees has reviewed this Follow-Up Report.

Signed:

James C. Ramos	Date
President, Board of Trustees, San Bernardino Community College District	

Bruce Baron	Date
Interim Chancellor, San Bernardino Community College District	

Accrediting Commission's Follow-Up Report Request
(From the Commission Action Letter Dated January 29, 2010)

The Commission reminds the college of the Follow-Up Report due October 15, 2010 (as noted in the February 3, 2009 Commission action letter). That report is to demonstrate the institution's resolution of the recommendations noted below and will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives:

Recommendation 6: Participation in Decision-Making and Planning Processes
In order to improve the quality of the institution, the college president should ensure that all areas, including academic, student, and administrative services, are actively participating in the decision making and planning processes. (Standards I.B.4, IV.A.3, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)

Recommendation 7: District-Level Program Review, Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, and Human Resources Plan
In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees, and the chancellor, in consultation with the leadership of the college campuses, develop a strategy for addressing some significant issues raised by each college and verified in interviews with staff in the following areas; namely:

- The development of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for reviewing all district functions and processes using a Program Review model. (Standards IV.B.3.a, b)
- The development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan that both acknowledges input and aligns with the colleges educational plan and serves as a guide for planning at the college level. (Standards I.B.3, IV.B.3.g)
- The development of a coordinated strategic plan for technology that is responsive to the colleges and assists them in the daily management of the college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information. (Standards I.B.2, 5, 6, IV.B.3.b, III.C.1.a, c, III.C.2, III.D.2.a)
- The development of a long range Human Resources Plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing the need for full-time faculty and staff. (Standards I.A.4, III.A.6, III.B.2.b)

Commission Recommendation 1: District Resource Allocation Process
The district's resource allocation process needs to be clarified and communicated to both colleges within the district. (Standards III.A.6, III.B.2.a, b, III.C.2, III.D.1.d, III.D.3, IV.B.3.a, c, d, f, g)

In addition to these three recommendations, the Commission also took action to require Crafton Hills College to demonstrate the institution's resolution of the following recommendations that were included in the Follow-Up Report submitted in the fall of 2009:

Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning, Quantitative Effectiveness Measures, and Long-Term Resource Allocation
As was noted in recommendations 1 and 2 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should integrate all planning processes and documents into a meaningful, comprehensive, long-range institutional plan to accomplish its mission and realize its vision. Additionally, the college plan should be integrated into an

overall district strategic plan. (Standards I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.1.a)

The college should move immediately to:

- Complete the implementation of a cycle of systematic integrated planning, evaluation, prioritization, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.
- Identify quantitative effectiveness measures (key performance indicators), gather baseline data and establish institutional planning goals.
- Revise the Educational Master Plan to include long-term resource allocation.

Recommendation 2: Data Reliability, Access, and Training
As was noted in recommendations 2 and 7 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should develop processes that produce reliable data, provide employees with easy access to data, and provide training on how to access, interpret and utilize data. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5, II.A.1.a)

Recommendation 8: Program Review
As was noted in recommendation 6 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and to meet the standards, the college should complete the integration of program review for all academic, student services and administrative services units into institutional evaluation and planning. In particular, the college should develop processes and procedures to ensure program effectiveness of distributed education courses. (Standards II.A.2.e, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.D.2.g, IV.A.5, ER 19, 21)

Recommendation 10: Long-term Fiscal Plans and Financial Information
As was noted in recommendation 9 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should develop long-term fiscal plans. Employees should be provided with adequate financial information and training in the use of such data. (Standards III.D.1.c, III.D.3)

Probation is issued when the Commission finds that an institution deviates significantly from the Commission's Eligibility Requirements, Standards of Accreditation, or policies or fails to respond to conditions imposed upon it by the Commission. <u>The accredited status of the institution continues during the probation period.</u>

I wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions out of compliance with standards or on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation. Crafton Hills College should resolve the deficiencies noted by **October 2010**. It should be noted that Recommendations 1, 2, 8, and 10 were first noted in the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and are seriously past due the date by which they must be resolved. The Commission has extended the time to resolve these recommendations in light of the enormous energy and significant work done at the college. Nevertheless, the college is now required to completely resolve these recommendations or the Commission will be compelled to act.

**Responses to Team Recommendations 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, and 10,
and to Commission Recommendation 1**

***Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning, Quantitative Effectiveness Measures, and Long-
Term Resource Allocation***
*As was noted in recommendations 1 and 2 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in
order to meet the standards, the college should integrate all planning processes and
documents into a meaningful, comprehensive, long-range institutional plan to accomplish its
mission and realize its vision. Additionally, the college plan should be integrated into an
overall district strategic plan. (Standards I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2,
III.D.1.a)*
The college should move immediately to:
- *Complete the implementation of a cycle of systematic integrated planning, evaluation,
  prioritization, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.*
- *Identify quantitative effectiveness measures (key performance indicators), gather
  baseline data and establish institutional planning goals.*
- *Revise the Educational Master Plan to include long-term resource allocation.*

Progress and Analysis

Integrated Long-Range Institutional Plan

In Spring 2006, the CHC President convened an Educational Master Plan Committee with
shared-governance representation to develop the elements of an Educational Master Plan (EMP).
From Spring 2006 through Spring 2007, the Committee, with information from an environmental
scan and broad input from campus forums, developed a mission statement, a vision statement,
institutional values, and a set of five overarching goals for the EMP. A workshop was held on
In-Service Day in August 2007 to develop action plans for the EMP, but the College's focus
shifted in 2007-08 to the pressing issue of increasing FTES, and the work lost momentum at that
point. So the CHC EMP remained incomplete when the College was placed on Probation in
early Spring 2009 (see documents 01.01.01-01.01.03).

In February 2009, the College established the Crafton Council, the highest-level shared-
governance body on campus, to coordinate responses to all the urgent Commission
recommendations. The Council assigned an instructional dean to lead the effort to address
Recommendation 1. He convened and coordinated the work of an ad hoc group that met weekly
from late March to June. The group, taking the Goals of the Spring 2007 Educational Master
Plan as their starting point, identified objectives and benchmarks for each EMP Goal, composed
a Glossary, and began the development of institutional quantitative effectiveness measures, or
key performance indicators. This dedicated group wrestled constructively with several difficult
issues, but it suffered from two main problems: It did not have shared-governance representation,
and its work was not integrated sufficiently with other College processes and prior planning
efforts. So in July 2009, the Crafton Council constituted a new Educational Master Planning
Committee (EMPC) with shared-governance representation; membership includes the following:

- Faculty co-chair of the Planning and Program Review Committee (P&PRC, the other principal committee heavily involved in integrated planning, evaluation, and improvement, from the unit level through the College level), ex officio
- Four other Academic Senate representatives
- The Vice President for Instruction, who is the Accreditation Liaison Officer, ex officio
- The other two College vice presidents, ex officio
- One instructional dean
- One Classified Senate representative
- One CSEA representative
- One Student Senate representative
- The Director of Research and Planning, ex officio

This new group included several members who had served on the 2006-07 Educational Master Planning Committee, had participated in the ad hoc group in Spring 2009, and/or were currently serving on the P&PRC. This membership configuration ensures integration of institutional planning efforts from the unit level through the College level, and facilitates communication about integrated planning processes and structures among all constituent groups (see documents 01.02.01-01.02.06).

The EMPC, which operates on a consensus model, was charged with developing the integrated, long-range institutional plan called for in the Recommendation. In weekly two-hour meetings from July 2009 to May 2010, it performed the following tasks, among others:

- Reviewed the College Mission, Vision, and Values statements.
- Reviewed the SBCCD Board of Trustees Imperatives and Institutional Goals.
- Reviewed the strategic and operational implications of major planning documents. Each member was designated as a primary or secondary expert on one or more of the following plans, based on their participation in developing or maintaining those plans:
  o Enrollment Management Plan
  o Student Equity Plan
  o Facilities Master Plan
  o Technology Plan
  o Basic Skills Initiative Plan
  o Assessment Plan
  o Matriculation Plan
  o EOPS Plan
  o Title V Plan
  o Learning Communities Plan
  o DSPS Plan
  o Distributed Education Plan
  o Professional Development Plan
  o Developmental Budgets/Fiscal Plan
- Revisited the 2007 EMP Goals and other elements.
- Reviewed the current cycle of planning and program review documentation for recurring issues and themes.

- Reviewed the strategically salient characteristics of the College, its students, and its service area.
- Informed constituency groups about the committee's progress.
- Solicited input and feedback on the plan from the Academic Senate, the other constituency groups, and individuals throughout the College community.
- Considered the implications of the draft District Strategic Plan.
- Developed a recommended set of institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators (QEIs; see *Quantitative Effectiveness Measures* section below).
- Developed and refined a set of Strategic Directions, Goals, and Objectives based on discussion and analysis of all the information collected.
- Identified a responsible point person or group, a tentative timeline, and a set of suggested actions for each objective (see documents 01.03.01-01.03.13).

The Committee received input and feedback from the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Student Senate, the management team, and the rest of the College community in four cycles:

- In September 2009, the recommended QEIs were presented by Committee members to the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Student Senate, and the management team for questions and feedback.
- In November 2009, Committee members facilitated workshops in meetings of the four constituency groups. Participants reviewed the recommended Strategic Directions and Goals, and recorded ideas for concrete steps the College should take in pursuing the Goals.
- In March 2010, the President distributed the latest draft EMP (including Strategic Directions, Goals, Objectives, Timelines, Point Persons, and Suggested Actions) and the recommended QEIs with baselines and targets to all College employees and to student leadership with a request for feedback. In addition, Committee members made presentations to meetings of the four constituency groups. Members answered questions and encouraged each audience to send feedback to their constituency representatives or to the chair of the Committee. In addition, Committee members held two open forums—one evening and one morning—to give everyone an additional opportunity to ask questions and offer feedback.
- The Accreditation Liaison Officer distributed the final recommended draft of the EMP to all College employees and to student leadership for one more round of feedback in April 2010. Committee members also made one more round of presentations to meetings of the four constituency groups (see documents 01.04.01-01.04.12).

The Committee seriously considered all feedback received in each cycle, and made changes as appropriate to strengthen the plan. It then submitted the final version to the President, who approved the Educational Master Plan on May 17, 2010. The approved EMP is composed of the following sections:

- Preamble
- Crafton Hills College Foundational Statements
- Program Highlights
- A Brief Introduction to Planning Terminology

- Overview of Crafton Hills College Strategic Directions, Goals, and Integration with Other Planning
- Crafton Hills College Strategic Directions, Goals, and Objectives
- Institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators
- Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast
- Planning Context: College Characteristics
- Planning Context: Information from the Environmental Scan
- Glossary

The Educational Master Plan is meaningful and integrated in that it explicitly links to the College mission and to other major planning, evaluation, and improvement documents, processes, and structures at the College. It also incorporates active review and revision provisions that ensure that it is a living document, not a bookshelf decoration—it is a plan in action, not a plan in place. The EMP serves as the College's strategic plan. In its Strategic Directions—especially *Student Access and Success* and *Best Practices for Teaching and Learning*—and the goals and objectives under them, it consistently demonstrates the institution's commitment to improving student learning. It is long-range and comprehensive in that it attends to the big-picture, strategic needs of the institution and the learning and support needs of its students for the foreseeable future, and it relates to structures and processes at every organizational level, from unit planning to the District Strategic Plan (see documents 01.05.01-01.05.02).

The strategic directions and goals of the CHC Educational Master Plan (along with the corresponding elements of the SBVC Strategic Plan and the Board Imperatives) laid the foundation for the District Strategic Plan (DSP). Indeed, every one of the goals in the CHC Educational Master Plan aligns with a District Strategic Direction and Goal in the DSP. The two plans thus have been thoroughly integrated from the beginning of the District strategic planning process (see documents 01.06.01-01.06.02; 01.05.01, pp. 18-19; 01.06.04, pp. 24-25).

A subcommittee of the EMPC polished the appearance of the approved Educational Master Plan during summer 2010, and posted it on the CHC website. The publication was included in the Navigator packets distributed at the August 13 CHC In-Service Day event, and the Vice President for Student Services made a presentation on its content to all faculty, all managers, classified staff, and student leadership that day. The campus community has been very well informed about the EMP (see document 01.07.01).

Monitoring timely implementation of EMP objectives is a top priority of the EMPC for 2010-11, and the committee has developed a template for periodic progress reports from point persons or groups (see documents 01.08.01-01.08.02). Actions related to several objectives are already well underway. For example:

- *1.2.1: Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of student access.*
  Administrative Services has implemented online purchase of parking permits (see document 01.09.01).
- *3.1.5: Establish and assess institutional student learning outcomes.*
  An ad hoc task force drafted six institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) in Spring 2010, and prepared options for assessment of four of the six. The Outcomes Committee, which

has now assumed the responsibility for further ILO development, reviewed the work on September 9, 2010, and scheduled presentations to the Academic, Classified, and Student Senates to solicit feedback (see documents 01.10.01-01.10.04).

- *5.1.1: Establish an infrastructure to coordinate marketing, outreach, and partnerships with community institutions and organizations.*
  Effective mid-September 2010, a Director of Marketing has joined the College staff; the position is shared with the District Office (see document 01.11.01).
- *6.1.2: Create a structure and processes to communicate committee and shared governance information to the campus.*
  6.2.1: Create a map or flowchart of organizational processes and structures.
  The Crafton Council published a draft updated edition of the *CHC Organizational Handbook*, which is now the authoritative source for committee and shared governance information, in August 2010. After incorporating input from all constituency groups as appropriate, it will publish the final version by mid-October 2010, which will include a map of organizational and collegial consultation structures (see document 01.12.01).
- *6.1.3: Develop processes and structures to give users convenient access to appropriate data for planning and decision-making.*
  6.1.4: Provide institutional support for the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data.
  The Office of Research and Planning (ORP) now provides systematic training in measurement and evaluation data access and interpretation. (See documents 01.13.01, 01.07.01; see also *Recommendation 2* section.)
- *7.1.1: Ensure that all faculty, staff, and administrators receive relevant, timely, and appropriate training.*
  The Professional Development Committee, together with the corresponding group at SBVC, has nearly completed a professional development needs assessment survey, and is scheduled to administer it to all Crafton employees in Fall 2010 (see document 01.14.01).

Integrated Planning, Program Review, and Resource Allocation Process

Central to integrated planning at CHC is planning, program review, and resource allocation, the process in which the most faculty, staff, and managers are involved every year. Coordinated by the shared-governance Planning and Program Review Committee (P&PRC), this process was significantly improved for the 2009-10 academic year to address the weaknesses that the P&PRC had identified in its evaluation of the prior version, and to align better with the Commission's Accreditation Standards. The enhanced process, which is detailed in the *Integrated Planning and Program Review Handbook*, ensures completion of the full cycle of program evaluation, planning, resource allocation, and implementation of improvements every year (see document 01.15.01). All units in all areas of the College have now completed at least one cycle of program review.

Planning and program review in all areas of the College (Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President's Area) occur in a three-year cycle, with roughly one-third of the units performing the full program review each year. Annual planning is the systematic update of the program review that occurs in the second and third years of each unit's cycle. Both program review and annual planning now require, in all units across the College, the preparation of a Three-Year Action Plan, based on systematic self-assessment and reflection.

The Three-Year Action Plan includes identification of goals, objectives in priority order, actions, timelines, responsible persons, and any required resources with cost estimates for three years. Goals and objectives foster concrete improvements: they are formulated explicitly to maintain or increase program strengths or address identified weaknesses. They are also updated each year, based in part on the unit's evaluation of its progress since the previous year. Assertions must be supported by evidence; for instructional units, a standard set of quantitative evidence is provided annually by the Office of Research and Planning (ORP), which also provides training in access and interpretation of the data. (Noninstructional units typically collect their own data locally, and the ORP provides analysis and assistance as needed.) Thoughtful consideration of the relevant issues in comprehensive departmental discussions is encouraged. Broad, collaborative, active participation from unit members, including part-time faculty and staff, is expected, and all permanent employees in the unit are required to sign off on each plan or program review, signifying that they share (or is some instances, do not share) in the consensus about the contents (see documents 01.16.01-01.16.05).

The quality of the documents in every program review submission is formally evaluated by the P&PRC based on whether the unit has met these and other expectations. For example, the Document Evaluation Rubric for the full program review for 2009-10 contains the following criteria for "Meets Expectations":

- For each question:
  o Answers all parts of the question completely with relevant information.
  o Well-written answer conveys meaning clearly.
  o Includes or refers to relevant evidence, concrete examples.
  o Shows evidence of thoughtful consideration of the question and the issues relevant to it.
  o Response indicates that the unit followed directions and suggestions on the Form and in the "Completing the Forms" section of the *Handbook*.
- Overall:
  o Responses indicate that the unit followed *Handbook* directions and suggestions with respect to the planning and program review process; for example:
    ▪ Broad participation and consensus, documented on the Forms
    ▪ Departmental discussions of significant issues
    ▪ Adherence to the planning and program review schedule
  o Overall, makes a persuasive case that the program is maintaining or increasing its strengths and addressing its weaknesses.

Guidance for Committee members in applying both rubrics consistently is provided. The P&PRC provides written feedback on program review document quality to every unit, which is expected to improve that quality in subsequent cycles. The Committee also provides a summary spreadsheet of document quality rubric results to all units and the President (see documents 01.17.01-01.17.04). A similar rubric was developed for annual planning documents, but the Committee did not use it in 2009-10 because the heavy time demands associated with evaluating program reviews precluded it. The P&PRC has decided to use the annual planning document rubric in a different way in future cycles; see below.

The substance of each program review and annual planning submission is the unit's evaluation of its performance based on quantitative and qualitative measures of effectiveness and on its reflections about itself. The questions each unit must answer for program review are set forth on the Program Review Form, and explained more fully in the *Handbook*. All units must describe their purposes, services, and clientele. They must also report the results of their assessment of outcomes: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in instruction and some support services, and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) in noninstructional departments. Some additional standard measures are specified by the Committee for instructional programs (e.g., course retention and success, WSCH per FTEF), but each unit is required to articulate its own definition of effectiveness, and to identify and apply measures to gauge it. It then has the opportunity to interpret the results, and to reflect on their implications for program and service improvement. It also reports on what is going well, and what is not going well, with respect to areas such as the SLO/SAO cycle and its results, curriculum, scheduling, alternative modes of delivery, partnerships, best practices, efficiency in using resources, group dynamics (including working relationships and leadership), and innovations. Each unit is required to look forward three years, share its vision of that future, and indicate how it contributes to the College's mission. It also prepares goals, objectives, and resource requests in the Three-Year Action Plan, as described above. Representatives of every unit that submits a program review are invited to a Committee meeting to answer clarifying questions and ask questions of their own (see document 01.18.01).

The list of annual planning questions is shorter, and focuses on significant changes in the program, recent results of effectiveness measures, program progress over the past year, the status of last year's goals and objectives, and an update of the Three-Year Action Plan (see document 01.19.01).

Based on the documents submitted for the full program review, the P&PRC evaluates the health of each instructional program, and the effectiveness of each noninstructional program, based on specific criteria contained in the applicable rubric. For example, the instructional program health rubric for 2009-10 contained a three-point anchored scale for each of 10 variables—half of which were directly related to student learning and success—with space for comments:

- Curriculum/Instructional Improvement
- Scheduling
- Persistence
- Retention
- Pass Rate
- Enrollment
- Faculty Ratio
- Marketing/Outreach
- WSCH/FTEF
- Faculty Load

The P&PRC provides written feedback to every unit on its health or effectiveness, and a summary spreadsheet of rubric results to all units and to the President. In addition, the Committee analyzes the results of each program review cycle overall, and sends the President a Summary of Program Health and Effectiveness. It identifies Exemplary Programs, Strong

Programs, Healthy Programs with Specific Concerns, and Distressed Programs that require the focused assistance of senior management in identifying the steps needed to improve. The President distributes this Summary to the College community, along with the summary spreadsheet of rubric results and documentation of annual planning priorities (see documents 01.20.01-01.20.04, 01.17.03-01.17.04; see below).

Priorities for objectives and resource allocations are set across the institution based on the systematic review of planning and program review documents at each organizational level.

- First, the division manager discusses unit Three-Year Action Plan priorities across the division with the unit leaders. (In Instruction, in some areas, priority discussions between the department chair and members of the disciplinary units under the chair's supervision may take place first in an analogous process.) Based on that discussion, he or she creates a consolidated divisional priority list of objectives, resources, and rationales, and submits it to the applicable Area manager and to the Planning and Program Review Committee, along with the final unit planning and program review documents. (A copy of each Three-Year Action Plan that includes technology resources is supposed to be forwarded to the Director of Technology Services to help inform that department's annual planning as well, though not all units took that step in 2009-10. The P&PRC will monitor this process more closely in 2010-11.)
- The Area manager then discusses priorities across the Area with the division managers. Based on that discussion, he or she creates a consolidated Area priority list of objectives, resources, and rationales from the divisional lists, and submits it to the President and to the Planning and Program Review Committee. The unit-level documents are also made available to the President for reference.
- The P&PRC then systematically reviews the Area priority lists (typically in a single long meeting, with the unit and divisional documents available for reference as needed), and consolidates them into a recommended institutional priority list of objectives, resources, and rationales, which it submits to the President.
- The President, with the advice of the Cabinet, approves the final institutional priority list of objectives, resources, and rationales based primarily on the P&PRC recommendation.
- If the President's list departs significantly from the P&PRC recommendation, the President provides the rationale for the departure(s).
- The President reviews the final institutional priority list with Crafton Council.
- The President notifies the entire campus community about the final priority list in two documents she sends out with the Summary of Program Health and Effectiveness: the spreadsheet showing both the P&PRC recommended priority and the final priority for every objective, and a memo delineating the rationale for any changes the President made in the final list.
- Resource requests on the institutional priority list are funded in descending order as actual revenues for the applicable fiscal year allow (see documents 01.21.01-01.21.02).

Resource priorities in this process depend primarily on the priorities of the program and service objectives. Annual planning in particular, which in too many cases used to be a mechanism for supplying rationales for equipment purchases and other resource requests, is thus far more meaningful and more productive of substantive improvements. Moreover, many objectives do

not require additional resources, and units are expected to make progress on those improvements even in lean times such as these.

The planning, program review, and resource allocation process has already produced concrete improvements in College programs and services. For example:

- To meet student demand identified in program review, the Learning Resource Center piloted an appointment-based system for focused tutoring using Basic Skills Initiative funds in Spring 2010, and increased both tutoring and equipment in science. Assessment of the improvements is scheduled for Spring 2011 (see documents 01.22.01-01.22.03).
- Fostering growth in the Fine Arts cluster to meet student needs, in part through equipment enhancements, was one of Instruction's top planning and program review priorities for 2010-11, and $5,000 in instructional equipment funds have already been provided to Fine Arts this year. Similar amounts were provided to other programs with top-priority needs (see document 01.23.01).
- To maintain quality and make possible further growth in a program that would have been down to a single full-time faculty member, CIS urgently requested replacement of a retirement for 2010-11 in its annual planning process. That position became the top hiring priority for CHC, was authorized, and will be filled in Spring 2011 (see document 01.24.01).
- In Student Services, institutionalization of categorically funded services (e.g., DSPS, EOPS) was a very high-priority planning and program review objective for 2010-11, and the majority of functions in those areas have now been moved to the General Fund. Assessment of services and consideration of further reorganization will take place beginning in Fall 2010, after the State budget is passed and the level of remaining categorical funding is clear (see documents 01.25.01-01.25.02).
- To facilitate student access, Administrative Services implemented online purchase of parking permits, an action that appeared in the Educational Master Plan (under Objective 1.2.1; see above) as well as in that Area's planning and program review priorities. General Fund dollars were committed to the project, the effectiveness of which will be assessed in Spring 2011 (see document 01.09.01).

Re-evaluation is an integral part of the planning and program review process, just as it is part of the EMP (see above) and any sound planning cycle. For example, the Annual Planning form requires each unit to evaluate its progress on goals and objectives in every cycle, and to update those goals and objectives accordingly. With regard to the process itself, each unit receives feedback on its submissions from the applicable director, dean, or Vice President, and is expected, though not required, to make improvements in response. As described above, the P&PRC also provides feedback to units on the quality of the submitted program review documents, the health of instructional programs, and the effectiveness of noninstructional programs.

These feedback loops exemplify the emphasis on communication that characterizes the process. Effective communication also takes place, as noted above:

- Within each unit as members discuss their program

- Through the planning and program review forms
- In the unit representatives' meetings with the P&PRC
- In the discussions about priorities at the divisional, Area, and College levels
- In the President's report to the campus community on document quality, program health and effectiveness, and the final objective and resource priorities
- Between the P&PRC and the campus community through the Committee website

To help units complete their work properly, the P&PRC published the first *Integrated Planning and Program Review Handbook* in Fall 2009. The second edition of the *Handbook* was distributed to all faculty and managers on In-Service Day in August 2010, and to all noninstructional planning units through their supervisors. It is also available on the P&PRC website, along with all the forms and rubrics mentioned above. Other helpful materials, such as sample responses, are also available online. In addition, the vice presidents, deans, and directors serve as trainers and resource people for their unit leaders and planning teams regarding the process (see documents 01.27.01, 01.15.01).

The planning and program review process itself, like the units that participate in it, engages in a continuous improvement cycle. The P&PRC evaluated the process in late Spring 2010 and has implemented numerous improvements for 2010-11, based on a survey of participants, informal discussions with participants, and comprehensive discussions in Committee meetings. Among the primary improvements are the following:

- Revisions of the program review and planning questions and forms to improve their clarity and utility. For example, the revised program review form specifically includes governance in the unit's analysis of what is going well and what is not.
- Revisions of all rubrics to improve their clarity and consistency, to facilitate a more thorough understanding of unit health or effectiveness, to eliminate items that proved ambiguous or otherwise inappropriate, and to match the forms and available quantitative and qualitative information better. For example, the revised instructional program health rubric now includes the following variables, each with a three-point anchored scale; as in 2009-10, the primary emphasis is on student learning and success:
    o Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
    o Needs-Based Curriculum
    o Scheduling Matrix
    o Course Retention Rate
    o Course Success Rate
    o Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Ratio
    o WSCH/FTEF Ratio
    o Fill Rate
    o Alignment with CHC Mission, Vision, and Goals
    o Goals
    o Objectives
- Adoption of a new model of document evaluation for annual planning: First, each unit will use the revised rubric to evaluate the quality of its own documents, and revise them accordingly. Then the division manager for that unit will apply the rubric to the revised annual planning documents and give feedback to the unit. If the feedback indicates that

the unit needs to improve its documents further, it will have the opportunity to do so before the final submission.

- Improvements in documentation of participation.
- Implementation of a web-based tool for completing both program review and annual planning documentation, building on the tool used in 2009-10 for District Program Review. With this tool, all College employees will have easy access to the final versions of the 2010-11 program reviews and annual plans of all units. Use of the web-based tool will thus facilitate an even more comprehensive dialogue about the results of all program reviews and annual plans, and about institutional effectiveness overall.
- Substantial revision of the *Handbook*, including all the procedural enhancements noted above.

These changes were communicated to all faculty, all managers, and classified staff in a presentation by the Vice President for Student Services (who serves as the 2010-11 P&PRC co-chair) at In-Service Day 2010. (All faculty and managers also attended a mandatory training session on the web-based tool that day.) Such enhancements promise to make an already strong process even better (see documents 01.28.01-01.28.09, 01.15.01, 01.07.01).

See the *Recommendation 6* section for information on evaluation and improvement of participation in and effectiveness of governance processes (Standard IV.A.5).

Quantitative Effectiveness Measures

The Educational Master Planning Committee, through a process of brainstorming followed by discussion and evaluation, developed a recommended pool of meaningful and useful Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators (QEIs), also known as "key performance indicators," for the institution as a whole. In September 2009 Committee members presented the set to the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Student Senate, and the management team for questions and feedback. Based on the feedback received and further discussion, the EMPC refined the pool, and in Spring 2010, under the leadership of the new Director of Research and Planning, developed empirically based baselines and five-year, ambitious but reasonable improvement targets on the following initial set of institutional QEIs (see document 01.05.01, pp. 38-50):

- Course Success Rate
  - Overall
  - Developmental Education/Basic Skills Courses
  - Transferable Courses
  - CTE Courses
- Persistence
- Degrees and Certificates
- SLOs/Service Area Outcomes Process
  - Progress
  - Improvement

- Course Retention Rate
  - Overall
  - Developmental Education/Basic Skills Courses
  - Transferable Courses
  - CTE Courses
- Transfer Rate
- Transfer Readiness Rate
- Productivity: Instructional (WSCH/FTEF)

These institutional QEIs, taken together, present a reasonably broad and accurate picture of overall institutional effectiveness from a quantitative perspective. Some of them overlap with

measures already applied to courses, programs, and services, but they are not intended to gauge the effectiveness of particular programs or services, in part because programs and services can vary a great deal in these measures. Nor do they replace those more narrowly focused measures of effectiveness, both quantitative and qualitative, that programs and services across the College use for their program reviews, reports to external agencies, and other purposes. Data on these QEIs are updated annually, starting with the baseline period for each, and results each year will show whether the College has made progress toward the improvement goal for each measure.

The EMPC also identified additional measures that require further development, or that can provide external validation of College outcomes, which appear in the EMP as the *Recommended Candidates for Further Development*. The EMPC will consider adding these measures in subsequent cycles, as data resources permit.

Detailed information on all the QEIs appears in the Educational Master Plan, and is thus accessible to the entire College community.

Consideration of Long-Term Resource Allocation in the Educational Master Plan

In Spring 2010, the Vice President of Administrative Services, in consultation with the Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services, finalized a budget outlook model for projecting the District's and CHC's likely revenues and expenditures three years beyond the approved budget, based on assumptions that are specified at the District level. The resulting CHC Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast presents both conservative and optimistic financial scenarios for revenues, District assessments under the new Resource Allocation Model (see *Commission Recommendation 1* section), and expenditures over a three-year period. It also shows explicitly the quantitative assumptions that underlie each of those scenarios. All the data in the Plan and Forecast will be updated regularly as information on the State budget process becomes available each year, and the utility of the document itself will be evaluated annually. The Plan and Forecast thus provides a long-range, realistic context for managers as they construct their developmental budgets each year; for units, committees, and administrators considering resource requests in the planning and program review process; for point persons and groups implementing the Educational Master Plan; and for all other major planning efforts at the College (see document 01.30.01).

The Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast is incorporated into the Educational Master Plan (see document 01.06.04, pp. 51-53).

Conclusion

The mission of Crafton Hills College is central to both the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and the planning and program review process, in which units must demonstrate their contributions to it (Standard I.A.4). The EMP and the planning and program review process build in the systematic measurement of institutional effectiveness using both quantitative and qualitative data, the establishment of goals and measurable objectives to improve effectiveness, and the ongoing assessment of progress toward those goals and objectives over time at every level. Collaboration is characteristic of all planning at the College, and especially of the planning and program review process, in which every unit participates in some capacity every year (Standards

I.B.2, I.B.3). Systematic review and revision are also characteristic; for example, the Educational Master Plan incorporates specifications for annual review and improvement, including the research underlying the Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators; the Planning and Program Review Committee conducts an evaluation of the planning and program review process each Spring with input from participants, and implements improvements in accord with its findings (Standard I.B.6).

The ongoing, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and evaluation systems and processes at Crafton Hills College include both the planning and program review process and educational master planning, which in turn aligns with other major planning processes at both the College and District levels. These well-documented systems and processes assure that all programs and services in instruction, student support, learning support, and administrative services assess themselves carefully every year, and improve their effectiveness as required, in terms of the following characteristics, among others:

- Their appropriateness and relevance to meeting the current needs of students, including the achievement of student learning outcomes, and their adequacy in meeting those needs
- Their constructive consideration of the future needs of students, other clients, and/or the programs themselves
- Their operations and procedures, including the effective and efficient use of human resources, physical resources, technology, and financial resources

Moreover, three of the eight Strategic Directions in the EMP aim at systematically improving the effectiveness and capacity of the College as a whole through *Effective, Efficient, and Transparent Processes* (SD6), *Organizational Development* (SD7), and *Effective Resource Use and Development* (SD8). Results of all these assessment and improvement processes are made available to all constituencies and the entire College community to promote and expand the ongoing dialogue about institutional effectiveness. (Standards II.A.2.e, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.D.2.g, ER 19, and ER 21 [cited in Recommendation 8 and included here under the coverage of integrated planning and program review], I.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.1.a,)

The College has fulfilled the requirements of Recommendation 1, with all the following:
- The development and implementation of the long-term, comprehensive Educational Master Plan, which is fully integrated with the enhanced planning, program review, and resource allocation process and with the District Strategic Plan;
- The completion of the full cycle of systematic, integrated planning, evaluation, prioritization, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation;
- The identification of institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators with baselines and improvement targets; and
- The inclusion of the Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast in the EMP.

All the elements of the integrated planning, evaluation, and improvement system will be reviewed and revised as needed during 2010-11:

- The Educational Master Planning Committee will evaluate progress on implementation of the EMP, and recommend any necessary changes, with appropriate input from the College's constituency groups.
- The Planning and Program Review Committee has begun implementing the revised planning and program review process in Fall 2010, and will evaluate its effectiveness in Spring 2011 with appropriate input, and modify it as needed.
- The EMPC will assess the College's progress on all the institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Measures in Spring 2011.
- The data in the CHC Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast will be updated throughout 2010-11 as needed, and the Plan and Forecast will be evaluated in Spring 2011.

Recommendation 2: Data Reliability, Access, and Training
As was noted in recommendations 2 and 7 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should develop processes that produce reliable data, provide employees with easy access to data, and provide training on how to access, interpret and utilize data. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5, II.A.1.a)

Progress and Analysis

The College was fortunate in hiring an experienced and knowledgeable community college researcher as the new Director of Research and Planning in Fall 2009. Under his leadership, the Office of Research and Planning (ORP) has already proven invaluable in providing meaningful access to reliable data to the College community as a whole. For example:

- The Director has reviewed the major data sources used by the ORP, initiated systematic corrections where necessary, and validated the accuracy of the data files (see documents 02.01.01-02.01.04).
- the ORP, in concert with DETS, trained users on the importance of accurate data entry for funding, research, and reporting (see documents 02.02.01-02.02.03).
- The ORP has begun a periodic series of brief *Did You Know?* reports to provide easy access to useful information on a variety of issues (see documents 02.03.01-02.03.03).
- The ORP has redesigned its webpage to improve both access and clarity; it is scheduled to go live by October 1, 2010 (see documents 02.04.01-02.04.02).
- The ORP has established a research calendar to keep the campus apprised of research projects that occur on a cyclical basis (see document 02.05.01).

The Director is an active member of both the Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC) and the Planning and Program Review Committee (P&PRC), and the ORP devotes substantial resources to providing essential research information to those committees and to the units performing program review and annual planning assessments. For example:

- The Director performed all the analyses on which the EMPC based its recommendations on the baselines and improvement targets for the institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators (QEIs). He presented the information to the Committee, drafted the applicable sections of the Educational Master Plan (EMP), and made presentations to the campus community on the QEIs to gather feedback and promote understanding and dialogue. The ORP will also update the quantitative evidence for progress on the QEIs annually (see documents 02.05.01; 02.06.01, pp. 40-50; 02.06.03).
- The ORP provided all the data on CHC student and employee characteristics in the EMP, and will update those data annually as well (see documents 02.06.01, pp. 54-60; 02.05.01).
- The Director was a valuable resource in ensuring that the Committee formulated all the EMP objectives in quantitatively and/or qualitatively measurable terms, and will provide support for measuring progress on those objectives (see document 02.06.01, pp. 20-37).
- For the P&PRC, the Director provided the summary analyses of document quality and program health and effectiveness, and took the lead on revising the program health and

effectiveness rubrics to make them more useful to both the Committee and the process participants (see documents 02.09.01-02.09.04).

- The ORP redesigned the standard planning and program review performance reports for instructional programs to match the revised program health rubric (see *Recommendation 1* section), and distributed them to all instructional units. The reports are also available online to all units (see document 02.10.01).
- The Director beta-tested the WebPPR tool during Summer 2010 and made several suggestions that were incorporated into the final implementation for Fall 2010 (see document 02.11.01).
- The ORP has systematically analyzed SARS data, linked with Datatel data, for the assessment of counseling and orientation services (see document 02.12.01).

Surveys are useful tools in ensuring that the opinions of targeted groups or the wider College population are heard, and the ORP has provided leadership in numerous survey projects. For example, the ORP provided consultation support on the District Operations Satisfaction Survey (see document 02.13.01; see also *Recommendation 7* section), and drafted, administered, and analyzed and reported the results of the following surveys, all in Spring 2010:

- The planning and program review process survey (see *Recommendation 1* section)
- The survey of participants in the presentations on the new District Resource Allocation Model (see *Commission Recommendation 1* section)
- The Participation by Student Leaders in Governance survey (see documents 02.09.02, 02.14.02-02.14.04; see also *Recommendation 6* section)

The Director has redesigned the annual campus climate survey, which will be administered in Fall 2010, to align more closely with the Educational Master Plan (see document 02.15.01; see also *Recommendation 6* section). The ORP also assists departments, especially in the noninstructional areas, in designing, administering, and interpreting surveys, which typically include both quantitative and qualitative data (see documents 02.16.01-02.16.02).

The ORP supports the identification of student learning needs and the assessment of progress toward achieving student learning outcomes and service area outcomes. In fact, the Instructional Assessment Specialist, the position responsible for providing technical assistance to programs in the development and assessment of SLOs, was moved under the ORP in Spring 2010. The Director has developed an online outcomes assessment tracking model to facilitate evaluation of progress in the SLO process, and will support the Vice President for Instruction in evaluating the utility of e-Lumen and its competitors as standardized SLO tools for all programs (see documents 02.17.01-02.17.03).

Training users in accessing, interpreting, and applying data is a high priority under the new Director. For example, he trained department chairs in the meaning and application of the new standard planning and program review performance reports in April 2010, and did the same for all faculty and managers at In-Service Day in August 2010. The ORP will continue training as needed on data access and interpretation in the Fall, both on a one-to-one basis and in groups (see documents 02.18.01-02.18.02).

Training in and use of the new Executive Reporting Information System (ERIS) was suspended in 2009-10 while apparent discrepancies between ERIS data and expected results were resolved. ERIS is now operational, and the Director has established that the underlying data in the Datatel system are sound in all cases investigated to date. Five reports in ERIS are now in production, as follows:

- Course Enrollments by Department, an especially useful enrollment planning tool
- Annual Planning Longitudinal Summary, for program review comparisons across terms
- FTE Summary Report, showing CCFS-320 FTES data by college and districtwide
- Daily Snapshot, an up-to-date summary of enrollment within a given term
- Daily Snapshot Detail, a summary of enrollment and FTES that permits choice of term

The ORP has scheduled training for faculty in the use of these reports in Fall 2010 (see document 02.19.01).

In cases where the ERIS reports, planning and program review reports, and other existing resources described above are insufficient to meet a particular set of data needs, the ORP takes ad hoc requests, works with users to clarify specifications, and provides reports as quickly as possible (see documents 02.20.01-02.20.05).

Since the arrival of the Director, the ORP has improved its outreach to the campus community about its services. For example, the Director made a brief presentation on the ORP's work to faculty, managers, classified staff, and student leadership at the CHC In-Service Day in August 2010 (see document 02.21.01).

Finally, one ORP position has been reclassified as a Research Assistant. That means that as of Fall 2010, the office has full research capacity for the first time in nearly two years (see document 02.22.01).

See Recommendation 10 below on availability of financial data.

Conclusion

The College has articulated its objectives in measurable terms in both the Educational Master Plan and the planning and program review process (Standard I.B.2). Under the leadership of the Director of Research and Planning, it has also applied the analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data to the assessment of progress toward those objectives in a systematic improvement cycle; to the identification of student learning needs and the assessment of progress toward achieving learning outcomes; and to decision support across the institution (Standards I.B.3, II.A.1.a). Assessment results are widely communicated to all constituencies in the College community (Standard I.B.5).

The College has satisfied the recommendation to "develop processes that produce reliable data, provide employees with easy access to data, and provide training on how to access, interpret and utilize data."

During 2010-11, the ORP will continue to monitor data integrity in the information systems on which it relies. It will also evaluate its own effectiveness in providing the College with reliable, timely information, and training in the use of that information, and make any necessary procedural improvements.

Recommendation 6: Participation in Decision-Making and Planning Processes
In order to improve the quality of the institution, the college president should ensure that all areas, including academic, student, and administrative services, are actively participating in the decision making and planning processes. (Standards I.B.4, IV.A.3, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)

Progress and Analysis

The accreditation consultant performed a systematic, thorough evaluation of administrative and governance structures, processes, and services in Summer 2009, as reported in the October 2009 Follow-Up Report (see document 06.01.01). One component of that evaluation was participation by all College Areas in decision-making and planning processes at the administrative level. As one result of that evaluation, the President implemented several enhancements during 2009-10 that have helped provide personnel in Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President's Area with the consistent and reliable information they need for effective participation, and ensured that their voices are heard in both formal and informal planning and decision-making:

- The President and the vice presidents together have established specific expectations for facilitating communication, problem-solving, and sharing information with line staff, and the President continues to delegate authority to all the vice presidents to take appropriate actions in support of the College's mission.
- Cabinet meetings alternate with meetings of the Crafton Council, the central deliberative collegial consultation body at Crafton Hills College, which the President chairs and on which all three vice presidents serve. Before some Crafton Council meetings, the President and vice presidents meet over lunch for an informal discussion of College issues.
- At the monthly management team meeting, the President has discussed her expectation that managers at every level share important information with their staff members, answer their questions, listen to their concerns, and convey those concerns back up to their supervisors.
- The President increased the frequency of her visits to campus offices and departments (see document 06.02.01).

Participation by all College Areas is also important in shared-governance and other major committees. The Accreditation Liaison Officer and President's Office each Spring prepare and analyze a census of Area participation on nine major committees, with comparative figures for the College as a whole and two administrative groups (see document 06.03.01). Results of the latest survey included the following:

- On average, with the exception of Administrative Services (which was underrepresented), each Area's committee participation was roughly at parity with the number of College employees in that Area.
- From Fall 2009 to Spring 2010, Student Services committee participation compared with the number of College employees in that Area improved in both ratio and number of underrepresented committees.

Restoring the rough parity of representation in Administrative Services that existed in Fall 2009 is a priority for 2010-11.

In some cases, one might expect and even value overrepresentation of certain Areas, and find the consequent underrepresentation of one or more other Areas explicable; for example, compared to the management team, Instruction is overrepresented on the Curriculum Committee, and the other three Areas are underrepresented. In some cases, however, Area underrepresentation calls for further examination. For example:

- Student Services has only one representative on the Technology Planning Committee.
- Administrative Services has no representation on the Professional Development Committee.

Additional analysis and discussion of these findings in Crafton Council will help the College identify and then implement needed improvements in the pattern of participation by personnel in all Areas.

Finally, the evaluation team noted that during their October 2008 visit, the Vice President of Student Services "does not appear to have the same level of involvement as the other vice presidents of the college" in decision-making processes. The current Vice President of Student Services, since assuming the position over a year ago, has been an active and valued contributor to Cabinet-level discussions, committee work, and Area leadership and advocacy, and has clearly indicated that she will continue that degree of involvement in both planning and decision-making processes. For example, she co-chairs the Planning and Program Review Committee for 2010-11, and has taken over leadership of the Enrollment Management Committee.

Closely related to Recommendation 6, the October 2008 visiting team's Recommendation 4 dealt with improvements in governance structures and processes. In the Accreditation Follow-Up Visit Report in December 2009, the team found that the requirements of Recommendation 4 had been met, but also noted that "consistent communication and sustained involvement of all constituent groups needs to be a priority as the College moves forward." Such consistent communication and sustained involvement has indeed remained a priority at Crafton Hills College, as indicated by the following:

- The Crafton Council has functioned smoothly, and has taken a very active role in shared-governance activities, including the establishment of new committees, the review of planning and program review priorities, the review of proposed policy changes, and the publication of an updated *CHC Organizational Handbook* that includes sections on committee member responsibilities, facilitating participation in governance, decision models, and mentors for student committee members (see documents 06.04.01-06.04.04). A draft of the *Organizational Handbook* was distributed to all faculty and managers at the CHC In-Service Day, August 13, 2010. After incorporating input from all constituency groups as appropriate, the Crafton Council will publish the final version by mid-October 2010.
- The Crafton Council has recommended a substantial revision of the CHC portion of Administrative Procedure 2225, to clarify governance structures and processes (see document 06.05.01).

- The President continues to publish her President's Letter to the entire college community about once per month. Each issue contains information about issues, priorities, concerns, and news important to the College (see document 06.06.01).
- The President continues to meet regularly with all three Senates. In fact, she visits and presents updates at Classified Senate meetings more frequently than she did prior to Fall 2009, and has regularly scheduled meetings with the Classified Senate President (see document 06.02.01).
- The President issued a directive to all managers to "facilitate participation in college governance activities by classified staff members under their supervision, to the extent feasible" (see document 06.08.01).
- For the first time, the College closed all offices for a portion of In-Service Day, so that all classified staff could attend the all-campus meeting (see documents 06.09.01-06.09.02).
- During the inaugural Classified Professionals Week in June 2010, 149 classified staff members participated in nine well-received workshops designed to promote their professional and personal growth. Two of those workshops—Dealing with Change and How to Serve Effectively on a Committee—were designed to address needs identified in the Educational Master Plan (see document 06.10.01).
- About three times per semester, the Vice President for Instruction holds All-Instruction Meetings, at which she presents a brief update on instructional issues and then opens the floor for a Q&A session (see documents 06.11.01-06.11.05).
- On the last Friday of each month, Student Services offices are closed for a portion of the afternoon so that all managers, faculty, and staff may attend a meeting of the whole Area, at which the Vice President and individual offices make presentations on matters of importance to everyone (see documents 06.12.01-06.12.10).
- As noted in the October 2009 Follow-Up Report, student participation improved in 2009-10 over previous years. To maintain that progress, the Vice President for Student Services and Director of Student Life contributed to the *CHC Organizational Handbook* methods to help retain student appointees on governance structures and to replace student appointees who no longer can serve (see document 06.04.04, pp. 7-9, 31-32).
- The Office of Research and Planning administered a survey of student leadership on their participation in governance. Results showed that respondents viewed their experiences in governance activities very positively, and believed that "students' interests are adequately represented in discussions and decisions regarding important issues facing the College" (see documents 06.14.01-06.14.02).
- The Office of Research and Planning is constructing a new edition of the annual campus climate survey to be administered in early Fall 2010. It is designed to facilitate a more systematic evaluation of governance participation and effectiveness from the constituents' perspective, and is aligned with the applicable sections of the Educational Master Plan. Results will be sent to the Crafton Council, one of whose functions is to "coordinate the systematic evaluation of governance and administrative structures, processes, and services," for possible action (see documents 06.04.04, p. 14; 06.15.01).
- The Crafton Council will implement a Committee Self-Evaluation process beginning in Spring 2011, to facilitate improvements in the effectiveness of all committees on campus. Results of the process will be aggregated across all committees and analyzed by the ORP, to enable the Council to gauge the overall effectiveness of committee structures and processes in planning and decision-making (see document 06.16.01).

Conclusion

All areas of the College—Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President's Area—are actively participating in decision-making and planning processes, as are all constituent groups (Standard I.B.4). The governance structures and processes now in place facilitate effective communication and collaborative work among members of all constituencies (Standard IV.A.3). All members of the President's administrative structure work productively together, with appropriate authority under the President, to further the College's mission and goals (Standards IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b). Administrative and governance structures and processes have been thoroughly evaluated, and will continue to be regularly evaluated; the results are communicated to the campus community, and are used to make significant improvements as the need for them is identified (Standards IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

The College, under the President's leadership, has met the recommendation to "ensure that all areas, including academic, student, and administrative services, are actively participating in the decision making and planning processes." In addition, it has established effective structures and processes to ensure "consistent communication and sustained involvement of all constituent groups," as suggested in the Accreditation Follow-Up Visit Report of December 2009.

During 2010-11, the College will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of its governance structures and processes, in part through the revised climate survey and the Committee Self-Evaluation. It will also re-evaluate participation by all areas in decision-making and planning processes, and implement any needed improvements.

Recommendation 7: District-Level Program Review, Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, and Human Resources Plan

In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees, and the chancellor, in consultation with the leadership of the college campuses, develop a strategy for addressing some significant issues raised by each college and verified in interviews with staff in the following areas; namely:

- *The development of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for reviewing all district functions and processes using a Program Review model. (Standards IV.B.3.a, b)*
- *The development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan that both acknowledges input and aligns with the colleges educational plan and serves as a guide for planning at the college level. (Standards I.B.3, IV.B.3.g)*
- *The development of a coordinated strategic plan for technology that is responsive to the colleges and assists them in the daily management of the college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information. (Standards I.B.2, 5, 6, IV.B.3.b, III.C.1.a, c, III.C.2, III.D.2.a)*
- *The development of a long range Human Resources Plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing the need for full-time faculty and staff. (Standards I.A.4, III.A.6, III.B.2.b)*

District Program Review

Progress and Analysis

Prior to 2009-10, several District functions and processes had undertaken self-evaluation and improvement activities akin to program review based on both quantitative and qualitative information, but the efforts had not yet become systematic, and documentation of improvements based on evaluations was sparse. For example:

- In the summer 2008 Business Services retreat, staff members looked at their challenges, identified efficiencies and correctives that were needed, and determined performance goals and objectives for 2008-09. During 2008-09, they updated quantitative measures of their progress on a monthly basis. Units did report implementing operational improvements on the basis of these assessments, although they did not document those improvements. However, with the departure of the Business Manager in June 2009, the planning and improvement cycle was interrupted until the District planning and program review process began in October 2009.
- Human Resources (HR) completed a program review document in August 2009. The department has also done an annual status report on its goals and activities in relation to the Board Imperatives and Institutional Goals.
- Distributed Education and Technology Services (DETS) collects evaluative information on its technology services primarily through Help Desk feedback emails (see documents 07a.01.01-07a.01.04).

These efforts represented steps in the right direction, but a more systematic District planning and program review process was clearly needed. To guide the initial cycle of that systematic process, the former Chancellor appointed an administrative Steering Committee composed of the

Vice Chancellors for Fiscal Services and Human Resources and the Executive Director of DETS. The new process began in earnest in October 2009 with Steering Committee meetings and the development of a planning and program review timeline. The Steering Committee recommended a three-year cycle, and decided that all District operations units except the Police department would do their initial program reviews in 2009-10. The Committee identified all applicable units in each division, determined that each unit team would be composed of all permanent employees in the unit, and appointed a team leader for each unit. It also approved a template for the program review document, and initiated development of a web-based tool based on that template (see documents 07a.02.01-07a.02.03).

The program review document for every unit includes the following sections:

I. Mission
II. Description
III. Outcomes and Other Measures of Effectiveness
    A. Effectiveness Measures
    B. Assessment of Effectiveness Using Those Measures
IV. External Opportunities and Challenges
V. Analysis and Evaluation
VI. Three-to-Five-Year Vision
VII. Impact on the Colleges and the District
VIII. Other Pertinent Information
IX. Goals, Objectives, and Action Plans
X. Resource Requests
XI. Progress Report on Last Cycle's Goals, Objectives, and Action Plans (if applicable)
XII. Description of Process and Participants

On November 20, 2009, members and leaders of all units attended a half-day kickoff workshop facilitated by the accreditation consultant. At the workshop, participants learned about the purposes of District program review and planning, the contents of a sound program review and planning document, and the cyclical process for program improvement. Each unit then went through a three-step process of developing a clear and cogent mission statement based on the unit's core purpose and core business. Units shared their mission statements and made comments. Participants then learned about measuring their unit's effectiveness and about the nature of outcome statements before reviewing a sample, drafting their own essential unit effectiveness measures and assessment methods, and reporting them on a form provided. Some units (e.g., Accounting, DCS-Technical Services) already had existing methods for gathering effectiveness data as a matter of course, but most needed to develop new measures and methods. Each unit submitted its draft to the Steering Committee at the end of the workshop (see documents 07a.03.01-07a.03.08).

The facilitator reviewed all the drafts and provided written feedback within a week to each unit through the applicable Steering Committee member, who also provided feedback as needed. All units submitted their revised drafts one week later. By mid-December all units had submitted their unit descriptions in draft form, on which the Steering Committee provided written feedback

in early January 2010 (see documents 07a.04.01-07a.04.02). In mid-January, the committee reviewed progress to date, and decided that the most effective method for facilitating completion of the program review process in all units would be an all-day workshop in March.

During the period leading up to the March workshop, the Steering Committee developed and approved an online District Operations Satisfaction Survey to be sent annually to all District and College employees and College student leadership. The committee chose to focus on usage of and satisfaction with District-level services for this initial survey because they comprise two of the most important measures of the effectiveness of District functions in supporting the colleges. Indeed, several of the units had identified client satisfaction with their services as an essential outcome. The survey was administered in late February and early March to approximately 1,200 recipients. Each respondent rated some 10 aspects of services in each unit from which he or she had requested or received services within the past 12 months, and had the opportunity to comment on needed improvements, additional desirable services, or anything else. Nine units (all except the Police department, which will engage in program review in the next cycle, and EduStream, an office whose clients are primarily outside the District) were included in the survey, which summarized the operational responsibilities and functions of each of them. There were 230 respondents, for a response rate of 19 percent. Quantitative results were sent to all units just before the workshop, unit-specific comments were sent to the units to which they applied, and general comments were sent to all units (see documents 07a.05.01-07a.05.02).

Results of the District Operations Satisfaction Survey indicated that both usage of and satisfaction with District services varied widely. Highlights of the survey results included the following (see document 07a.06.01):

- Over three-quarters of respondents had requested or received services from DCS-Technical Services and from Human Resources within the last 12 months, while fewer than 30 percent had requested or received services from Distributed Education and from District Facilities within the same period.
- District Facilities had the highest proportion of users who were satisfied overall (84%), while Human Resources had the lowest proportion of satisfied users (50%). In the rest of the units, the proportion of users who were satisfied overall ranged from 73% to 79%.
- Human Resources and Purchasing had the highest proportions of users who were dissatisfied overall, at 26% and 19% respectively, while Accounting/Accounts Payable/Audit had the lowest proportion of dissatisfied users, at 6%. In the rest of the units, the proportion of users who were dissatisfied overall ranged from 7% to 10%.
- Six specific aspects of service included in the survey were regarded as most revealing of overall effectiveness in supporting the colleges. Satisfaction ratios (the ratios of positive ratings to negative ratings) for these aspects ranged as follows:

Aspect	Highest Satisfaction Ratios* (Satisfied:Dissatisfied)	Lowest Satisfaction Ratios* (Satisfied:Dissatisfied)	Range of Ratios* in Remaining Units
Helpfulness	DCS-Technical Services (23:1) District Facilities (20:1)	Human Resources (4:1) Purchasing (6:1)	9:1 to 14:1
Follow-through	District Facilities (13:1) Accounting/Accounts Payable/Audit (12:1)	Human Resources (2:1) Purchasing (5:1)	7:1 to 11:1
Accuracy of information provided	DCS-Administrative Services (16:1) Distributed Education (15:1)	Human Resources (3:1) Purchasing (6:1)	8:1 to 14:1
Timeliness of initial response	Distributed Education (41:1) Printing Services (12:1)	Human Resources (2:1) Purchasing (5:1)	6:1 to 10:1
Timeliness of final resolution	Distributed Education (42:1) Printing Services (11:1)	Human Resources (2:1) Purchasing (5:1) DCS-Administrative Services (5:1)	6:1 to 9:1
Clarity and consistency of procedures	District Facilities (13:1) Distributed Education (8:1)	Human Resources (1:1) Purchasing (3:1)	5:1 to 7:1

* Explanation of Satisfaction Ratios: One would expect a unit that is highly effective from its clients' perspective to have a large proportion of respondents who are satisfied with its service (positive ratings of 4 or 5 on the survey), and a small proportion who are not satisfied (negative ratings of 1 or 2). The ratio of positive ratings to negative ratings (the Satisfaction Ratio) shows this relationship in a concise way. The higher this ratio is for a given aspect of a unit's service or overall, the more satisfaction predominates among its users, and thus the more effective its service is in the eyes of those users. The satisfaction ratio conveys more information than mean satisfaction ratings, for example.

- The mean satisfaction ratio across all service aspects by unit ranged from 19:1 for Distributed Education and 13:1 for District Facilities to 5:1 for Purchasing and 3:1 for Human Resources. The mean ratios in the rest of the units ranged from 7:1 to 11:1.
- In all but one unit, the courtesy of the staff received the highest satisfaction ratio. Satisfaction ratios for that aspect ranged from 5:1 in Human Resources and 6:1 in Printing Services to over 20:1 in DCS-Technical Services, DCS-Administrative Services, Distributed Education, Accounting/Accounts Payable/Audit, and District Facilities.
- In every unit, the opportunity to provide input on changes in service or procedures received the lowest satisfaction ratio. Satisfaction ratios for that aspect ranged from 1:1 in Human Resources and 2:1 in Purchasing to 4:1 in District Facilities.

Respondents made 398 comments in the survey, an enormous number. Nearly all were thoughtful and constructive, though a few respondents took the opportunity to vent their frustrations with services that had fallen short of their expectations. In some cases, a unit received praise from one respondent and criticism from another for the same service. Needed-improvement themes that recurred across two or more units included the following, many of which echoed the survey results:

- Communication and clarity about procedures (especially changes therein), requirements, and the status of requests
- More efficient procedures, in part through the use of technology

- Consistency of information provided—from different unit staff members, to different clients, and across different periods of time
- Training, both of unit staff and of clients, to improve the match of expectations and performance
- Input on service offerings, software systems, and the like
- Responsiveness, especially in answering and returning telephone requests for help
- Turnaround time on service requests, sometimes coupled with observations about unit understaffing (see document 07a.07.01)

All units considered the quantitative survey results, the comments applicable to them, and to a lesser extent the comments that applied to District services and operations overall, as they finished their self-assessment at the March 19 all-day workshop. All teams were trained in the use of the web-based planning tool, which they could use instead of the word-processing template if they so chose. Most chose to use the web-based tool that day. Teams drafted each remaining section of their program review in turn, with guidance and feedback from the facilitator, their own unit leaders, and the Steering Committee members. A substantial part of the afternoon session focused heavily on analysis of assessment results (including interpretation of the District Operations Satisfaction Survey results) and formulation of goals, objectives, and action plans, since those areas are most difficult for many groups new to program review and planning. By the end of the workshop, every unit had completed a rough draft of the entire planning and program review document (see documents 07a.08.01-07a.08.04).

Based on the survey results, other effectiveness measures, and qualitative analysis of their own strengths and weaknesses, District units incorporated numerous operational improvements into their goals and objectives for next year. For example:

- The Purchasing unit team attributed the unit's low satisfaction ratios primarily to inadequate or unclear communication with clients about the legal and organizational requirements that apply to purchasing transactions. So their objectives for 2010-11 include workshops for users, improved communication methods, and more streamlined processes.
- The Human Resources team, acknowledging the unit's low satisfaction ratios as a weakness, adopted excellent customer service as a goal, with objectives that include more effective communication through the HR newsletter and an intranet, and scheduled office hours at the colleges by HR staff.
- Several units (Accounting/Accounts Payable/Audit, Distributed Education, DCS-Technical Services, and District Facilities) addressed the inadequate opportunities clients had for input on services and procedural changes by formulating goals or objectives to provide more of those opportunities through surveys, user committees, Help Desk improvements, and better training (see documents 07a.09.01-07a.09.06).

All units had two weeks to polish and submit their formal drafts, including their final prioritized lists of objectives and resource requests. The quality of the submissions was generally high, considering that none of the units had ever prepared such documents before. For example, alignment among measures of effectiveness, analysis of results, goals and objectives, and resource requests was stronger than expected. Units generally took the task seriously and

considered their responses thoughtfully. The DCS-Administrative Services document, in fact, was exemplary (see document 07a.10.01). On the other hand, the Steering Committee identified a few units that will likely need additional assistance to ensure that their next planning and program review cycle is more effective.

The facilitator provided written feedback two weeks after submission of the formal drafts to every unit through the applicable Steering Committee member, who also provided feedback as needed. The facilitator also provided suggestions to improve the quality of the documents for the next cycle (see document 07a.11.01). All units incorporated feedback and submitted their final documents on the web-based planning tool by early May. All final documents are available for viewing by all employees of the District on the District Program Review website (see document 07a.12.01).

The Interim Chancellor periodically reported District Program Review progress to all employees in the District in his *Chancellor's Chat* online newsletter. In addition, in late April, he distributed the quantitative results of the District Operations Satisfaction Survey to all employees in the District (see documents 07a.13.01-07a.13.03).

Division and area supervisors, as well as the Chancellor, are holding units accountable for progress on their goals and objectives every year. Each year, all units not engaged in a full program review will prepare an annual planning update with the following sections:

- Significant changes in the unit
- Summary of results of effectiveness measures applied since program review
- Progress in effectiveness, innovations, partnerships, operational efficiency, and other areas
- Progress on last year's goals and objectives
- Updated goals and objectives in priority order
- Resources needed, if any, to achieve objectives
- Other information as needed

The cyclical process of program review and annual planning is designed to facilitate continuous improvement in all District operations (see documents 07a.14.01-07a.14.03).

Several units have already implemented improvements in their services based on their program reviews, and the rest have scheduled such improvements. For example:

- Human Resources began holding office hours at the colleges in April 2010.
- Distributed Education has begun to deploy technologies requested by users, including Blackboard 9 and Camtasia Relay, and has implemented new training attendee evaluation forms to improve tracking of customer satisfaction.
- DCS-Administrative Services has developed a new comprehensive training calendar and on-demand training materials.
- DCS-Technical Services has scheduled an overhaul of the entire network core infrastructure for July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011.

- Printing Services has purchased new hardware that will dramatically improve staff efficiency.
- Facilities (District) has completed documentation of Facilities operating procedures.
- Payroll met its accuracy target for pay warrants in every cycle from March to date.
- Business Services has begun the use of standardized notifications to end-users regarding the receipt of contracts (see documents 07a.15.01-07a.15.10).

The Steering Committee developed a computer-assisted method to facilitate the production of the consolidated divisional and area priority lists of objectives and resource requests for District operations. The committee sent its recommended final priorities list to the Interim Chancellor on August 3, 2010. He made two changes and supplied rationales for both, and notified all unit participants and the rest of District community of the results in his *Chancellor's Chat* newsletter on August 26, 2010. The Interim Chancellor has directed the Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Services to set aside a total of $100,000 in the 2010-11 District operations budget for funding of resource requests associated with the highest-priority District Program Review objectives and for implementation of the District Strategic Plan (see documents 07a.16.01-07a.16.03).

On a more global level, the Interim Chancellor, the Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Services, the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, and the Executive Director of DETS considered the overall program review process and results as they planned District operations and resource allocations for 2010-11. For example, in large part because of critical comments on the District Operations Satisfaction Survey, the start date for moving the DETS Help Desk to a different provider was accelerated to July 1, 2010. In Fiscal Services, access to certain forms and status information will be streamlined, and document control will be digitized, beginning in 2010-11 (see documents 07a.17.01-07a.17.02).

To gauge the appropriateness and effectiveness of the planning and program review process from the participants' perspective, the Interim Chancellor asked all participants to respond to an online Process Survey about the workshops, the feedback, the web-based tool, their level of input, and the helpfulness of the process as a whole for self-evaluation and continuous improvement (see document 07a.18.01). Respondents could also add any comments they wished. Twenty-three people (61 percent of them unit members, as opposed to unit leaders or managers) completed the survey, for a response rate of 37 percent.

Results of the Process Survey suggested that participants' evaluation of the process was generally positive (see documents 07a.19.01-07a.19.03):

- A large majority of respondents found the process extremely or quite helpful to their units in measuring their effectiveness (75%), analyzing their strengths and weaknesses (69%), identifying needed improvements (75%), and setting goals and objectives for next year (87%).
- All respondents found the workshops at least somewhat helpful, and all but one found the feedback at least somewhat helpful. Comments indicated that respondents valued the ability to focus on the process without outside interruptions, and sharing the experience with each other and with other units.

- The majority of the 12 respondents who said they had used the web-based planning tool found its features easy or extremely easy to use.
- Respondents felt themselves full participants in the process: Four of every five said that they had either enough or more than enough opportunity to provide meaningful input in the program review and planning process.
- Asked what aspect of the process worked best, respondents cited the focused, shared workshops; the District Operations Satisfaction Survey results; the web-based tool; and the feedback each unit received on its drafts.
- Communication about the process as a whole was sufficiently clear that most respondents understood its nature and purposes reasonably well.

However, the survey results, informal discussions with process participants, and further reflection on the process by the Steering Committee highlighted certain issues that needed to be addressed, and led the committee to recommend the following improvements in the process for the next cycle:

- Add a representative from each Area to the Steering Committee.
- Improve documentation in the next cycle to clarify the flow of information, the steps in the process, and the purposes of feedback, including feedback provided at workshops.
- Incorporate the consideration of the District Strategic Plan, the District Technology Strategic Plan, and other applicable major planning documents.
- Evaluate, and if needed modify, the management of time and tasks associated with the workshops.
- Adjust the schedule for the next cycle to ensure timely completion of the process, and timely communication of its results to the participants.
- Inform the colleges about the process and its results in more timely fashion, and solicit suggestions for improving the process in the next cycle.
- Modify the descriptions of unit functions in next year's survey to clarify those functions, the differences among units, and the differences between district-level functions and their college-level counterparts.
- Consider expanding the survey to assess district operational effectiveness in additional ways.
- Modify the web-based planning tool to ease navigation, data entry, and prioritization.
- Directions to respondents in next year's survey will urge them to focus on each applicable unit as a whole, rather than on individuals, and will request that they not use names. Any names of employees entered in comments will be masked before distribution to participants (see document 07a.20.01).

The Interim Chancellor presented information on the District program review process and its results to all attendees of the annual In-Service Day at both colleges on August 13, 2010. He also notified all unit participants and the rest of the District community of the Process Survey results and the above recommendations for improvement in the next cycle in his *Chancellor's Chat* of September 13, 2010 (see documents 07a.21.01-07a.21.02).

Conclusion

For the first time, the District has developed and fully implemented a systematic, ongoing District planning and program review process focused on continuous improvement. This process helps ensure that District operations provide "effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions" (Standard IV.B.3.b). Quantitative effectiveness measures and qualitative information applied in this initial cycle have already led to concrete improvements in some units, and provide a baseline for assessing progress in subsequent cycles. Unit members and leaders, division managers, and area managers were all active participants in the process, helped assess its effectiveness, and contributed ideas for improving it. The wider District and college communities also participated through their responses on the District Operations Satisfaction Survey. That survey summarized the operational responsibilities and functions of each of the nine units included, and thus helped delineate those functions to college personnel, though there was still some confusion at the colleges about three District units (Standard IV.B.3.a). Despite some weaknesses that are being addressed, the District has made great strides in evaluating and improving its own operations for the benefit of the clients it serves.

With the establishment of the systematic and ongoing District planning and program review process, the District has addressed the recommendation to develop "an appropriate and clearly communicated process for reviewing all district functions and processes using a program review model."

The process will become more efficient and efficacious as it is implemented for a second cycle in 2010-11. In that second cycle, the colleges will be informed about the process in more timely fashion, and will provide suggestions for improving it.

District Strategic Plan

Progress and Analysis

No District Strategic Plan existed before 2009-10. In lieu of strategic directions or initiatives that would appear in a District Strategic Plan, the District used Board of Trustees Imperatives, structured along the lines of the Commission's Accreditation Standards, with annually updated Institutional Goals under each. These Imperatives and Goals informed strategic planning at San Bernardino Valley College and the early development of the CHC Educational Master Plan (see documents 07b.01.01-07b.01.02).

To develop a proper District Strategic Plan (DSP), the District Strategic Planning Committee (DSPC) was formed in October 2009. The Committee had broad and active shared-governance representation, including Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Students representatives from both CHC and SBVC; both colleges' presidents, strategic and educational master planning committee chairs, and researchers; a representative of the District Office classified staff; and representatives of both KVCR and Economic Development and Corporate Training (EDCT), as well as the Chancellor, both Vice Chancellors, and the Executive Director of Distributed Education and Technology Services (DETS). Committee members worked diligently through Spring 2010 on their tasks, which included reviewing extensive materials

before and after every semimonthly meeting (e.g., the agenda, detailed minutes, reports, reference documents, transcriptions of posted comments, updates of action documents) as well as subcommittee work (see documents 07b.02.01-07b.02.03). Documentation of all DSPC materials is readily available on the Committee's website (http://www.sbccd.cc.ca.us/District_Faculty_,-a-,_Staff_Information-Forms/District_Committee_Minutes/District_Strategic_Planning_Committee.aspx).

The first three meetings focused on orientation and groundwork in areas such as the following:

- Purposes of the District Strategic Plan
- Characteristics of excellent planning processes
- Distinctions among goals, objectives, and activities
- Problems and successes in previous planning experiences in the District
- Semimonthly meeting schedule and locations
- Committee operations, logistics, and ground rules (see documents 07b.03.01-07b.03.07)

The DSPC adopted by consensus a set of member, convener, and facilitator responsibilities, which explicitly included, along with attendance and active engagement in the deliberations, sharing the committee's progress with constituents and colleagues at the colleges and bringing back input from those constituents and colleagues throughout the process. By the end of the third meeting, the committee had established a timeline and process for development of the DSP that built in input from and alignment with the colleges' strategic and educational master plans (see documents 07b.04.01-07b.04.02).

Over the next several meetings, the Committee reviewed and discussed numerous additional sources of information, including the following (see documents 07b.05.01-07b.05.09):

- The strategic directions/initiatives and goals in the colleges' strategic and educational master plans
- San Bernardino Community College District Board Imperatives
- The District's and colleges' missions and other foundational statements
- The California Community Colleges System Strategic Plan
- The ACCJC's Rubric for evaluating planning
- Data for both colleges (including enrollment and productivity trends, student performance and impact indicators, and institutional characteristics) drawn from local research and from Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) reports
- Demographic and economic information about the colleges' service areas from an environmental scan provided by the Center of Excellence housed at EDCT

In addition, subcommittees gathered information on important strategic issues related to higher education in the following areas:

- Budget, law and regulation, and capital funding
- Pedagogical innovations, accountability, and learning outcomes
- Educational attainment in relation to economic opportunity

- Competition for students with other institutions
- Private support for education, including grant opportunities
- Technology issues and trends related to education
- Financial aid

The subcommittees reported their findings and the main implications of those findings for strategic planning in January and February 2010 DSPC meetings (see documents 07b.06.01-07b.06.06).

From December 2009 through February 2010, drawing on this flow of information and numerous discussions, the Committee refined a working set of District strategic directions and goals, each version of which showed alignment of District goals with the colleges' goals. In early March, the Interim Chancellor distributed the working set to all District employees and student leadership with a request for email feedback on the importance of the strategic directions and goals, for specific change suggestions, and for ideas on concrete steps the District should take to make progress on the goals. The facilitator asked the presidents of the Academic Senates, the Classified Senates, the SBVC Associated Students, and the CHC Student Senate to discuss the working set in their meetings; the CHC Academic Senate provided a transcript of their discussion. Three well-publicized open forums—one at each college and one at the District offices—were held to present information, answer questions, and record feedback on the working set. Several members of the DSPC also participated in the forums (see documents 07b.07.01-07b.07.10).

The Committee discussed all the feedback received. Email respondents, though few in number, affirmed that the strategic directions and goals in the working set were important for the continued progress of the District. Most of the CHC Academic Senate comments were requests for clarification of the process, which the CHC Academic Senate President (who serves on the DSPC) provided at the Senate meeting. The Committee concluded that since most of the comments received at the forums and from the Academic Senate were requests for clarification, and since forum participants, when asked, raised no objections to the existing language, no changes in the language of any of the strategic directions and goals were warranted. However, partly in response to one comment, the Committee did decide to include an objective emphasizing improved collaboration among all District entities (see documents 07b.08.01-07b.08.02).

The DSPC spent a substantial portion of the meetings in March and April developing and refining one to three objectives for each goal, with tentative timelines, point persons, measurements of progress, and concrete actions. All objectives were measurable by qualitative or quantitative methods, and many were measurable by both. The Committee focused on objectives that would accomplish one or more of five main purposes (see documents 07b.09.01-07b.09.04):

- Provide needed District support to both colleges in pursuing and achieving their own goals.
- Coordinate, or place a District umbrella over, analogous sets of goals and objectives that already exist at both colleges.

- Guide further planning at both colleges.
- Establish or enhance a District-level operation to advance a District goal.
- Fill a gap in the colleges' planning.

During February, March, and April 2010, the DSPC accomplished several other tasks as well:

- It reviewed in detail updated and enhanced environmental scan information, and identified the principal implications of the data for District strategic planning.
- It adopted a set of major planning assumptions based primarily on analysis and discussion of the strategic issues subcommittee reports, the performance and impact indicators, and the environmental scan reports.
- It developed and refined a detailed process for review, revision, and continuous improvement commencing in 2010-11. This process was designed to assess both the effectiveness of the DSP itself and the District's progress on achieving its goals and objectives, with annual progress reports and triennial full evaluations.
- It incorporated a long-range financial plan and forecast, which included the District Resource Allocation Model.
- It developed a glossary of terms and acronyms to assist readers in understanding the plan.

All these components were incorporated into the distribution draft of the DSP. In late April, the Interim Chancellor sent an email to all District employees and student leadership with a link to the draft, inviting everyone to provide constructive suggestions or comments via a dedicated email address or through a DSPC member. He also led an open meeting at the District Office to answer questions and receive feedback. In addition, the facilitator led an open forum at each college to answer questions and receive feedback on the plan; again, several DSPC members participated. He also made a presentation on the DSP draft to the District Assembly (see documents 07b.10.01, pp. 47-67, 21, 4-6, 35-37, 68-70; 07b.10.02-07b.10.04).

A greater amount of feedback was received this time, and at its meeting on May 7, the Committee seriously considered all of it (see document 07b.11.01). After considerable discussion, most of which focused on monitoring and ensuring progress under the plan, the DSPC made the following changes to the DSP:

- To help ensure continuing progress in implementing the plan, added quarterly monitoring to the evaluation and revision section: "The DSPC will monitor progress on the DSP on a quarterly basis in consultation with the point persons and groups, and facilitate corrective actions as needed."
- To improve communication about progress in implementing the plan, added two actions under Objective 1.1.1:
  - "Build into the agendas of regular meetings and events (e.g., In-Service Day, President's Cabinet, Crafton Council, SBVC College Council, Senates, and meetings of other representative bodies) communication about progress on the DSP."
  - "Develop a template or other tool to facilitate regular communication with and feedback from all district personnel about DSP progress."

- To support transparent allocation of resources, added two actions under Objective 3.1.2:
  - "DSPC makes a formal recommendation to the District Budget Committee to review the annual budget within the framework of the DSP."
  - "Establish a committee for coordination of and communication about grant activity district-wide."
- To reflect more accurately the long-range nature of the plan, changed the title to "Strategic Plan 2010-14."
- Revised the language of one action.
- Revised the point persons/groups on three objectives.
- Altered the timelines on two objectives (see document 07b.12.01).

The DSPC approved the DSP with these changes by consensus, and recommended it to the Interim Chancellor. In turn, he notified the District community of his approval, listed the goals of the plan, and provided a link to the plan on May 25, 2010. The Board of Trustees approved the plan at their July 8, 2010 meeting (see documents 07b.13.01-07b.13.03).

The District Strategic Plan is composed of the following sections:

- Preamble
  - Main Purposes of the District Strategic Plan
  - Background and Process
  - Evaluation and Revision of the Plan
  - Participants
- District and College Foundational Statements
- Effectiveness and Impact Indicators
  - ARCC College-Level Indicators
  - Student Performance, WSCH per Faculty Load, and FTES
- Consolidated Report of Strategic Issues: Highlights and Implications
- Major Planning Assumptions
- A Brief Introduction to Planning Terminology
- Overview of Strategic Directions, Goals, and Alignment with College Plans
- District Strategic Directions, Goals, and Objectives
- Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast
  - Forecast, 2010-11 through 2012-13
  - Revenue, Expenditure, and Other Forecast Assumptions
  - 2010-11 District Resource Allocation Model
- Characteristics of the Colleges
  - Student Demographics
  - Employee Demographics
- Planning Context: Information from the Environmental Scan
- Glossary

Several actions called for in the DSP were underway even before the end of the 2009-10 academic year. For example:

Objective	Action	Status
1.1.1	Publish a periodic *Chancellor's Chat*, summarizing significant developments and decisions during each month and including other useful information as needed.	Chencellor's Chat began publication February 8, 2010; the last issue for 2009-10 was published June 15, 2010 (see documents 07b.14.01-07b.14.02).
3.1.2	Finalize resource allocation model and process.	The Resource Allocation Committee approved the Resource Allocation Model for 2010-11 May 17, 2010 (see *Commission Recommendation 1* section below).
3.2.1	Publish the organizational structure for technology services.	The organizational structure is published on page 12 of the DETS Catalog of Services, which is available on the DETS website see document 07b.15.01).
3.3.1	Determine resources available to colleges.	See Objective 3.1.2 above.

However, the timelines for work on most objectives begin in Fall 2010. To kick off implementation of actions under those objectives, the Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Services (the convener of DSPC for 2010-11) invited the point persons who are not members of the Committee to join in an implementation session at its first meeting on August 27, 2010. Implementation of the plan will be a particular focus of the Interim Chancellor, who has directed the Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Services to set aside a total of $100,000 in the 2010-11 District operations budget for implementation of the District Strategic Plan and for funding of resource requests associated with the highest-priority District Program Review objectives (see documents 07b.16.01-07b.16.04).

The Interim Chancellor presented information on the DSP to all attendees of the annual In-Service Day at both colleges on August 13, 2010, and in his remarks asked them to familiarize themselves with the plan at the website. He will also distribute a brochure version of the DSP throughout the year to audience members when he appears at educational forums and other events in the communities served by the District (see document 07b.17.01).

The Interim Chancellor asked the college presidents to ensure that all appropriate college committees review the DSP, consider it in their work, and forward annually to the DSPC a summary of progress on any goals or objectives related to the DSP. At CHC, the *Integrated Planning and Program Review Handbook* directs units engaged in program review to consider the DSP along with the CHC Educational Master Plan as they review their performance and make plans for improvement (see documents 07b.18.01; 07b.18.02, p. 15).

Beginning in 2010-11, the DSPC will assess the District's progress toward meeting its stated goals and objectives quarterly, in consultation with point persons and groups, as the plan requires. Frequent monitoring of adherence to timelines and progress toward meeting objectives will help to ensure alignment with college planning efforts and to mitigate and address implementation problems as early as possible. If progress appears insufficient in any objectives, the Committee, which includes the Interim Chancellor and the presidents of both colleges, will facilitate corrective action as needed (see document 07b.13.01, pp. 4-5).

In 2010-11 the DSPC will also begin the cycle of continuous improvement of the plan itself. With appropriate consultation, the DSPC will evaluate the 2010-14 DSP and revise it as needed

to make the next edition of the plan exemplary. Steps in that process include the following (see documents 07b.13.01, p. 5; 07b.20.01):

- Review, and if necessary revise, existing District foundational statements.
- Incorporate additional input and feedback mechanisms, such as structured surveys or community forums, if needed.
- Fully integrate KVCR and EDCT into the DSP.
- Enhance the plan's foundation of research and other information, including updated demographics, student performance data, and environmental scanning results.
- Review and update strategic issues likely to have significant effects on the plan, such as District and College growth projections and targets and identification of new courses and programs to meet student needs.
- Based on the available information, revise planning assumptions as needed.
- Update documentation of alignment with college and other major plans.
- Update provisions for regular evaluation and revision if necessary.
- Update the glossary as needed.
- Modify, add, or retire objectives, actions, measurements, timelines, and point persons based on input, feedback, research, planning assumptions, changes in foundational statements, and Committee deliberations.
- Solicit feedback on the draft 2011-15 edition of the DSP from the colleges (including their constituency groups and their strategic and educational master planning committees), District Office, KVCR, and EDCT, and incorporate as appropriate.
- Submit the final recommended 2011-15 edition of the DSP to the Chancellor.
- Distribute widely the 2011-15 edition of the DSP.

Conclusion

The District has completed its first formal District Strategic Plan. It drew substantial input from the SBVC Strategic Plan and the CHC Educational Master Plan, and its goals demonstrably align with theirs. The plan will help guide both strategic planning processes and program improvement at the colleges through the applicable committee structures. Regular, systematic evaluation of the plan and the planning process to assure their effectiveness in assisting the colleges is built into the plan, as is communication of the results of the evaluation through District-wide distribution of plan revisions. Specific resources have been allocated in support of plan implementation. Assessment of the District's substantive progress on its goals and objectives—all of which are measurable by quantitative means, qualitative means, or both—will occur in quarterly, annual, and triennial cycles, commencing in Fall 2010. Results of these assessments will be used to improve effectiveness in achieving those goals and objectives. (Standards I.B.3, IV.B.3.g)

The completion of the District Strategic Plan, which is aligned with the colleges' plans and includes concrete steps for regular evaluation and improvement, has met the recommendation for "development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan" that "acknowledges input [from] and aligns with the colleges' education plan."

The District Strategic Plan will also serve "as a guide for planning at the college level" as it is considered by all appropriate college committees in their work beginning in Fall 2010, and it will be evaluated and improved in the 2010-11 academic year.

Strategic Plan for Technology

Progress and Analysis

A comprehensive District Information Technology Strategic Plan was adopted in 2007, and was in force through 2010. In addition to goals and implementation strategies, it contained IT directives that tied to five of the 2008-09 Institutional Goals under the Board Imperatives (see document 07c.01.01).

To determine whether implementation of this plan was sufficiently responsive to College needs, the District contracted with PlanNet to assess District IT services. In accord with the findings of that assessment, as of July 1, 2009, the Distributed Education and Technology Services (DETS) division substantially reorganized its technology service structures and associated committee structures to improve clarity of roles, and coordination, responsiveness, and quality of service. The two most important among numerous significant changes were the conversion to internal management of the District Computing Services (DCS) department and the implementation of a new information technology governance structure; both enhancements were designed in large part to improve significantly the division's responsiveness to the colleges (see document 07c.02.01).

After almost 20 years of outsourcing DCS management to Sungard, the District began the move toward fully internal management in Summer 2009. For example:

- All desk-side support services were localized at the colleges for greater responsiveness to college needs.
- A District Director of Computing Services was hired in Fall 2009.
- Campus Directors of Technology were hired at both colleges. Each reports to both the College President and the Director of District Computing Services.
- A catalog of services was completed and is now available to all District employees on the DETS website (dets.sbccd.org). Hard copies will be distributed to all employees in Fall 2010 (see document 07c.03.01).
- Functions for which DCS does not have internal expertise may now be "out-tasked" to outside firms on an as-needed basis.

At the top of the new information technology governance structure, the DETS Executive Committee is charged with developing the overarching vision, framework, monitoring and evaluation of the technology strategic planning and implementation process. The Vice Presidents of Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services; the Academic Senate Presidents; the Directors of Research; and the Campus Directors of Technology from both colleges all serve on this committee, to ensure that the colleges have a strong voice in planning and directing technology services across the District. In addition, four working committees—the Administrative Applications, User Services, Technical Services, and Web Standards

Committees—are charged with the following tasks in their respective areas (see document 07c.04.01):

- Developing specific goals and supporting strategies in the District Technology Strategic Plan
- Recommending policies, procedures, priorities, and standards
- Providing input and direction in the development of measures to be used in District operations program review
- Overseeing project implementations
- Other tasks specific to the area

The strength of the colleges' voice in District technology services extends to all four working committees, which have broad representation from all four constituency groups at both colleges. Instruction, Student Services, Fiscal Services, and District Human Resources are represented on both the Administrative Applications and User Services Committees, and DSPS and Marketing are represented on the Web Standards Committee. Every committee also includes DETS staff members or managers with the requisite technical expertise, and a DETS Chairs Committee coordinates the efforts of the four working committees.

The Executive Director of DETS coordinated a survey of DETS Executive Committee members to begin evaluation of the new structure's effectiveness in August 2010. Respondents were asked how much and in which direction (better or worse) DETS services had changed since the reorganization in clarity, coordination, quality, and responsiveness at the colleges and in District operations. Results suggested that services were somewhat better, particularly in the area of communication and information sharing, and that roles in technology services had been clarified. However, they also suggested that some role confusion remains, and that the centralized help desk system is still not as functional as it should be (see documents 07c.05.01-07c.05.02).

To determine the effects of the structural changes from the college users' perspective, the Executive Director will distribute a survey to all District employees in Fall 2010. The DETS Executive Committee will consider the results of both surveys in formulating its recommendations for improvements (see document 07c.06.01).

Development of the new District Technology Strategic Plan, which involved active participation by all District stakeholders through the governance structures described above, began in Fall 2009. The DETS Executive Committee conducted several planning sessions to discuss the various elements of the strategic plan. At each step, the thoughts and recommendations of the group were captured and sent to participants for review and clarification. Once the Executive Committee completed the process, overview, and vision sections, the four working committees developed specific goals and supporting strategies. All the committees had the opportunity to review and comment on one another's work. The Executive Committee then consolidated the committees' documents and completed the final District Technology Strategic Plan recommendation. That recommendation was reviewed and approved by Chancellor's Cabinet in May 2010, and posted on the DCS website. The Board of Trustees approved the plan at their July 8, 2010 meeting. The Interim Chancellor notified all employees that the Plan is now posted on the District website on September 13, 2010 (see documents 07c.07.01-07c.07.02).

The District Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2013 (DTSP) contains the following sections (see document 07c.08.01):

- Overview of the District Technology Strategic Plan
- District Mission Statement
- Elements of Success in Technology Planning
- Strengths
- Weaknesses
- Challenges
- The SBCCD District Technology Strategic Plan
  - Process
  - Planning Team
  - Technology Vision
  - Technology Mission
  - Guiding Principles
- Alignment of Technology Goals with District Strategic Directions
- Alignment of Technology Goals with Crafton Hills College Technology Plan
- Alignment of Technology Goals with San Bernardino Valley College Technology Plan
- District Technology Goals

The DTSP consistently emphasizes responsiveness to the needs of the colleges. For example, four of the nine elements of success in technology planning that it cites stress input, access, process transparency, and accommodation to changing needs. Moreover, the explicit intent of the plan is to "encourage and enable all District constituencies to participate in the assessment of technology needs and the development of the vision, direction, and prioritization of solutions to address those needs" (see document 07c.08.01, pp. 1, 4).

The DTSP also emphasizes evaluation and continuous improvement. For example, a three-year evaluation cycle is built in. To improve the assessment of progress within each cycle, the committees are scheduled to develop more clearly defined outcome measurements related to the DTSP's goals and strategies beginning in Fall 2010 (see document 07c.08.01, pp. 2, 6).

In addition, the DTSP emphasizes integration with other major college and District planning processes. For example, three sections of the plan demonstrate the substantial alignment of the District Technology Strategic Goals with the District Strategic Plan 2010-14 Strategic Directions, the Crafton Hills College Technology Plan Goals, and the San Bernardino Valley College Technology Strategies, respectively. The DETS Executive Committee will monitor such alignment on an annual basis in consultation with the campus technology committees and the District Strategic Planning Committee, beginning in Fall 2010 (see document 07c.08.01, pp. 13-17, 6).

Implementation of DTSP activities is supported largely by the DETS budget; the plan itself does not include specific resource allocations. Some additional resource requests are funded through the District program review and planning process (see *District Program Review* section above); others are brought by the Executive Director of DETS to the Chancellor's Cabinet for

consideration, and funded from a variety of sources, including bond funds (see documents 07c.12.01, 07c.13.01)

Finally, two of the DTSP goals explicitly address the ongoing need to assist the colleges in daily management of college functions, and the perennial problem of finding additional funding for technology enhancements:

- Goal 2: Develop tools and resources that facilitate the daily management of college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information.
    - Strategy 2.1: Work with college leaders to evaluate tools and data needed for financial analysis and planning.
    - Strategy 2.2: Research and deploy systems to address the needs identified in 2.1.
    - Strategy 2.3: Define and implement systems to help users monitor the reliability of crucial data.
- Goal 3: Provide a financial base to allow the District to keep pace with technology.
    - Strategy 3.1: Identify opportunities and partner with grant writing experts to obtain grant funding.
    - Strategy 3.2: Develop a budgeting plan that is reviewed annually.

In accord with Goal 2, the DETS Executive Committee has already placed administration of surveys and focus groups at the colleges on its schedule of tasks for 2010-11, to help identify the tools and data that the colleges need for planning and for financial analysis (see document 07c.08.01, p. 19).

See Recommendation 10 below on access to and use of financial information.

Conclusion

Collaborative development of the District Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2013 provided opportunities for input by every constituency group at both colleges, through their designated representatives on the DETS Executive Committee and the four working committees (Standard I.B.4). Planning was grounded in a documented assessment of technology services conducted by the external firm PlanNet, and further informed by input from and discussions by committee representatives (Standard I.B.5). Technology planning is integrated with the District Strategic Plan and the colleges' technology plans, which in turn are aligned with elements of the SBVC Strategic Plan and the CHC Educational Master Plan, respectively (Standard III.C.2). The DTSP will remain current through ongoing monitoring and a triennial evaluation and modification process (Standard I.B.6).

Ultimately, the plan and the technology services that it guides are designed to support instruction and student services at the colleges (Standards III.C.1.a, IV.B.3.b). The plan sets goals to improve the District's technological effectiveness, and the supporting strategies that it articulates are measurable, though more precise measurement methods will be specified beginning in Fall 2010 (Standard I.B.2).

Resource allocations to implement the plan occur through existing budget processes and District program review, and one of the DTSP goals (Goal 3) is to develop additional resources to facilitate keeping pace with technology (Standard I.B.4). Another goal (Goal 9) explicitly addresses the need to upgrade infrastructure in accord with District-wide hardware and software standards, and the charge of the User Services Committee includes the development of such standards for desktop and peripheral devices and other equipment (Standard III.C.1.c). A third (Goal 2) aims at developing the tools and resources to facilitate the monitoring, assessment, and use of financial information (Standard III.D.2.a).

Finally, the District Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2013, in combination with the move to internal management and the new information technology governance structure described above, represents a significant improvement in responsiveness to the technology needs of the colleges.

The development and implementation of the District Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2013 have addressed the recommendation for "the development of a coordinated strategic plan for technology that is responsive to the colleges and assists them in the daily management of the college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information."

During 2010-11, the responsible committees will develop improved outcome measurements related to the DTSP's goals and strategies, and incorporate those measurements into the triennial evaluation and revision cycle.

Human Resources Plan

Progress and Analysis

Work on the long-range Human Resources plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing full-time hiring needs—which is now called the Staffing Plan—began in Fall 2009 with a review of sample HR-related plans provided by the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. At her request, the accreditation consultant identified a pool of potential plan components drawn from that sample. On the basis of that research, the Vice Chancellor, the Director of Human Resources, and the Human Resources Analyst in November recommended an outline of contents for the projected plan (see document 07d.01.01).

In late Fall 2009, the District Resource Allocation Committee (RAC), which included faculty, classified, and management representatives from both colleges and classified and management representatives from District operations, assigned a subcommittee to prepare a draft of the Staffing Plan. From December 2009 through March 2010, the subcommittee, chaired by the Vice Chancellor, debated about what belonged in the plan and what did not, using the November 2009 content outline and the HR Department's August 2009 initial program review draft as starting points. It developed successive outlines and drafts that reflected the debates, culminating in a draft that went to the full RAC in late March. There was general agreement in the RAC that the draft required substantial modification. The Interim Chancellor, who chairs the RAC, then asked the Vice Chancellor to coordinate the completion of data collection and analysis for the plan, clarify the narrative portions of the plan, and bring a revised draft back to the RAC as soon as possible (see documents 07d.02.01-07d.02.05).

At the RAC meeting in mid-May, the Vice Chancellor presented the results of the work that had been completed with the help of both HR and college staff. This draft of the Staffing Plan, which focused on providing data and analysis to the colleges to help them plan and prioritize full-time hiring, included the following enhancements:

- A summary of the types of information provided and the purposes they served
- A more complete description of the relationships between the plan and District and college missions, the District Strategic Plan, and other planning processes
- Standardized presentation of data
- Numerous additional tables designed to meet college needs, such as staffing ratios with examples of how to apply them in planning
- Source notes for all tables
- Graphical representations of data where most appropriate
- Analytical notes and commentary
- A Matrix of Anticipated Hires, a form designed to provide the colleges with concrete information on those positions they had requested in the current planning and program review cycle, or anticipated requesting within the next two cycles (see documents 07d.03.01-07d.03.02)

The RAC discussed the draft, and concluded that two primary changes were needed:

- Because of specific concerns at SBVC related to the personnel evaluation process, the Staffing Plan should include a section on evaluation requirements and processes.
- Because the college planning and program review processes already collect the necessary information on specific positions and generate human resources requests accordingly, deletion of the Matrix of Anticipated Hires should be considered (see document 07d.04.01).

The Interim Chancellor directed the Vice Chancellor to incorporate the necessary changes and produce a final draft for consideration by the RAC at its first two meetings in Fall 2010.

The final draft presented to the RAC at its meeting of August 23, 2010 included the following new features:

- An expanded section on the relationship between the plan and District, College, and HR Department missions
- An expanded section on the relationship between the plan and other planning processes
- A new section containing summaries of faculty, classified, and management evaluation processes, along with data on the status and timeliness of evaluations
- A section for listing hiring priorities from the colleges and District operations, including EDCT and KVCR, in lieu of the Matrix of Anticipated Hires

In addition, the draft included three formal, measurable objectives, with suggested actions, timelines, and persons responsible for facilitating and monitoring progress, to address district-wide needs identified during preparation of the plan:

- Objective 1: In accord with District Strategic Plan Objective 5.1.1, the Human Resources Department, in consultation with the colleges, will develop and implement a district mentoring program for all new employees.
- Objective 2: The Human Resources Department, in consultation with the colleges, will develop and implement more systematic methods to monitor and ensure the timeliness of the evaluation processes for classified staff and management.
- Objective 3: In accord with District Strategic Plan Objective 3.1.1, the Human Resources Department, in consultation with the colleges, will design and implement workshops and/or other professional development experiences to help the colleges develop internal candidates for vacancies that arise due to retirements and other turnover.

The RAC suggested a small number of changes, which were incorporated into a final draft. At its meeting of August 30, the committee by consensus recommended the Staffing Plan as revised to the Interim Chancellor, who approved it and provided a link to it in his Chancellor's Chat of September 13, 2010 (see documents 07d.05.01-07d.05.02).

The Staffing Plan is a tool designed to help the planning and program review processes and the management of the colleges and District operations in planning and prioritizing full-time hiring. It provides in one document basic information on hiring, evaluation, and retention of quality employees, and an abundance of useful data, including:

- Current workforce demographics
- Applicant pool diversity
- Historical staffing ratios
- Faculty loads and positions by discipline
- Turnover rates
- Retirement projections
- Information on compliance issues such as the full-time faculty obligation and the 50-percent law (see document 07d.06.01)

The hiring and retention of high-quality human resources that this plan supports are crucial to the missions of the colleges and the District, so this plan supports those missions as well. It also aligns with objectives under three Strategic Directions in the District Strategic Plan, and with the Human Resources Department's internal planning and program review process. Moreover, it provides direction to that department in the form of the three objectives shown above (see documents 07d.06.01, pp. 6-7, 9, 15, 27, 31; 07d.07.02, pp. 28, 30, 32; 07d.07.03).

Conclusion

The Staffing Plan is aligned with the missions of the District and its colleges (Standard I.A.4). It is also aligned with the District Strategic Plan, and includes information about the requirements and timeliness of personnel evaluation processes (Standard III.A.1.b). The plan provides units engaged in annual planning or program review with information that helps them plan for and prioritize their human resources needs, especially in the long term. That information also helps the District and the colleges understand and improve their efficiency in using human resources, and their compliance with mandates related to human resources (Standard III.A.6).

The development and implementation of the Staffing Plan has met the recommendation for the "development of a long range Human Resources Plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing the need for full-time faculty and staff."

During 2010-11, the Staffing Plan will be reviewed and revised as needed, with appropriate input from the colleges.

Recommendation 8: Program Review and Distributed Education
As was noted in recommendation 6 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and to meet the standards, the college should complete the integration of program review for all academic, student services and administrative services units into institutional evaluation and planning. In particular, the college should develop processes and procedures to ensure program effectiveness of distributed education courses. (Standards II.A.2.e, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.D.2.g, IV.A.5, ER 19, 21)

Progress and Analysis

Please see *Recommendation 1* above for full coverage of integrated planning and program review in all areas of the College. This section will cover issues related to Distributed Education (DE) courses.

The Educational Technology Committee (ETC) of the Academic Senate, co-chaired by a faculty member and an instructional dean, has overall responsibility for monitoring the development, implementation, and effectiveness of DE courses and the program as a whole. In addition, each DE course and instructor is organizationally housed in the applicable instructional department, so the department chair and dean share responsibility for course effectiveness with the ETC.

The ETC has implemented numerous procedures to ensure the effectiveness of the DE program. Among them are the following:

- The ETC developed and implemented the revised certification process for instructors to teach DE courses. In this process, a Committee member, through observation, evaluates the technical and practical skills of each prospective DE teacher in using the Blackboard system. The Committee also administers a quiz covering applicable Title 5 regulations, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provisions, appropriate responses to computer viruses, and other subjects. This evaluation, which occurs after the prospective DE teacher has completed training and well before the class is scheduled, ensures that every DE teacher has the knowledge he or she needs to manage an online course. Committee plans call for recertification to occur every three to five years (see documents 08.01.01-08.01.04).
- The ETC implemented the revised "CHC Online Course Readiness Check List," through which the Committee evaluates the actual Blackboard site prepared by the DE instructor. Standard syllabus information (e.g., course SLOs, prerequisite skills, required materials, office hours, grading policies, etc.), activities for disparate learning styles, clear instructions for using Blackboard, and numerous other elements must appear on the site. Using this method, the Committee assures that students have the information they need to make informed decisions about taking the course. The dialogue regarding approvals also leads to further conversation among ETC members and DE instructors regarding course and program quality (see document 08.02.01).
- The ETC created the content for a new web portal for all DE courses that eases access by both students and instructors, and then implemented the portal at the beginning of Fall 2010. The portal includes information that replaces the previously planned DE procedures handbook (see documents 08.03.01-08.03.04).

The ETC has also gathered and discussed considerable research information on the effectiveness of DE courses to help guide improvements:

- The ETC administered the Online Course Evaluation to students in all DE courses in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 (and will continue to do so each semester). In addition to the typical questions about the instructor and course, the form also asks students to evaluate the utility of online resources and activities in the course, and the distance learning experience per se. Results of each course evaluation were sent to the applicable faculty member and instructional dean. The ETC received summary reports for both semesters from the Office of Research and Planning, and used them to identify trends, successes, and areas needing improvement in the DE program as a whole. Overall, student response to DE courses has been positive: 93 percent of students surveyed in both semesters stated that they would recommend their DE course to another student (see documents 08.04.01-08.04.03).
- The ETC also compared retention and success rates in DE courses to those in corresponding face-to-face courses. Results indicated that success rates are similar when the DE and face-to-face versions of the course are taught by the same instructor in the same term, while retention rates are somewhat lower in the DE version. Results of the evaluation were shared with DE faculty and instructional deans (see document 08.05.01).

The ETC has asked instructional deans to work with individual faculty to improve course effectiveness based on the results of this research. In addition, the ETC is scheduling faculty brown bags at which instructors who are successful in the DE environment can share strategies with other DE instructors. On an ongoing basis, the ETC will evaluate data on a programmatic level, make revisions to its processes, and make recommendations to the Academic Senate and instructional management aimed at ensuring the overall effectiveness of the DE program at every stage: teacher preparation, technical quality control, ease of access, student evaluations, comparative assessment of key outcomes and full documentation (see document 08.06.01).

Conclusion

With the improvements in operations, procedures, evaluation, and implementation described above, the College has met the recommendation to "develop processes and procedures to ensure program effectiveness of distributed education courses."

During 2010-11, the ETC will evaluate the effects of the deans' work with individual faculty, the strategy-sharing at brown bags, its own procedural enhancements, and other changes on the effectiveness of the DE program as a whole.

Please see *Recommendation 1* above for the conclusions related to integrated planning and program review.

Recommendation 10: Long-Term Fiscal Plans and Financial Information
As was noted in recommendation 9 of the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report and in order to meet the standards, the college should develop long-term fiscal plans. Employees should be provided with adequate financial information and training in the use of such data. (Standards III.D.1.c, III.D.3)

Progress and Analysis

Long-Term Fiscal Plans

Long-term fiscal plans were made available to the entire College community in Spring 2010, and are incorporated into the Educational Master Plan, as described in the *Recommendation 1* section above. In Spring 2010, the Vice President of Administrative Services, in consultation with the Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services, finalized a budget outlook model for projecting the District's and CHC's likely revenues and expenditures three years beyond the approved budget, based on assumptions that are specified at the District level. The resulting CHC Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast presents both conservative and optimistic financial scenarios for revenues, District assessments under the new Resource Allocation Model (see *Commission Recommendation 1* section), and expenditures over a three-year period, including long-term obligations such as the SERP. It also shows explicitly the quantitative assumptions that underlie each of those scenarios. All the data in the Plan and Forecast will be updated regularly as information on the State budget process becomes available each year. The Plan and Forecast thus provides a long-range, realistic context for managers as they construct their developmental budgets each year; for units, committees, and administrators considering resource requests in the planning and program review process; for point persons and groups implementing the Educational Master Plan; and for all other major planning efforts at the College. The District-wide version of the Plan and Forecast will also help the District maintain prudent levels of reserves (see documents 10.01.01; 10.01.02, pp. 51-53).

Financial Information and Training

All College staff have access to District-wide and College-specific budget and expenditure figures for each fund at the object-code level in the monthly budget summaries on the District website (see document 10.02.01).

EduReports, the reporting tool for the District's Financial 2000 system, is available to all department chairs as well as to cost center managers. Online training in EduReports is available to all users. The Vice President for Administrative Services also conducts periodic workshops for EduReports users on request. In addition, to assist employees who need more basic help in understanding financial information, he conducts an annual workshop on the basics of budgeting (see documents 10.03.01-10.03.03).

Conclusion

Using the CHC Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast, Crafton Hills College is now able to consider more systematically the long-range financial implications of its decisions, which promotes its fiscal stability. The Plan and Forecast, together with the new District Resource Allocation Model, takes into consideration liabilities and future obligations (Standard III.D.1.c).

The College's planning and program review process (see *Recommendation 1* section), which will benefit from the addition of the Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast to its information arsenal, facilitates annual assessment and improvement of the effective use of financial resources (Standard III.D.3). Finally, all College personnel who require financial information now have ready access to it, and training systems are in place for those who need them.

The development and use of the CHC Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast, together with ready access to and training in the use of financial information, has fulfilled the recommendation to "develop long-term fiscal plans" and provide "adequate financial information and training in the use of such data" to employees.

The data in the CHC Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast will be updated throughout 2010-11 as needed, and the Plan and Forecast will be evaluated in Spring 2011. The College will also continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the training it provides in the use of financial information.

Commission Recommendation 1: District Resource Allocation Process
The district's resource allocation process needs to be clarified and communicated to both colleges within the district. (Standards III.A.6, III.B.2.a, b, III.C.2, III.D.1.d, III.D.3, IV.B.3.a, c, d, f, g).

Progress and Analysis

In late Summer 2009, the Chancellor's Cabinet approved the "Summary of Budget Allocation Model 2008-09," which clarified the methods used for 2008-09 allocations to District operations and the colleges. This document represented the first written description of such allocations ever done in the District. It thus represented a major advance in transparency and communication for the District and its colleges, and was posted in Fall 2009 on the District website. However, it was descriptive of what had been done, not prescriptive of what should be done, and the Cabinet made the decision to develop a model based on best practices that would meet current and future needs (see document CR1.01.01).

To address the issue, the Interim Chancellor convened a Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) with representation from both colleges, the District Office, Economic Development and Corporate Training (EDCT), KVCR, and all constituency groups. The RAC began meeting in October 2009 with a discussion of the tasks at hand and the timeline for accomplishing them. In subsequent meetings, RAC members examined the characteristics of the existing allocation model in detail, considered best practices in the field and eight budget models from other multi-campus districts, formulated guiding principles for the SBCCD model, and sought input from colleagues at the campuses (see documents CR1.02.01-CR1.02.10).

On the basis of all this information, the Interim Chancellor drafted an allocation model in February 2010 for committee consideration, and notified all District employees of the RAC's work to date (see document CR1.03.01). The model, which allocated funds to the colleges based primarily on the average proportion of FTES generated by each over the past four years, included the following elements by college:

- Historical FTES data
- Total State base revenue
- Growth and COLA based on the Governor's budget
- Projection of part-time faculty FTEF and costs
- Lottery revenue projections
- Interest revenue
- Other campus revenue allocable to each campus
- An assessment for District Office operations
- An assessment for District-wide costs such as KVCR, insurance, and retiree funds
- An assessment for District-wide equipment costs
- An assessment for District reserves
- A final budget allocation (see document CR1.04.01)

Based on the committee's discussion of this model, the Interim Chancellor drafted a revised model, which was approved by the committee in March for distribution to the District community for feedback. This second model contained the following principal changes:

- It placed KVCR and auxiliary services into a separate column rather than in the assessment for District-wide costs.
- It reduced projected growth funds to zero, pending approval of the final State budget.
- It deleted the assessment for District-wide equipment costs.
- It added an assessment to fund the 2009-10 SERP (see document CR1.05.01).

In April the Interim Chancellor asked the colleges' Vice Presidents for Administrative Services to test the revised model in consultation with their respective college presidents, sent the model to all employees in the District with a request for feedback, and presented a live webcast to explain it. The CHC Vice President also made presentations on the model to the CHC Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and management team. The participants in those discussions were asked to respond to a survey afterward regarding the extent to which the model was transparent and easy to understand (see documents CR1.06.01-CR1.06.05).

Based on the feedback received, the Interim Chancellor drafted a third model, which the RAC considered on May 17, 2010. This model incorporated the following principal changes:

- The historical FTES data column used funded FTES, instead of actual FTES.
- Lottery, interest, and other campus revenue were projected in a more realistic fashion.
- The assessment for KVCR was placed in its own column, and funding for the auxiliary services accounting staff was placed in the assessment for District Office operations.

During discussion of the third draft and the comments received in response to the survey, the committee recommended moving funding for the Professional Development Center from the assessment for District Office operations to its own column. The RAC then approved the model unanimously, as amended. The Interim Chancellor shared the adopted model with all District employees in mid-June. In addition, the Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Services presented the preliminary 2010-11 budget in the context of the model to all faculty, all managers, classified staff, and student leadership at the CHC In-Service Day (see documents CR1.07.01-CR1.07.04, CR1.02.10).

The approved model was used in making allocations to the colleges for the 2010-11 fiscal year. It was also incorporated into the District Strategic Plan. In accord with the guiding principles, it will be reviewed annually by the District-wide Budget Committee, which will recommend changes as needed. The colleges will provide their own input into that review; for example, the Crafton Council and the CHC President's Cabinet will evaluate the effectiveness of the model from the perspective of CHC, and forward their comments and suggestions for enhancement, if any, to the District-wide Budget Committee (see documents CR1.08.01-CR1.08.02).

Conclusion

The new resource allocation model, for the first time, clearly distinguishes between District and college functions within the budget allocation process (Standard IV.B.3.a). It distributes resources to support effective college operations fairly, and transparently communicates the distribution method to the colleges, the District Office, KVCR, and EDCT (Standards IV.B.3.c, IV.B.3.f). It

puts control of college budgeting firmly in the hands of the colleges themselves, the most appropriate location for effective control of expenditures (Standard IV.B.3.d), rather than at the District level—subject, of course to the final authority of the Board of Trustees over the budget. It also builds in a process for evaluating its effectiveness annually with appropriate input from the college councils and the constituency groups represented thereon, and making changes designed to improve its operation, to the ultimate benefit of the colleges and their students (Standards III.D.1.d, III.D.3, and IV.B.3.g).

In the following crucial areas, the presidents now have budgetary authority, which they exercise in accord with the colleges' own strategic plans and with collegial consultation input from their planning and program review processes:

- Both full-time and part-time hiring priorities for faculty, staff, and managers, guided in part by the information provided by the Staffing Plan. (Standard III.A.6; see also Recommendation 7)
- Equipment and facilities modifications, to improve the tools and settings needed for excellent instruction and services. (Standards III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b)
- Technology purchases and upgrades, in consultation with District and College technology staff, and guided in part by the District Technology Strategic Plan. (Standard III.C.2; see also Recommendation 7)

A draft of the model was clearly communicated to the colleges, the District Office, KVCR, and EDCT before adoption; feedback was incorporated as appropriate; and then the adopted model was clearly communicated to all District employees.

With the development, adoption, communication, and implementation of the new resource allocation model, the District has met the recommendation that "the district's resource allocation process needs to be clarified and communicated to both colleges within the district."

During 2010-11, the District Budget Committee, with appropriate input from the colleges, will evaluate implementation of the model, and make any necessary modifications.

List of Supporting Evidence

Note: Items appearing in multiple sections have a different Document ID number in each section.

Statement on Report Preparation

DocID	Document
RP.01.01	Crafton Council Minutes 082410 final.docx
RP.01.02	CHC F-U Rept Feedback Request Email 100812.pdf
RP.01.03	CHC F-U Rept Feedback Request Reminder 100818.pdf
RP.01.04	Follow-up Report Meetings Final Aug 2010.pptx
RP.01.05	CHC Presentations Attendance.doc
RP.01.06	http://www.craftonhills.edu/Accreditation/reports/Follow%20Up%20Report%20-%20Draft%20for%20Distribution%20100811%20CHC.pdf

Recommendation 1

DocID	Document
01.01.01	071109 CHC Educational Master Plan Final 11-9-07.doc
01.01.02	In Service Presentation.ppt.
01.01.03	Aug 2007 Educational Master Plan Workshop Res 090622.doc
01.02.01	Crafton Council Minutes 090203.pdf
01.02.02	Crafton Council Minutes 090217.pdf
01.02.03	CHC Rec1_GnOs_Rev5-8.pdf
01.02.04	CHC Rec 1 Wkgrp Glossary_Rev3.pdf
01.02.05	CHC Rec 1 Wkgrp Key%20Performance%20Information.pdf
01.02.06	EMPC Roster 2009-10.doc
01.03.01	http://www.craftonhills.edu/Faculty_&_Staff/Committees/Educational_Master_Plan_Committee/Minutes.php
01.03.02	CHC BSI Action Plan 2007-2008 Final.doc
01.03.03	CHC TechPlan_07_07FINAL Detailed.pdf
01.03.04	Enrollment Management Plan.docx
01.03.05	CHC_Vol_1_Master_Plan%20_FINAL.pdf
01.03.06	(1B11) Professional Development Plan, April 2008.doc.
01.03.07	DSPS Plan.pdf
01.03.08	EOPS Plan.pdf
01.03.09	Matric Plan.pdf
01.03.10	Title V Plan.pdf
01.03.11	Student Equity Plan.pdf
01.03.12	Learning Comm Plan.pdf
01.03.13	Assessment Plan.pdf
01.04.01	Request for Input 091104.doc
01.04.02	CHC Group info from Brainstorm forms.doc
01.04.03	SD8 Form compiled results.doc
01.04.04	SD7 Form compiled results.doc
01.04.05	SD6 Form compiled results.doc
01.04.06	SD5 Form compiled results.doc
01.04.07	SD4 Form compiled results.doc
01.04.08	SD3 Form compiled results.doc
01.04.09	SD2 Form compiled results.doc
01.04.10	SD1 Form compiled results.doc
01.04.11	EMP_Presentation_March2010_FINAL MCL rev 100322.ppt

DocID	Document
01.04.12	CHC EMP Final Input Request 100415.pdf
01.05.01	EMP Final Corrected 100824.doc
01.05.02	Approval Memo EMP.pdf
01.06.01	DSPC 2A CHC EMP to Goals 091027.doc
01.06.02	Working Set SDs & Goals 091217.doc
01.06.04	DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc
01.07.01	In Service presentation Aug 13 2010.pptx
01.08.01	EMP Committee Minutes 20100824 rev(2).doc
01.08.02	Plan Status Report Form CHC EMP Sample 100914.pdf
01.09.01	Permits Sold Report 7-7-10.xls
01.10.01	CHC ILOs, April 12, 2010.docx
01.10.02	ILO_FA10_Assessment_Plan.docx
01.10.03	ILO_Assessment_SP09CCSSE2.docx
01.10.04	Agenda 9-9-2010.docx
01.11.01	Director of Marketing Approval 100909.pdf
01.12.01	CHC Organizational Handbook 100806.doc
01.13.01	PPR_Training_InService_Aug2010.pptx
01.14.01	Professional Development Survey Draft 100912.doc
01.15.01	PPR Handbook 2nd ed 100806 Final.doc
01.16.01	Cycle Diagram.doc
01.16.02	PR & Planning 10-11 Schedule revised 8-5.doc
01.16.03	Three Year Action Plan 100730.doc
01.16.05	Program Review Report Signature Sheet rev 091020.doc
01.17.01	Doc Eval Rubrics 090819.doc
01.17.02	Rubric application guidelines 091019.doc
01.17.03	Chemistry PPR Feedback.docx
01.17.04	SummaryProgramHealth (4).xls
01.18.01	ProgramReviewQuestionsRev1.doc
01.19.01	Annual Planning Template Revised 2009.doc
01.20.01	ProgramHealth Rubric 090810.doc
01.20.02	Program Eff Noninstr Rubric 090818.doc
01.20.03	Summary of Program Health Memo.docx
01.20.04	Cover email 100426.doc
01.21.01	2010-2011 CHC Annual Planning Prioritized Objectives 032510.xls
01.21.02	Planning Priorities 2010-11 Memo (2).doc
01.22.01	Science Tutor Overview.PDF
01.22.02	Group Study Science Evidence.doc
01.22.03	Tutoring in Science 090817-100913.doc
01.23.01	Example Purchases for 2010-11 based on PPR.doc
01.24.01	CIS Job Posting.mht
01.25.01	Institut of Categorical SSvcs-1.pdf
01.25.02	Institut of Categorical SSvcs-2.pdf
01.27.01	Handbook 090810.doc
01.28.01	PPR_SP10_Survey_Results.pdf
01.28.02	Program Review 100709.doc
01.28.03	Annual Planning Template 100721.doc
01.28.04	ProgramEffectivenessNonInstructionalRubric7.docx
01.28.05	Instructional Rubric Suggestions rev7.docx
01.28.06	Doc Eval Rubric-PR 100714.doc
01.28.07	Doc Eval Rubric-AnnlPlan 100730.doc
01.28.08	Participation 100709.doc
01.28.09	Web Planning Tool Screenshots 100806.doc

DocID	Document
01.30.01	CHC Long Range Financial Plan 4-12-10.xls

Recommendation 2

DocID	Document
02.01.01	MIS_Email_20100601.htm
02.01.02	MIS_Everett_Email.htm
02.01.03	MIS_Dianna_Email.htm
02.01.04	Sample_FA09_DatatelRecords_Not_in_MIS_SIDRemoved.xlsx
02.02.01	MIS_Presentation_Importance97.ppt
02.02.02	Effective MIS Data Entry Training_June2nd_4th_Presentation.ppsx
02.02.03	MIS_CHC_Diagram.docx
02.03.01	DidYouKnow1_CCSSE_SP09.pdf
02.03.02	DidYouKnow2_CCSSE_SP09MR.pdf
02.03.03	DidYouKnow3_Transfers.docx
02.04.01	ORP_Web_Pages Design.doc
02.04.02	http://www.craftonhills.edu/About_CHC/Research_and_Planning.aspx
02.05.01	Research Calendar.xls
02.06.01	EMP Final Corrected 100824.doc
02.06.03	EMP_Presentation_March2010_FINAL MCL rev 100322.ppt
02.09.01	SummaryProgramHealth (4).xls
02.09.02	PPR_SP10_Survey_Results.pdf
02.09.03	Instructional Rubric Suggestions rev7.docx
02.09.04	ProgramEffectivenessNonInstructionalRubric7.docx
02.10.01	PPR_CIS_Data_20102011.doc
02.11.01	Web Planning Tool Screenshots 100806.doc
02.12.01	1011_Counseling_SAO.docx
02.13.01	Final Ops Satisf Questionnaire.pdf
02.14.02	RAMSurvey.pdf
02.14.03	CHC_RAM_Survey_Results.pdf
02.14.04	CHC_StudentLeadersinGovernance_SurveyResults_SP10.pdf
02.15.01	EmplCC_Draft2_20100907.docx
02.16.01	POS Library FA09.docx
02.16.02	POS HWC FA09.pdf
02.17.01	DPS-SLO-Brief.docx
02.17.02	SL-FA09-SLO-Brief.docx
02.17.03	SLO-SAO Assessment Online Form.pdf
02.18.01	0910_PPR_Training_Presentation_Chairs.pdf
02.18.02	PPR_Training_InService_Aug2010.pptx
02.19.01	ERIS Status 100804.pdf
02.20.01	PHYSICS_persistence.docx
02.20.02	0910-Honors-Brief.pdf
02.20.03	ACCT_persistence_208to209.docx
02.20.04	1011-PE-X4-Courses-Brief.docx
02.20.05	MATH250_Students2_0506to0910.docx
02.21.01	In Service presentation Aug 13 2010.pptx
02.22.01	Research Asst Board Action 100812.pdf

Recommendation 6

DocID	Document
06.01.01	Governance Communication Summary 090830.doc
06.02.01	President Gov memo 100804b.doc
06.03.01	Area Partic Census Analysis 100414.xls
06.04.01	Crafton Council Minutes 020210 final.doc
06.04.02	Crafton Council Minutes 041310.docx
06.04.03	Crafton Council Minutes 033010 final.doc
06.04.04	CHC Organizational Handbook 100806.doc
06.05.01	CHC Proc 2225 Final Rec 100330.doc
06.06.01	http://www.craftonhills.edu/About_CHC/Presidents_Page/index.php
06.08.01	MemoClassifiedParticipation.docx
06.09.01	In Service Aug 13 2010 Distribution.doc
06.09.02	Office ClosedAug 13_sign to post prior to the 13th.pdf
06.10.01	ClassifiedPD_SP10_MR.pdf
06.11.01	All Instruction Meeting 030110.docx
06.11.02	All Instruction Meeting 041510.docx
06.11.03	All Instruction Meeting 090810.docx
06.11.04	All Instruction Meeting 100409.docx
06.11.05	All Instruction Meeting 111409.docx
06.12.01	Agenda September 25 2009.docx
06.12.02	Agenda October 20 2009.docx
06.12.03	Meeting Notes October 20, 2009.docx
06.12.04	Agenda November 27 2009.docx
06.12.05	Student Services Focus and Action Nov 27 2009.docx
06.12.06	Student Services Agenda 2 26 10.docx
06.12.07	Agenda April 30 2010.docx
06.12.08	Agenda May 28, 2010.docx
06.12.09	Agenda August 27, 2010.docx
06.12.10	Agenda September 20, 2010.docx
06.14.01	Student_Gov_Survey2.docx
06.14.02	CHC_StudentLeadersinGovernance_SurveyResults_SP10.pdf
06.15.01	EmplCC_Draft2_20100907.docx
06.16.01	Committee Self-Eval 100908.doc

Recommendation 7a

DocID	Document
07a.01.01	Bus Svcs Retreat Agenda 080619.pdf
07a.01.02	Purchase Order analysis.pdf
07a.01.03	HR Prgm Rev 08-09.pdf
07a.01.04	20090627 DCS Status.pdf
07a.02.01	Timeline 100119.pdf
07a.02.02	Dist Prgm Rev Participants.pdf
07a.02.03	ProgramReviewTemplate w boxes 091120.pdf
07a.03.01	Agenda 091120.pdf
07a.03.02	Purposes of Dist PR 091120.pdf
07a.03.03	PR Dist Ops Contents 091120.pdf
07a.03.04	Foundations of Framework 091118.pdf
07a.03.05	Outcome Statements-Services 100318.doc
07a.03.06	Measurement Samples by Outcome Type 091120.pdf
07a.03.07	Measures form 091120.pdf

DocID	Document
07a.03.08	Measures form sample 091120.pdf
07a.04.01	Feedback Descriptions 100106.doc
07a.04.02	Feedback Mission & Measures 091217.doc
07a.05.01	Final Ops Satisf Questionnaire.pdf
07a.05.02	Dist Ops Survey Invitation 100223.pdf
07a.06.01	Summary of Results for Dist Distrib.pdf
07a.07.01	Ops Svy Comments Restored Negs Xd 100331 Accptd.pdf
07a.08.01	Agenda 100319.pdf
07a.08.02	Web Planning Tool Screenshots.doc
07a.08.03	Goals-Obj Distinctions-Services 100318.doc
07a.08.04	Goal & Objective Verbs.doc
07a.09.01	Plans for Procurement 100504.pdf
07a.09.02	Plans for Human Resources 100524.pdf
07a.09.03	Plans for Accounting 100504.pdf
07a.09.04	Plans for Distributed Education 100416.pdf
07a.09.05	Plans for DCS-Tech 100505.pdf
07a.09.06	Plans for Facilities 100419.pdf
07a.10.01	Plans for DCS-Admin 100505.pdf
07a.11.01	ML General Comments 100411.pdf
07a.12.01	https://www.sbccd.org/ProgramReview/Home.aspx/Listing
07a.13.01	Chancellor's Chat 100208.pdf
07a.13.02	Chancellor's Chat 100427.pdf
07a.13.03	Chancellor email on Dist Ops Svy Results 100426.pdf.
07a.14.01	Annl Planning Template.pdf
07a.14.02	District Planning Process graphic 100803.pdf
07a.14.03	Calendar 2010-11 100822.doc
07a.15.01	HR Newsletter 1004.pdf
07a.15.02	Blackboard Agreement.pdf
07a.15.03	Financial 2000 EduReports Online Tutorial.pdf
07a.15.04	DE satisfactionSurvey.pdf
07a.15.05	DE Fall2010Workshops.pdf
07a.15.06	Infrastructure Upgrade.xls
07a.15.07	520GESeries Press.pdf
07a.15.08	DPR Status Facilities 100616.pdf
07a.15.09	DPR Status Payroll 100616.pdf
07a.15.10	DPR Status Procurement 100616.pdf.
07a.16.01	Steering Comm Pri Rec 100803 rev.pdf
07a.16.02	Chancellors Chat 100826.pdf
07a.16.03	***DPR-DSP Allocation 2010-11.pdf
07a.17.01	Help Desk Presidium Contract approval 100513.pdf
07a.17.02	http://www.sbccd.cc.ca.us/District_Faculty_,-a-,_Staff_Information-Forms/Business_Services_For_Employees.aspx
07a.18.01	DPR Process Survey Invitation 100513.pdf
07a.19.01	Process SurveySummary_05212010.pdf
07a.19.02	Process SurveySummary_06012010 Crosstab.pdf
07a.19.03	Process Svy Comments Report.pdf
07a.20.01	Evaluation Results on 2009-10 Process 100810.doc
07a.21.01	ChancellorPresentation2.ppt
07a.21.02	Chancellor's Chat 100913.pdf

Recommendation 7b

DocID	Document
07b.01.01	SBCCD Institutional Goals 2008-09.pdf
07b.01.02	SBCCD '08 - '09 Institutional Goals Status Report 8-09 Fin.pdf
07b.02.01	Strategic Planning Cmt Appt 091016.pdf
07b.02.02	Strategic Planning Cmt Appt Cover 091016.pdf
07b.02.03	DSPC Roster 100111.pdf
07b.03.01	Purposes of Dist Strat Planning 091029a.pdf
07b.03.02	Excellent Strategic Planning Processes 0910.pdf
07b.03.03	Goals-Obj Distinctions.pdf
07b.03.04	Map of Exc Planning Procs to SBCCD Exps 091116.pdf
07b.03.05	Meeting Schedule 091113.pdf
07b.03.06	Planning Logistics 091029a.pdf
07b.03.07	Ground rules 091115.pdf
07b.04.01	DSPC Member Responsibilities.pdf
07b.04.02	Steps timeline 091207.pdf
07b.05.01	SBVC SIs and Goals 091027.pdf
07b.05.02	CHC EMP to Goals 091027.pdf
07b.05.03	Imperatives and Goals 09-10.pdf
07b.05.04	Foundational Statements.pdf
07b.05.05	CCC Sys Strat Plan executive_summary 091113.pdf
07b.05.06	ACCJC Rubric Planning Only October 2007.pdf
07b.05.07	SBCCD_IE_Industry&OccupationalAnalysis_1209.pdf
07b.05.08	Enrollment Mgmt Practices at SBVC and CHC.pdf
07b.05.09	CHC & SBVC Impact & Perf 2000-08.pdf
07b.06.01	5B Subcomm Rept Budget 100113.pdf
07b.06.02	6H Subcomm Rept Pedagogy & Outcomes 100127.pdf
07b.06.03	6I Subcomm Rept Degree-Cert and Wages 100125.pdf
07b.06.04	6J Subcomm Rept Competition for Students 100127.pdf
07b.06.05	6K Subcomm Rept Private Funding 100127.pdf
07b.06.06	7A Subcomm Rept Technology.pdf
07b.07.01	6B Working Set SDs & Goals 100115.pdf
07b.07.02	7C Working Set SDs & Goals 100129.pdf
07b.07.03	8B Working Set SDs & Goals 100220.pdf
07b.07.04	9A Working Set SDs Goals & Objs100226.pdf
07b.07.05	10C Working Set SDs Goals & Objs100322.pdf
07b.07.06	11B Working Set SDs Goals & Objs100331.pdf
07b.07.07	12A Working Set SDs Goals & Objs100418.pdf
07b.07.08	Cover email on DSP Feedback Req 100301.pdf
07b.07.09	9B Feedback Req Working Set SDs&Goals 100301.pdf
07b.07.10	10I CHC Ac Senate Discussion on District Strategic Plan ed.pdf
07b.08.01	10G Feedback Received on DSP 100323.pdf
07b.08.02	Strategic Planning Committee 3-26-10 final.pdf
07b.09.01	10F Draft Objectives with Worksheet 100312.pdf
07b.09.02	11C Draft Objectives 100404.pdf
07b.09.03	12B Draft Objectives 100418.pdf
07b.09.04	13B Draft Objectives 100423.pdf
07b.10.01	13A DSP Draft 100425.doc
07b.10.02	Cover email on DSP Feedback Req 100426.pdf
07b.10.03	Dist Assembly Agenda 100504.pdf
07b.10.04	Dist Assembly Minutes 5-4-10.docx
07b.11.01	13D Feedback Report thru 100505.pdf

DocID	Document
07b.12.01	Strategic Planning Committee 5-7-10 final.pdf
07b.13.01	DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc
07b.13.02	Chancellor's Chat 100525.pdf
07b.13.03	Board Minutes 100708.pdf
07b.14.01	Chancellor's Chat 100208.pdf
07b.14.02	Chancellor's Chat 100615.pdf
07b.15.01	DETS Catalog of Ser 4-20-10.pdf
07b.16.01	DSPC Profl Dev PP Invit email.pdf
07b.16.02	DSPC VPI PP Invit email.pdf
07b.16.03	2010-08-27 Minutes.doc
07b.16.04	***DPR-DSP Allocation 2010-11.pdf
07b.17.01	ChancellorPresentation2.ppt
07b.18.01	Chancellor to presidents on DSP-Coll Comm 100804.pdf
07b.18.02	PPR Handbook 2nd ed 100806 Final.doc
07b.20.01	3A Task Schedule 2010-11 100910.doc

Recommendation 7c

DocID	Document
07c.01.01	District_IT_Plan_9-07.pdf
07c.02.01	PlanNet Assessment Powerpoint version.pdf
07c.03.01	DETS Catalog of Ser 4-20-10.pdf
07c.04.01	110909 DETS Committee Purposes V2.pdf
07c.05.01	Survey_Dets Exec Comm.pdf
07c.05.02	DETS Ex Comm Survey Report.doc
07c.06.01	District-wide Services Survey 100903.docx
07c.07.01	Board Minutes 100708.pdf
07c.07.02	Chancellor's Chat 100913.pdf
07c.08.01	District_Information_Technology_Strategic_Plan_-_Final_Version_06.01.10.docx
07c.12.01	Infrastructure Upgrade.xls
07c.13.01	DCS working budget 2009-10.xls

Recommendation 7d

DocID	Document
07d.01.01	HR Plan Outline 091125.doc
07d.02.01	Resource Allocation Committee Membership 100701.doc
07d.02.02	HR Program Review - Draft as of AUG2009.doc
07d.02.03	Human Resources Plan - Outline 01-26-2010.doc
07d.02.04	Human Resources Allocation PLAN 03-03-2010.doc
07d.02.05	2nd DRAFT Human Resources Allocation PLAN 03-12-2010.doc
07d.03.01	DRAFT Staffing PLAN rev ML 100513.doc
07d.03.02	Projections pages 100517.doc
07d.04.01	Resource Allocation Committee Notes 5 17 10.pdf
07d.05.01	Letter to Accept Staffing Plan.pdf
07d.05.02	Chancellor's Chat 100913.pdf
07d.06.01	Final Staffing PLAN 100902.doc
07d.07.02	DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc
07d.07.03	https://www.sbccd.org/ProgramReview/Home.aspx/Listing

Recommendation 8

DocID	Document
08.01.01	Distributed Education Intent to Teach 03.03.10.pdf
08.01.02	Online Instructor Readiness Quiz 09.16.09.pdf
08.01.03	DE Addendum 09.16.09.pdf
08.01.04	DE Status Report Aug 2010.doc
08.02.01	Online Course Readiness Checklist 09.16.09.pdf
08.03.01	ETCstudentFAQportalfinal.rtf
08.03.02	ETCapprovalportalfinal.docx
08.03.03	ETCwelcomeportafinal.docx
08.03.04	http://www.craftonhills.edu/Courses_%26_Programs/CHC_Online
08.04.01	SP10_DEEValForm.docx
08.04.02	FA09_DE_CourseEvals.pdf
08.04.03	SP10_DE_CourseEvals.pdf
08.05.01	0910_CHC_DE_SuccessRetention_0405to0809.pdf
08.06.01	ETC Minutes 4-21-10.docx

Recommendation 10

DocID	Document
10.01.01	CHC Long Range Financial Plan 4-12-10.xls
10.01.02	DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc
10.02.01	SBCCD Budget Information Screenshots.doc
10.03.01	Financial 2000 EduReports Online Tutorial.pdf
10.03.02	EduReports Reporting Training 8-20-09.doc
10.03.03	Basic Budgeting II Presentation 2-8-10.ppt

Commission Recommendation 1

DocID	Document
CR1.01.01	Final Prior Budget Model.pdf
CR1.02.01	agenda 10-20-09.doc
CR1.02.02	agenda 11-2-09.doc
CR1.02.03	agenda 11-30-09.doc
CR1.02.04	agenda 1-11-10.pdf
CR1.02.05	agenda 1-25-10.pdf
CR1.02.06	agenda 2-22-10.pdf
CR1.02.07	Resource Allocation Committee Notes 10 20 2009.pdf
CR1.02.08	Resource Allocation Committee Notes 11 2 2009.pdf
CR1.02.09	Resource Allocation Committee Notes 11 30 09.pdf
CR1.02.10	Resource Allocation Committee Notes 5 17 10.pdf
CR1.03.01	Chancellor's Chat 100217.pdf
CR1.04.01	Budget Model SBCCD Draft 2 22 2010.xls
CR1.05.01	Budget Model SBCCD Draft 3 22 2010 rev.xls
CR1.06.01	RAM Feedback request cover 100406.pdf
CR1.06.02	Ac Sen Minutes 4-7-10b.docx
CR1.06.03	Classified Sen Minutes 4-8-10.docx
CR1.06.04	RAMSurvey.pdf
CR1.06.05	CHC_RAM_Survey_Results.pdf
CR1.07.01	Budget Model SBCCD Final 5 23 10.pdf
CR1.07.02	Budget Model SBCCD Final Guiding Princs 5 23 10.pdf

DocID	Document
CR1.07.03	Chancellor's Chat 100615.pdf
CR1.07.04	In Service presentation Aug 13 2010.pptx
CR1.08.01	2010-2011 Tentative Budget.ppt
CR1.08.02	DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE
701 South Mt. Vernon Ave.
San Bernardino, CA 92410

FOLLOW-UP REPORT

This report summarizes progress on Evaluation Team Recommendations made during
the October 6-9, 2008 site visit to San Bernardino Valley College.

October 15, 2010

Presented to the Board of Trustees for Review
on September 23, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement on Report Preparation

This follow-up report addresses the three recommendations noted in the February 3, 2009 action letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) that reaffirmed San Bernardino Valley College's accreditation.

This report provides information on the development of the following:
- Use of student learning outcomes as a component of evaluations
- Development of a district program review process
- Development of the district strategic plan
- Development of the district strategic plan for technology
- Development of the district human resources plan
- Clarification and communication of the district resource allocation process

The report was written by the accreditation consultant, the Dean of Organizational Development, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, and the College President. The report was reviewed, discussed, and edited by the faculty and staff of the college both individually and through our collegial consultation representative groups of College Council, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Student Government (see documents RP.01.01-RP.01.04).

The final report was approved by Dr. Debra S. Daniels, President of San Bernardino Valley College, and was submitted to the board of trustees for review at its meeting on September 23, 2010.

_____
Dr. Debra S. Daniels   Date
President, San Bernardino Valley College

Certification of the Institutional Follow-Up Report

Date: October 1, 2010

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western
               Association of Schools and Colleges.

From: San Bernardino Valley College
               701 South Mt. Vernon, San Bernardino, CA 92410

This follow-up report is submitted for the purpose of meeting the February 2009 request
from ACCJC for a report by October 15, 2010.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community in the
development of the follow-up report, and that the San Bernardino Community College
District Board of Trustees has reviewed it. We believe the follow-up report reflects the
nature and substance of this institution.

James C. Ramos, President, Board of Trustees, SBCCD	Date

Bruce Baron, Interim Chancellor, SBCCD	Date

Dr. Debra S. Daniels, President, SBVC	Date

Dr. John Stanskas, President, Academic Senate, SBVC	Date

Grayling Eation, President, Classified Senate, SBVC	Date

Damaris Castillo-Torres, President, Associated Student Government, SBVC	Date

Dr. Larry Buckley, Accreditation Liaison Officer, SBVC	Date

Accrediting Commission's Follow-Up Report Request
(From the Commission Action Letter Dated February 3, 2009)

The commission requires that the follow-up report be submitted by October 15, 2010. The follow-up report should demonstrate the institution's resolution of the recommendations and concerns as noted below:

Recommendation 5: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Recommendation 6: In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the board of trustees and the chancellor, in consultation with the leadership of the college campuses, develop a strategy for addressing some significant issues raised by each college and verified in interviews with staff in the following areas; namely:

- *The development of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for reviewing all district functions and processes using a program review model. (Standard IV.B.3.a, b)*
- *The development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan that both acknowledges input and aligns with the college's educational plan and serves as a guide for planning at the college level. (Standards I.B.3, IV.B.3.g)*
- *The development of a coordinated strategic plan for technology that is responsive to the colleges and assists them in the daily management of the college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information. (Standards I.B.2, 4, 5, 6, IV.B.3.b, III.C.1.a, c, III.C.2)*
- *The development of a long range human resources plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing the need for full-time faculty and staff. (Standards III.A.1.b,c, III.A.6)*

Commission Recommendation 1: The district's resource allocation process needs to be clarified and communicated to both colleges within the district. (Standards III.A.6, III.B.2.a, b, III.C.2, III.D.1.d, III.D.3, IV.B.3.a, c, d, f, g)

Responses to Team Recommendations 5

Recommendation 5: Student Learning Outcomes As a Component of Evaluations
In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Overview

In 2008, when the visiting accreditation team arrived, San Bernardino Valley College had already made significant progress on SLOs and assessment. There was evidence to support the following:

- 99% of all instruction programs had student learning outcomes.

- 100% of all student service areas had service student learning outcomes.

- 100% of courses had identified institutional core competencies.

- SLO assessment was occurring in most areas of the campus.

- Program review included the requirement that at least one SLO and one assessment, for programs undergoing review, be considered as efficacious.

The college was already at the level of "sustainable continuous quality improvement" according to the ACCJC rubric, when it received the recommendation that progress on SLOs be included as a component of evaluation.

Progress

Compliance with the recommendation involves changes to the California Teacher Association (CTA) union contract, since evaluation is a contractual tool. As a result, the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources began working with CTA representatives to address the recommendation. In a series of five meetings with CTA, SLOs and self-reflection evaluation of SLOs have been on the agenda (see documents 05.01.01-05.01.06). Several successive drafts of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) have been discussed with CTA. The most recent draft MOU under discussion would add to the evaluation process a question that would ask the faculty member to reflect on the effect of SLOs on student success in their courses. The MOU described above was discussed at length with the interim chancellor at a CTA executive committee retreat held July 17, 2010. The same draft MOU was shared with the SBVC Academic Senate on August 18, 2010 and reviewed and discussed at the subsequent meeting of the Academic Senate on September 1, 2010 (see document 05.01.07). The CTA distributed a survey concerning the MOU to its constituency in August and are currently tabulating the results.

Conclusion

The college, district, and CTA representatives have worked diligently to incorporate acceptable language into the MOU on SLOs as a part of performance evaluation. CTA leaders will ask the members to review the latest MOU in the fall semester 2010, and if their response is positive, then a final MOU may be in place by 2011.

Recommendation 6: District-Level Program Review, Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, and Human Resources Plan

In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the board of trustees and the chancellor, in consultation with the leadership of the college campuses, develop a strategy for addressing some significant issues raised by each college and verified in interviews with staff in the following areas; namely:

- *The development of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for reviewing all district functions and processes using a program review model. (Standard IV.B.3.a, b)*
- *The development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan that both acknowledges input and aligns with the college's educational plan and serves as a guide for planning at the college level. (Standards I.B.3, IV.B.3.g)*
- *The development of a coordinated strategic plan for technology that is responsive to the colleges and assists them in the daily management of the college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information. (Standards I.B.2, 4, 5, 6, IV.B.3.b, III.C.1.a, c, III.C.2)*
- *The development of a long range human resources plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing the need for full-time faculty and staff. (Standards III.A.1.b,c, III.A.6)*

District Program Review

- *The development of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for reviewing all district functions and processes using a program review model. (Standard IV.B.3.a, b)*

Overview

Prior to 2009-2010, several district functions and processes had used quantitative and qualitative information to evaluate and improve district processes. However, the efforts had not yet become systematic or widely public, and documentation of improvements based on evaluations was sparse. For example:

- In summer 2008, Business Services held a retreat in which staff members discussed challenges in their area and identified efficiencies and corrective actions that were needed. As a result, performance goals and objectives were developed for 2008-2009. During 2008-2009, they updated quantitative measures of their progress on a monthly basis. Units did report improvements in operational improvements on the basis of these assessments. With the departure of the business manager in June 2009, the planning and improvement cycle was interrupted until the district planning and program review process began in October 2009.
- Human Resources (HR) completed a program review document in August 2009. The unit has also done an annual status report on its goals and activities in relation to the board imperatives and institutional goals.

- Distributed Education and Technology Services (DETS) collects evaluative information on its technology services primarily through help desk feedback emails (see documents 06a.01.01-06a.01.04).

These efforts represented steps in the right direction, but a more systematic district planning and program review process was clearly needed. To guide the initial cycle of that systematic process, the former chancellor appointed an administrative steering committee composed of the Vice Chancellors for Fiscal Services and Human Resources and the Executive Director of DETS. The new process began in earnest in October 2009 with steering committee meetings and the development of a planning and program review timeline. The steering committee recommended a three-year cycle, and decided that all district operations units except the police department would do their initial program reviews in 2009-2010. The committee identified all applicable units in each division, determined that each unit team would comprise all permanent employees in the unit, and appointed a team leader for each unit. It also approved a template for the planning and program review document, and initiated development of a web-based tool based on that template (see documents 06a.02.01-06a.02.03).

On November 20, 2009, members of all units (e.g., the district-level departments and offices participating in the district program review process) attended a half-day workshop to initiate the program review process, which was facilitated by the accreditation consultant. Information on the purposes of district program review and planning, elements of a sound program review and planning document, and the cyclical process for program improvement were presented. Each unit went through an exercise of developing and sharing their newly created mission statements. Although some units (accounting, technical services) had data on effectiveness measures, the majority of the units had to discuss how to measure performance. Each unit submitted its draft at the end of the workshop and the facilitator provided written feedback through the steering committee a week later. Drafts were revised and resubmitted to the steering committee. In January 2010 it was suggested that an all-day workshop on program review be held in March. Simultaneously, the steering committee was devising a district operations satisfaction survey to be used for program review (see documents 06a.03.01-06a.03.08, 06a.04.01-06a.04.02).

The committee chose to focus on usage of and satisfaction with district-level services for this initial survey because they comprise two of the most important measures of the effectiveness of district functions in supporting the colleges. The survey was administered in late February and early March to approximately 1,200 recipients. The survey asked respondents to rate aspects of services in any of nine district units from which he or she had requested or received services within the past 12 months. There were 230 respondents, for a response rate of 19 percent. Quantitative results were sent to all units just before the March workshop, unit-specific comments were sent to the units to which they applied, and general comments were sent to all units (see documents 06a.05.01-06a.05.02).

Some of the results of the district operations satisfaction survey indicated that both usage of and satisfaction with district services varied widely. Highlights of the survey results included the following (see document 06a.06.01):

- More than three-quarters of respondents had requested or received services from DCS-Technical Services and from Human Resources within the last 12 months, while fewer than 30 percent had requested or received services from Distributed Education and from District Facilities within the same period.
- Facilities had the highest proportion of users who were satisfied (84%) with its services whereas Human Resources had the lowest proportion (50%). The remaining seven units ranged from 73% to 79%.
- Human Resources and Purchasing had the highest proportions of users who were dissatisfied overall with 26% and 19% respectively. Accounting/Accounts Payable/Audit had the lowest proportion of dissatisfied users at 6%. The proportion of dissatisfied users in the remaining units ranged from 7% to 10%.
- Six specific aspects of service included in the survey were regarded as most revealing of overall effectiveness in supporting the colleges. Satisfaction ratios (the ratios of positive ratings to negative ratings) for these aspects ranged as follows:

Aspect	Highest Satisfaction Ratios (Satisfied:Dissatisfied)*	Lowest Satisfaction Ratios (Satisfied:Dissatisfied)*	Range of Ratios in Remaining Units
Helpfulness	DCS-Technical Services (23:1) District Facilities (20:1)	Human Resources (4:1) Purchasing (6:1)	9:1 to 14:1
Follow-through	District Facilities (13:1) Accounting/Accounts Payable/Audit (12:1)	Human Resources (2:1) Purchasing (5:1)	7:1 to 11:1
Accuracy of information provided	DCS-Administrative Services (16:1) Distributed Education (15:1)	Human Resources (3:1) Purchasing (6:1)	8:1 to 14:1
Timeliness of initial response	Distributed Education (41:1) Printing Services (12:1)	Human Resources (2:1) Purchasing (5:1)	6:1 to 10:1
Timeliness of final resolution	Distributed Education (42:1) Printing Services (11:1)	Human Resources (2:1) Purchasing (5:1) DCS-Administrative Services (5:1)	6:1 to 9:1
Clarity and consistency of procedures	District Facilities (13:1) Distributed Education (8:1)	Human Resources (1:1) Purchasing (3:1)	5:1 to 7:1

* Explanation of satisfaction ratios: One would expect a unit that is highly effective from its clients' perspective to have a large proportion of respondents who are satisfied with its service (rating 4 or 5 on the survey), and a small proportion who are not satisfied (rating 1 or 2). The ratio of positive ratings to negative ratings (the satisfaction ratio) shows this relationship in a concise way. The higher this ratio is

for a given aspect of a unit's service or overall, the more satisfaction predominates among its users, and thus the more effective its service is in the eyes of those users. The satisfaction ratio conveys more information than, for example, mean satisfaction ratings.

- In all but one unit, the courtesy of the staff received the highest satisfaction ratio. Satisfaction ratios for that aspect ranged from 5:1 in Human Resources and 6:1 in Printing Services to more than 20:1 in DCS-Technical Services, DCS-Administrative Services, Distributed Education, Accounting/Accounts Payable/Audit, and District Facilities.
- In all units, the opportunity to provide input on changes in service or procedures received the lowest satisfaction ratio. Satisfaction ratios for that aspect ranged from 1:1 in Human Resources and 2:1 in Purchasing to 4:1 in District Facilities.

There were 398 comments by respondents (see document 06a.07.01). Nearly all were thoughtful and constructive, though some were expressions of frustration. Improvement themes that recurred across two or more units included the following:

- Communication and clarity about procedures, requirements, and the status of requests
- More efficient procedures, in part through the use of technology
- Consistency of information provided—from different unit staff members, to different clients, and across different periods of time
- Training, both of unit staff and of clients, to improve the match of expectations and performance
- Increased opportunity for input on service offerings, software systems, and the like
- Responsiveness, especially in answering and returning telephone requests for help
- Turnaround time on service requests, sometimes coupled with observations about unit understaffing

All units considered the quantitative survey results, the comments applicable to them, and to a lesser extent the comments that applied to district services and operations overall, as they finished their self-assessment at the March 19 all-day workshop. All teams were trained in the use of the web-based planning tool, which they could use instead of the word-processing template if they so chose. Most chose to use the web-based tool that day. Teams drafted each remaining section of their program review and plan in turn, with guidance and feedback from the facilitator, their own unit leaders, and the steering committee members. A substantial part of the afternoon session focused heavily on analysis of assessment results (including interpretation of the district operations satisfaction survey results) and formulation of goals, objectives, and action plans, since those areas are most difficult for many groups new to program review and planning (see documents 06a.08.01-06a.08.05). By the end of the workshop, every unit had completed a rough draft of the entire planning and program review document, which included the following sections:

I.   Mission
II.   Description
III.   Outcomes and Other Measures of Effectiveness
      A. Effectiveness Measures
      B. Assessment of Effectiveness Using Those Measures
IV.   External Opportunities and Challenges
V.   Analysis and Evaluation
VI.   Three-to-Five-Year Vision
VII.   Impact on the Colleges and the District
VIII.   Other Pertinent Information
IX.   Goals, Objectives, and Action Plans
X.   Resource Requests
XI.   Progress Report on Last Cycle's Goals, Objectives, and Action Plans (if applicable)
XII.   Description of Process and Participants

Based on the survey results and other effectiveness measures of their own strengths and weaknesses, units incorporated numerous operational improvements into their goals and objectives for next year. For example:

- The Purchasing unit team attributed the unit's low satisfaction ratios primarily to inadequate or unclear communication with clients about the legal and organizational requirements that apply to purchasing transactions. As a result, their objectives include workshops for users, improved communication methods, and more streamlined processes.
- The Human Resources team, acknowledging the unit's low satisfaction ratios as a weakness, adopted excellent customer service as a goal, with objectives that include more effective communication through the HR newsletter and the Human Resources website, and scheduled office hours at the colleges by HR staff.
- Several units (Accounting/Accounts Payable/Audit, Distributed Education, DCS-Technical Services, and District Facilities) addressed the inadequate opportunities clients had for input on services and procedural changes by formulating goals or objectives to provide more of those opportunities through surveys, user committees, help desk improvements, and better training (see documents 06a.09.01-06a.09.06).

All units had two weeks to submit their formal drafts, including their final prioritized lists of objectives and resource requests. The quality of the submissions was generally high, considering that none of the units had ever prepared such documents before. For example, alignment among measures of effectiveness, analysis of results, goals and objectives, and resource requests was stronger than expected. Units generally took the task seriously and considered their responses thoughtfully; a good example is the program review produced by DCS-Administrative Services (see document 06a.10.01). The steering committee identified those units that likely will need additional assistance to ensure that their next planning and program review cycle is more effective.

The facilitator provided written feedback two weeks after submission of the formal drafts to every unit through the applicable steering committee member, who also provided feedback as needed. The facilitator also provided suggestions to improve the quality of the documents for the next cycle (see document 06a.11.01). All units incorporated feedback and submitted their final documents on the web-based planning tool by early May. All final documents are available for viewing by all employees of the district on the district program review website (see document 06a.12.01).

The interim chancellor periodically reported district program review progress to all employees in the district in his *Chancellor's Chat* online newsletter. In addition, in late April, he distributed the quantitative results of the district operations satisfaction survey to all district employees (see documents 06a.13.01-06a.13.03).

The intention of the program review process is to ensure that units are accountable for progress on their goals and objectives every year. Each year, all units not engaged in a full program review will prepare an annual planning update with the following sections:
- Significant changes in the unit
- Summary of results of effectiveness measures applied since program review
- Progress in effectiveness, innovations, partnerships, operational efficiency, and other areas
- Progress on last year's goals and objectives
- Updated goals and objectives in priority order
- Resources needed, if any, to achieve objectives
- Other information as needed

The cyclical process of program review and annual planning is designed to facilitate continuous improvement in all district operations (see documents 06a.14.01-06a.14.03).

Several units have already implemented improvements in their services based on their program reviews, and the rest have scheduled such improvements. For example:

- Human Resources began holding office hours at the colleges in April.
- Distributed Education has begun to deploy technologies requested by users, including Blackboard 9, Camtasia Relay, and EduStream version 2.0, and has implemented new training attendee evaluation forms to improve tracking of customer satisfaction.
- DCS-Administrative Services has developed a new comprehensive training calendar and on-demand training materials.
- DCS-Technical Services has scheduled an overhaul of the entire network core infrastructure for July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011.
- Printing Services has purchased new hardware that will dramatically improve staff efficiency.
- Facilities (district) has completed documentation of Facilities operating procedures.
- Payroll met its accuracy target for pay warrants in every cycle from March to date.

- Business Services has begun the use of standardized notifications to end users regarding the receipt of contracts (see documents 06a.15.01-06a.15.10).

The steering committee developed a computer-assisted method to facilitate the production of the consolidated divisional and area priority lists of objectives and resource requests for district operations. The committee sent its recommended final priorities list to the interim chancellor on August 3, 2010. He made two changes and supplied rationales for both, and notified all unit participants and the rest of the District community of the results in his *Chancellor's Chat* newsletter on August 26, 2010. The interim chancellor has directed the Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Services to set aside a total of $100,000 in the 2010-2011 District operations budget for funding of resource requests associated with the highest-priority District Program Review objectives and for implementation of the District Strategic Plan (see documents 06a.16.01-06a.16.03).

On a more global level, the interim chancellor, the interim vice chancellor for Fiscal Services, the vice chancellor for Human Resources, and the executive director of DETS considered the overall program review process and results as they planned district operations and resource allocations for 2010-2011. For example, in large part because of critical comments on the district operations satisfaction survey, the start date for moving the DETS help desk to local control was accelerated to July 1, 2010. In Fiscal Services, access to certain forms and status information will be streamlined, and document control will be digitized, beginning in 2010-2011 (see documents 06a.17.01-06a.17.02).

To gauge the appropriateness and effectiveness of the planning and program review process from the participants' perspective, the interim chancellor asked all of them to respond to an online process survey about the workshops, the feedback, the web-based tool, their level of input, and the helpfulness of the process as a whole for self-evaluation and continuous improvement (see document 06a.18.01). Respondents could also add any comments they wished. Twenty-three people (61 percent of them unit members, as opposed to unit leaders or managers) completed the survey, for a response rate of 37 percent.

Results of the process survey suggested that participants' evaluation of the process was generally positive (see documents 06a.19.01-06a.19.03):

- A large majority of respondents found the process extremely or quite helpful to their units in measuring their effectiveness (75%), analyzing their strengths and weaknesses (69%), identifying needed improvements (75%), and setting goals and objectives for next year (87%).
- All respondents found the workshops at least somewhat helpful, and all but one found the feedback at least somewhat helpful. Comments indicated that respondents valued the ability to focus on the process without outside interruptions, and sharing the experience with each other and with other units.

- The majority of the 12 respondents who said they had used the web-based planning tool found its features easy or extremely easy to use.
- Respondents felt themselves full participants in the process: Four of every five said that they had either enough or more than enough opportunity to provide meaningful input in the program review and planning process.
- Asked what aspect of the process worked best, respondents cited the focused, shared workshops; the district operations satisfaction survey results; the web-based tool; and the feedback each unit received on its drafts.
- Communication about the process as a whole was sufficiently clear that most respondents understood its nature and purposes reasonably well.

However, the survey results, informal discussions with process participants, and further reflection on the process by the steering committee highlighted certain issues that needed to be addressed, and led the committee to recommend the following improvements in the process for the next cycle:

- Add a representative from each area to the steering committee.
- Improve documentation in the next cycle to clarify the flow of information, the steps in the process, and the purposes of feedback, including feedback provided at workshops.
- Incorporate the consideration of the District Strategic Plan, the District Technology Strategic Plan, and other applicable major planning documents.
- Evaluate, and if needed modify, the management of time and tasks associated with the workshops.
- Adjust the schedule for the next cycle to ensure timely completion of the process, and timely communication of its results to the participants.
- Inform the colleges about the process and its results in more timely fashion, and solicit suggestions for improving the process in the next cycle.
- Modify the descriptions of unit functions in next year's survey to clarify those functions, the differences among units, and the differences between district-level functions and their college-level counterparts.
- Consider expanding the survey to assess district operational effectiveness in additional ways.
- Modify the web-based planning tool to ease navigation, data entry, and prioritization.
- Directions to respondents in next year's survey will urge them to focus on each applicable unit as a whole, rather than on individuals, and will request that they not use names. Any names of employees entered in comments will be masked before distribution to participants (see document 06a.20.01).

The interim chancellor presented information on the District program review process and its results to all attendees of the annual In-Service Day on August 13, 2010. He also notified all unit participants and the rest of the district community of the process survey results and the above recommendations for improvement in the next cycle in his *Chancellor's Chat* of September 13, 2010 (see documents 06a.21.01-06a.21.02).

Progress and Analysis

For the first time, the district has developed and fully implemented a systematic, ongoing district planning and program review process focused on continuous improvement. This process will help ensure that district operations provide "effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions" (Standard IV.B.3.b). Quantitative effectiveness measures and qualitative information applied in this initial cycle have already led to improvements in some units, and will provide a baseline for assessing progress in subsequent cycles. Unit members and leaders, division managers, and area managers were all active participants in the process, helped assess its effectiveness, and contributed ideas for improving it. The wider district and college communities also participated through their responses on the district operations satisfaction survey. That survey summarized the operational responsibilities and functions of each of the nine units included, and helped delineate those functions to college personnel, though there was still some confusion at the colleges about three district units (Standard IV.B.3.a). Despite some weaknesses that are being addressed, the district has made great strides in evaluating and improving its own operations for the benefit of the clients it serves.

Conclusion

With the establishment of the systematic and ongoing district planning and program review process, the district has addressed the recommendation to develop "an appropriate and clearly communicated process for reviewing all district functions and processes using a program review model."

The process will become more efficient and efficacious as it is implemented for a second cycle in 2010-2011. In that second cycle, the college will be informed about the process in more timely fashion, and will provide suggestions for improving it.

District Strategic Plan

- *The development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan that both acknowledges input and aligns with the college's educational plan and serves as a guide for planning at the college level. (Standards I.B.3, IV.B.3.g)*

Overview

There was no SBCCD Strategic Plan prior to 2009-2010; however, in 2006 the district began using the SBCCD planning imperatives in lieu of a strategic plan. These imperatives guided planning, and progress on them was reported annually to the board. In addition, goals for the two college presidents were reported using the imperatives (see documents 06b.01.01-06b.01.02).

The District Strategic Planning Committee (DSPC) was formed in fall 2009. It had broad representation across the district, including Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students, and management representatives from SBVC as well as other areas of the district. For the following seven months committee members worked diligently, reviewing materials before and after every meeting (e.g., the agenda, detailed minutes, reports, reference documents, transcriptions of posted comments, updates of action documents), preparing subcommittee reports, and contributing to lively discussions during each meeting (see documents 06b.02.01-06b.02.03, and documentation of all DSPC materials on the committee's website: http://www.sbccd.cc.ca.us/District_Faculty_,-a-, Staff_Information-Forms/District_Committee_Minutes/District_Strategic_Planning_Committee.aspx).

The first three meetings focused on orientation and groundwork in the following areas:

- Defining the purposes of strategic planning
- Exchanging information on excellent planning processes
- Distinguishing among goals, objectives, and activities
- Establishing norms, operations, and logistics for meetings (see documents 06b.03.01-06b.03.07)

The DSPC adopted by consensus a set of member, convener, and facilitator responsibilities, which explicitly included, along with attendance and active engagement in the deliberations, sharing the committee's progress with constituents and colleagues at the colleges and bringing back input from those constituents and colleagues throughout the process. By the end of the third meeting, the committee established a timeline and process for development of the District Strategic Plan (DSP), which included alignment with the colleges' strategic and educational master plans (see documents 06b.04.01-06b.04.02).

Over the next several meetings, the committee reviewed and discussed the following (see documents 06b.05.01-06b.05.09):

- The strategic directions/initiatives and goals in the SBVC Strategic Plan and the CHC Educational Master Plan
- San Bernardino Community College District board imperatives
- District and college missions
- California Community Colleges System Strategic Plan
- ACCJC rubric on planning
- Data for both colleges (enrollment and productivity trends, student performance and impact indicators, institutional characteristics, economic information on service areas)
- Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) reports

In addition, subcommittees gathered information on important strategic issues related to higher education in the following areas:

- Budget, law and regulation, and capital funding
- Pedagogical innovations, accountability, and learning outcomes
- Educational attainment in relation to economic opportunity
- Competition for students with other institutions
- Private support for education, including grant opportunities
- Technology issues and trends related to education
- Financial aid (see documents 06b.06.01-06b.06.06)

From December 2009 through February 2010, the committee refined a working set of district strategic directions and goals aligned with the goals of each college. In early March, the interim chancellor distributed the initial draft to all district employees and student leadership with a request for email feedback. The facilitator encouraged the presidents of the academic and classified senates and the Associated Students governments to discuss the draft in their meetings, and the CHC Academic Senate provided a transcript of their discussion. Three open forums—one at each college and one at the district office—were held to present information, answer questions, record feedback, and ensure direct participation in the process (see documents 06b.07.01-06b.07.10).

The DSPC discussed all the feedback received. Email respondents, though few in number, affirmed that the strategic directions and goals in the working set were important for the continued progress of the district. The committee concluded that since most comments received at the forums and from the CHC Academic Senate were requests for clarification, and since forum participants, when asked, raised no objections to the existing language, no changes in the language of any of the strategic directions and goals were warranted. However, partly in response to one comment, the Committee did decide to include an objective emphasizing improved collaboration among all district entities (see documents 06b.08.01-06b.08.02).

The DSPC spent a substantial portion in its March and April meetings developing and refining objectives, establishing timelines, responsibility centers, measurements of progress, and actions for each goal (see documents 06b.09.01-06b.09.04). All objectives were measurable by qualitative or quantitative methods, and many were measurable by both. The committee focused on objectives that would accomplish one or more of the following:

- Provide district support to both colleges in pursuing and achieving their goals.
- Coordinate analogous sets of goals and objectives that already exist at both colleges.
- Guide further planning at both colleges.
- Establish or enhance a district-level operation to advance a district goal.
- Supplement the colleges' planning.

In spring 2010 the DSPC was able to accomplish several other tasks:

- Review updated environmental scan information and identify principal implications for planning purposes.
- Adopt a set of major planning assumptions.
- Develop a process to assess both the effectiveness of the DSP itself and the district's progress on achieving its goals and objectives.
- Incorporate a long-range financial plan and forecast, which included the district resource allocation model.
- Select a glossary of terms and acronyms to be used in the document.

All these components were incorporated into the distribution draft of the DSP. In late April, the interim chancellor emailed a link to the draft to all district employees and student leadership to ensure it was widely communicated. He invited everyone to provide constructive suggestions or comments via a dedicated email address or through a DSPC member. He also held an open forum at the district office to answer questions and receive feedback. An open forum was also held at each college to answer questions and receive feedback on the plan, and District Assembly received a presentation on the draft (see documents 06b.10.01, pp. 47-67, 21, 4-6, 35-37, 68-70; 06b.10.02-06b.10.05).

The DSPC met on May 7 to consider all the feedback received on the draft, which was more extensive than that received in March (see document 06b.11.01). As a result of the discussions, the DSPC made the following changes to the plan:

- Quarterly monitoring by the committee and the responsibility centers, with facilitation of corrective actions as needed.
- Improve communication about progress in implementing the plan. Two actions under Objective 1.1.1 were added:
  - "Build into the agendas of regular meetings and events (e.g., In-service Day, President's Cabinet, Crafton Council, SBVC College Council,

Senates, and meetings of other representative bodies) communication about progress on the DSP."
- o "Develop a template or other tool to facilitate regular communication with and feedback from all district personnel about DSP progress."
- To support transparent allocation of resources, added two actions under Objective 3.1.2:
  - o "DSPC makes a formal recommendation to the District Budget Committee to review the annual budget within the framework of the DSP."
  - o "Establish a committee for coordination of and communication about grant activity district-wide."
- Changed the name of the plan to "Strategic Plan, 2010-2014," to reflect the long-range nature of the plan.
- Revised the language of one action.
- Revised the responsibility centers on three objectives.
- Altered the timelines on two objectives (see document 06b.12.01).

The committee approved the additional changes and submitted the draft to the interim chancellor for his approval. He notified the district community of his approval, listed the goals of the plan, and provided a link to the plan on May 25, 2010. The Board of Trustees approved the plan at their July 8, 2010 meeting (see documents 06b.13.01-06b.13.03).

Even before the plan was approved, several district areas began to implement changes. For example:

Objective	Action	Status
1.1.1	Publish a periodic *Chancellor's Chat*, summarizing significant developments and decisions during each month and including other useful information as needed.	*Chancellor's Chat* began publication February 8, 2010; the ninth issue was published June 15, 2010 (see documents 06b.14.01-06b.14.02).
3.1.2	Finalize resource allocation model and process.	The Resource Allocation Committee approved the Resource Allocation Model for 2010-2011 (see Commission Recommendation 1 section).
3.2.1	Publish the organizational structure for technology services.	The organizational structure is published on page 12 of the DETS Catalog of Services, which is available on the DETS website (see document 06b.15.01).
3.3.1	Determine resources available to colleges.	See Objective 3.1.2 above.

The committee established fall 2010 timelines to begin implementation of the strategic plan objectives. To kick off implementation of actions under those objectives, the DSPC

invited the responsibility centers to its first meeting in late August 2010. The interim chancellor has stressed the importance of timely implementation, and has directed the Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Services to set aside a total of $100,000 in the 2010-2011 District operations budget for implementation of the District Strategic Plan and for funding of resource requests associated with the highest-priority District Program Review objectives (see documents 06b.16.01-06b.16.04).

The interim chancellor presented information on the SBCCD Strategic Plan on August 13, 2010 to all attendees of the annual in-service day event, and in his remarks asked them to familiarize themselves with the full plan at the website. Throughout the year a brochure version of the plan will be distributed by the interim chancellor in community events and educational forums in the area (see document 06b.17.01).

The interim chancellor asked the presidents to ensure that all appropriate college committees review the DSP, consider it in their work, and forward annually to the DSPC a summary of progress on any goals or objectives related to the DSP (see document 06b.18.01).

The DSPC will begin quarterly assessments in 2010-2011. Frequent monitoring of adherence to timelines and progress toward meeting objectives will help to ensure alignment with college planning efforts and to mitigate and address implementation problems as early as possible (see document 06b.13.01, pp. 4-5).

A continuous cycle of improvement, which includes evaluation, improvement, and re-evaluation, has been built into this strategic plan to ensure that it becomes a living plan. In 2010-2011, with appropriate consultation, the DSP will (see document 06b.13.01, p. 5):

- Review, and if necessary revise, existing district foundational statements and planning assumptions.
- Incorporate additional input and feedback mechanisms, such as structured surveys or community forums, if needed.
- Fully integrate KVCR and EDCT into the DSP.
- Update and enhance the plan's foundation of research, including demographics, student performance data, and environmental scanning results.
- Review and update strategic issues likely to have significant effects on the plan, such as district and college growth projections and targets and identification of new courses and programs to meet student needs.
- Update documentation of alignment with college and other strategic plans, glossary terms as needed, and provisions for regular evaluation and revision.
- Modify, add, or retire objectives, actions, measurements, timelines, and responsibility centers based on input, feedback, research, planning assumptions, changes in foundational statements, and committee deliberations.
- Distribute the 2011-2015 edition of the DSP with sufficient time for incorporation of district and college feedback prior to approval by the chancellor and board.

Progress and Analysis

The district has completed its first formal SBCCD Strategic Plan. It drew substantial input from the SBVC Strategic Plan and Educational Master Plan and the Crafton Educational Master Plan. It aligns district goals with college goals. The district plan will support strategic and educational planning processes and program improvement at the colleges. Although the plan has not yet undergone its initial review and quarterly assessment of progress, systematic evaluation is built into the plan. Communication among all consultative groups is an important component of the plan's success. Specific resources have been allocated in support of plan implementation. Assessments of the district's substantive progress on its goals and objectives will occur in quarterly, annual, and triennial cycles, commencing in fall 2010. Results of these assessments will be used to improve effectiveness in achieving those goals and objectives. (Standards I.B.3, IV.B.3.g)

Conclusion

The completion of the District Strategic Plan, which is aligned with the colleges' plans and includes concrete steps for regular evaluation and improvement, has met the recommendation for "development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan" that "acknowledges input [from] and aligns with the colleges' education plan."

The District Strategic Plan will also serve "as a guide for planning at the college level" as it is considered by all appropriate college committees in their work beginning in fall 2010, and it will be evaluated and improved in the 2010-2011 academic year.

Strategic Plan for Technology

- *The development of a coordinated strategic plan for technology that is responsive to the colleges and assists them in the daily management of the college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information. (Standards I.B.2, 4, 5, 6, IV.B.3.b, III.C.1.a, c, III.C.2)*

Overview

A comprehensive District Information Technology Strategic Plan was adopted in 2007, and was in force through 2010 (see document 06c.01.01). In addition to goals and implementation strategies, it contained institutional technology (IT) directives that tied to five of the 2008-2009 Board Imperatives.

To determine whether or not implementation of the IT plan was sufficiently responsive to college needs, the district contracted with PlanNet to assess IT services. In July 2009, as a response to the findings of PlanNet, the Distributed Education and Technology Services (DETS) division substantially reorganized its technology service structures. Associated committee structures, clarification of roles, coordination, responsiveness, and quality of services were also included in their restructuring (see documents 06c.02.01-06c.02.03). The two most important changes were the conversion to internal management of District Computing Services (DCS) and the implementation of a new information technology governance structure; both enhancements were designed to improve significantly the division's responsiveness to the colleges.

In summer 2009, after almost 20 years of outsourcing DCS management to Sungard, the district began transition to its own internal management. For example:

- All desk-side support services were localized at the colleges
- An SBCCD Director of District Computing Services was hired in fall 2009.
- Campus Directors of Technology were hired at both colleges and report to the respective presidents, as well as to the Director of District Computing Services.
- A catalog of services was completed and is now available to all district employees on the DETS website (dets.sbccd.org). Hard copies will be distributed to all employees in fall 2010 (see document 06c.03.01).
- Functions for which DCS does not have internal expertise may now be "out-tasked" to other IT professionals/businesses on an as-needed basis.

At the top of the new information technology governance structure, the DETS Executive Committee is charged with developing the overarching vision, framework, monitoring and evaluation of the technology strategic planning and implementation process. The vice presidents of instruction, student services, and administrative services; the Academic Senate presidents; the directors of research; and the directors of technology from both colleges all serve on this committee. The change was needed to ensure that the colleges have a voice in planning and directing technology services district-wide. In addition, four working committees—Administrative Applications, User Services,

Technical Services, and Web Standards Committees—are charged with the following tasks in their respective areas (see documents 06c.04.01-06c.04.02):

- Developing specific goals and supporting strategies in the District Technology Strategic Plan
- Recommending policies, procedures, priorities, and standards
- Providing input and direction in the development of measures to be used in District operations program review
- Overseeing project implementations
- Other tasks specific to the area

All four working committees have broad representation from college constituency groups, and benefit from the technical expertise of DETS staff members or managers.

The executive director of DETS coordinated a survey of DETS Executive Committee members to begin evaluation of the new structure's effectiveness in August 2010. Respondents were asked how much and in which direction (better or worse) DETS services had changed since the reorganization in clarity, coordination, quality, and responsiveness at the colleges and in District operations. Results suggested that services were somewhat better, particularly in the area of communication and information sharing, and that roles in technology services had been clarified. However, they also suggested that some role confusion remains, and that the centralized help desk system is still not as functional as it should be (see documents 06c.05.01-06c.05.02).

To determine the effects of the structural changes from the college users' perspective, the executive director will distribute a survey to all district employees in Fall 2010. The DETS Executive Committee will consider the results of both surveys in formulating its recommendations for improvements (see document 06c.06.01).

Development of the revised District Technology Strategic Plan (DTSP) began in fall 2009. The DETS Executive Committee conducted several planning sessions to discuss the various elements of the strategic plan. At each step, notes of discussions and recommendations of the group were sent to participants for review and clarification. Once the executive committee completed the process, overview, and vision sections, the four working committees developed specific goals and supporting strategies. All the committees had the opportunity to review and critique the findings. The executive committee consolidated the committees' documents and completed the final District Technology Strategic Plan recommendation. That recommendation was reviewed and approved by chancellor's cabinet in May 2010, and posted on the DCS website. The board of trustees approved the plan at their July 8, 2010 meeting. The interim chancellor notified all employees that the Plan is now posted on the District website on September 13, 2010 (see documents 06c.07.01-06c.07.02).

The DTSP consistently emphasizes responsiveness to the needs of the colleges. For example, four of the nine elements of success in technology planning that it cites stress

input, access, process transparency, and accommodation to changing needs. Moreover, the explicit intent of the plan is to "encourage and enable all district constituencies to participate in the assessment of technology needs and the development of the vision, direction, and prioritization of solutions to address those needs" (see document 06c.09.01, pp. 1, 4).

The DTSP also emphasizes evaluation and continuous improvement. For example, a three-year evaluation cycle is built in. To improve the assessment of progress within each cycle, the committees will develop more clearly defined outcome measurements related to the DTSP's goals and strategies beginning in fall 2010 (see document 06c.09.01, pp. 2, 6).

In addition, the DTSP emphasizes integration with other major college and district planning processes. For example, two sections of the plan demonstrate the alignment of the District Technology strategic goals with the District Strategic Plan 2010-14 strategic directions and the San Bernardino Valley College Information Technology Strategic Plan strategies. The DETS Executive Committee will monitor alignment on an annual basis in consultation with the campus technology committees and the District Strategic Planning Committee (see document 06c.09.01, pp. 13-17, 6).

Implementation of DTSP activities is supported largely by the DETS budget; the plan itself does not include specific resource allocations. Some additional resource requests are funded through the district program review and planning process (see *District Program Review* section above); others are brought by the executive director of DETS to the chancellor's cabinet for consideration, and funded from a variety of sources, including bond funds (see documents 06c.12.01, 06c.13.01).

Finally, two of the DTSP goals explicitly address the ongoing need to assist the colleges in daily management of college functions, and the perennial problem of funding for technology enhancements:
- Goal 2: Develop tools and resources that facilitate the daily management of college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information.
    - Strategy 2.1: Work with college leaders to evaluate tools and data needed for financial analysis and planning.
    - Strategy 2.2: Research and deploy systems to address the needs identified in 2.1.
    - Strategy 2.3: Define and implement systems to help users monitor the reliability of crucial data.

- Goal 3: Provide a financial base to allow the District to keep pace with technology.
    - Strategy 3.1: Identify opportunities and partner with grant writing experts to obtain grant funding.
    - Strategy 3.2: Develop a budgeting plan that is reviewed annually (see document 06c.09.01, p. 19).

In accord with Goal 2, the DETS Executive Committee has already placed administration of surveys and focus groups at the colleges on its schedule of tasks for 2010-2011, to help identify the tools and data that the colleges need for planning and for financial analysis.

Progress and Analysis

Collaborative development of the District Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2013 provided opportunities for input by every constituency group at both colleges, through designated representatives on the DETS Executive Committee and the four working committees (Standard I.B.4). Planning was grounded in a documented assessment of technology services conducted by the external firm PlanNet, and further informed by input from and discussions by committee representatives (Standard I.B.5). Technology planning is integrated with the District Strategic Plan and the colleges' technology plans. SBVC includes technology as one of its major strategic initiatives in its Strategic Plan (Standard III.C.2). The DTSP will remain current through ongoing monitoring and a triennial evaluation and modification process (Standard I.B.6).

Ultimately, the plan and the technology services that it guides are designed to support instruction and student services at the colleges (Standards III.C.1.a, IV.B.3.b). The plan sets goals to improve the district's technological effectiveness, along with strategies and measurements. A more precise measurement methodology will be specified beginning in fall 2010 (Standard I.B.2).

Resource allocations to implement the plan occur through existing budget processes and District program review, and one of the DTSP goals (Goal 3) is to develop additional resources to facilitate keeping pace with technology (Standard I.B.4). Goal 9 addresses the need to upgrade infrastructure in accord with district-wide hardware and software standards; the charge of the User Services Committee includes the development of such standards for desktop and peripheral devices and other equipment (Standard III.C.1.c). Goal 2 aims at developing the tools and resources to facilitate the monitoring, assessment, and use of financial information (Standard III.D.2.a).

Finally, the District Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2013, in combination with the move to internal management and new information technology governance structure, represents a significant improvement in responsiveness to the technology needs of SBVC and our sister college CHC.

Conclusion

The development and implementation of the District Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2013 have addressed the recommendation for "the development of a coordinated strategic plan for technology that is responsive to the colleges and assists them in the daily management of the college functions, including the monitoring, assessing and use of financial information."
During 2010-2011, the responsible committees will develop improved outcome measurements related to the DTSP's goals and strategies, and incorporate those measurements into the triennial evaluation and revision cycle.

Development of a Long-Range Human Resources Plan

- *The development of a long range human resources plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing the need for full-time faculty and staff. (Standards III.A.1.b,c, III.A.6)*

Overview

Work on the long-range Human Resources plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing full-time hiring needs—which is now called the Staffing Plan—began in Fall 2009 with a review of sample HR-related plans provided by the vice chancellor for Human Resources. At her request, the accreditation consultant identified a pool of potential plan components drawn from that sample. On the basis of that research, the vice chancellor, the director of Human Resources, and the Human Resources analyst in November recommended an outline of contents for the projected plan (see document 06d.01.01).

In late Fall 2009, the District Resource Allocation Committee (RAC), which included faculty, classified, and management representatives from both colleges and classified and management representatives from District operations, assigned a subcommittee to prepare a draft of the staffing plan. From December 2009 through March 2010, the subcommittee, chaired by the vice chancellor, debated about what belonged in the plan and what did not, using the November 2009 content outline and the HR department's August 2009 initial program review draft as starting points. It developed successive outlines and drafts that reflected the debates, culminating in a draft that went to the full RAC in late March. There was general agreement in the RAC that the draft required substantial modification. The interim chancellor, who chairs the RAC, then asked the vice chancellor to coordinate the completion of data collection and analysis for the plan, clarify the narrative portions of the plan, and bring a revised draft back to the RAC as soon as possible (see documents 06d.02.01-06d.02.06).

At the RAC meeting in mid-May, the vice chancellor presented the results of the work that had been completed with the help of both HR and college staff. This draft of the staffing plan, which focused on providing data and analysis to the colleges to help them plan and prioritize full-time hiring, included the following enhancements:
- A summary of the types of information provided and the purposes they served
- A more complete description of the relationships between the plan and District and college missions, the District Strategic Plan, and other planning processes
- Standardized presentation of data
- Numerous additional tables designed to meet college needs, such as staffing ratios with examples of how to apply them in planning
- Source notes for all tables
- Graphical representations of data where most appropriate
- Analytical notes and commentary
- A matrix of anticipated hires, a form designed to provide the colleges with concrete information on those positions they had requested in the current

planning and program review cycle, or anticipated requesting within the next two cycles (see documents 06d.03.01-06d.03.02)

The RAC discussed the draft, and concluded that two primary changes were needed:
- Because of specific concerns at SBVC related to the personnel evaluation process, the staffing plan should include a section on evaluation requirements and processes.
- Because the college planning and program review processes already collect the necessary information on specific positions and generate human resources requests accordingly, deletion of the matrix of anticipated hires should be considered (see document 06d.04.01).

The interim chancellor directed the vice chancellor to incorporate the necessary changes and produce a final draft for consideration by the RAC at its first two meetings in Fall 2010.

The final draft presented to the RAC at its meeting of August 23 included the following new features:
- An expanded section on the relationship between the plan and district, college, and HR department missions
- An expanded section on the relationship between the plan and other planning processes
- A new section containing summaries of faculty, classified, and management evaluation processes, along with data on the status and timeliness of evaluations
- A section for listing hiring priorities from the colleges and district operations, including EDCT and KVCR, in lieu of the matrix of anticipated hires

In addition, the draft included three formal, measurable objectives, with suggested actions, timelines, and persons responsible for facilitating and monitoring progress, to address district-wide needs identified during preparation of the plan:

- Objective 1: In accord with District Strategic Plan Objective 5.1.1, the Human Resources department, in consultation with the colleges, will develop and implement a district mentoring program for all new employees.
- Objective 2: The Human Resources department, in consultation with the colleges, will develop and implement more systematic methods to monitor and ensure the timeliness of the evaluation processes for classified staff and management.
- Objective 3: In accord with District Strategic Plan Objective 3.1.1, the Human Resources department, in consultation with the colleges, will design and implement workshops and/or other professional development experiences to help the colleges develop internal candidates for vacancies that arise due to retirements and other turnover.

The RAC suggested a small number of changes, which were incorporated into a final draft. At its meeting of August 30, the committee by consensus recommended the

staffing plan as revised to the interim chancellor, who approved it and provided a link to it in his *Chancellor's Chat* of September 13, 2010 (see document 06d.05.02).

The staffing plan is a tool designed to help the planning and program review processes and the management of the colleges and district operations in planning and prioritizing full-time hiring. It provides in one document basic information on hiring, evaluation, and retention of quality employees, and an abundance of useful data, including:
- Current workforce demographics
- Applicant pool diversity
- Historical staffing ratios
- Faculty loads and positions by discipline
- Turnover rates
- Retirement projections
- Information on compliance issues such as the full-time faculty obligation and the 50-percent law (see document 06d.06.01)

The hiring and retention of high-quality human resources that this plan supports are crucial to the missions of the colleges and the district, so this plan supports those missions as well. It also aligns with objectives under three strategic directions in the District Strategic Plan, and with the Human Resources department's internal planning and program review process. Moreover, it provides direction to that department in the form of the three objectives shown above (see documents 06d.06.01 pp. 6-7, 9, 15, 27, 31; 06d.07.02 pp. 28, 30, 32; 06d.07.03).

Progress, Analysis, and Conclusion

The staffing plan is aligned with the missions of the district and its colleges (Standard I.A.4). It is also aligned with the District Strategic Plan, and includes information about the requirements and timeliness of personnel evaluation processes (Standard III.A.1.b). The plan provides CHC units engaged in annual planning or program review with information that helps them plan for and prioritize their human resources needs, especially in the long term. That information also helps the District and the colleges understand and improve their efficiency in using human resources, and their compliance with mandates related to human resources (Standard III.A.6).

See Recommendation 5 above on student learning outcomes as a component of evaluations (Standard III.A.1.c).

The development and implementation of the staffing plan has met the recommendation for the "development of a long range Human Resources plan to assist the colleges in planning and prioritizing the need for full-time faculty and staff."

During 2010-2011, the staffing plan will be reviewed and revised as needed, with appropriate input from the colleges.

Overview

In late summer 2009, the chancellor's cabinet approved the "Summary of Budget Allocation Model 2008-2009," which clarified the methods used for 2008-2009 allocations to district operations and the colleges. This document represented the first written description of such allocations completed at the district. It represented a major advance in transparency and communication for the district and its colleges. The information was posted in fall 2009 on the district website. It was, however, descriptive of what had been done, not prescriptive of what should be done. The cabinet made the decision to develop a model based on best practices that would address current and future needs (see document CR1.01.01).

To address the issue, the interim chancellor convened a Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) with representation from both colleges, the district office, Economic Development and Corporate Training, KVCR, and all constituency groups. The RAC began meeting in October 2009 with a discussion of not only its tasks but also a timeline for accomplishing them. In subsequent meetings, RAC members examined the characteristics of the existing allocation model in detail, considered best practices among eight budget models from other multi-campus districts, formulated guiding principles for the SBCCD model, and sought input from colleagues at the campuses (see documents CR1.02.01-CR1.02.12).

On the basis of this information, the interim chancellor drafted an allocation model in February 2010 for committee consideration, and notified all district employees of the RAC's work to date (see document CR1.03.01).   The model, which allocated funds to the colleges based primarily on the proportion of FTES generated by each over the past four years, included the following elements by college:

- Historical FTES data
- Total state base revenue
- Growth and COLA based on the governor's budget
- Projection of part-time faculty FTEF and costs
- Lottery revenue projections
- Interest revenue
- Other campus revenue allocable to each campus
- An assessment for district office operations
- An assessment for district-wide costs such as KVCR, insurance, and retiree funds
- An assessment for district-wide equipment costs
- An assessment for district reserves
- A final budget allocation (see document CR1.04.01)

Based on the committee's discussion, the interim chancellor drafted a revised model, which was approved by the committee in March 2010 for dissemination to the district community for feedback. This second model contained the following principal changes:

- It placed KVCR and auxiliary services into a separate column rather than in the assessment for district-wide costs.
- It set projected growth funds at zero, pending approval of the final state budget.
- It deleted the assessment for district-wide equipment costs.
- It added an assessment to fund the 2009-2010 SERP. (see document CR1.05.01)

In April the interim chancellor asked the colleges' vice presidents for administrative services to test the revised model in consultation with their respective presidents. The model was also sent to all district employees for feedback. In order to further communication on the topic, the interim chancellor presented a live webcast to explain the model. Presentations were made to College Council, Academic Senate, and managers (see documents CR1.06.01, CR1.06.03-CR1.06.04). Based on the feedback received, the interim chancellor drafted a third model, which the RAC considered on May 17. This model incorporated the following changes:

- The historical FTES data column used funded FTES, instead of actual FTES.
- Lottery, interest, and other campus revenue were projected in a more realistic fashion.
- The assessment for KVCR was placed in its own column, and funding for the auxiliary services accounting staff was placed in the assessment for district office operations.

The committee recommended moving funding for the Professional Development Center from the assessment for district office operations to its own column, on the basis of discussions after the circulation of the third draft. The RAC then approved the model unanimously, as amended. The interim chancellor shared the adopted model with all employees (see documents CR1.07.03-CR1.07.04, CR1.07.06, CR1.02.10).

The approved model was used in making allocations to the colleges for the 2010-2011 fiscal year. It was also incorporated into the SBCCD Strategic Plan. In accord with the guiding principles, it will be reviewed annually by the district-wide Budget Committee, which may recommend changes as needed. The SBVC College Council, which serves as the institution's primary collegial consultation group and oversees college processes including budget, will review and provide input on the model during 2010-2011 (see documents CR1.08.01-CR1.08.02).

Progress and Analysis

The new resource allocation model, for the first time, clearly distinguishes between district and college functions within the budget allocation process (Standard IV.B.3.a). It

distributes resources to support effective college operations fairly, and communicates the distribution method to the colleges, the district office, KVCR, and EDCT (Standards IV.B.3.c, IV.B.3.f). The resource allocation model places control of college budgeting firmly with the colleges themselves—considered the most appropriate location for effective control of expenditures (Standard IV.B.3.d)—rather than at the district level. The model is subject to the final authority of the Board of Trustees over the budget. It also builds in a process for evaluating its effectiveness annually with appropriate input from the college councils and constituency groups. Any changes are designed to improve district operations, which ultimately benefit the colleges and their students (Standards III.D.1.d, III.D.3, and IV.B.3.g).

In the following crucial areas, the presidents now have budgetary authority, which they exercise in accord with the colleges' own strategic plans and with collegial consultation input from their planning and program review processes:

- Both full-time and part-time hiring priorities for faculty, staff, and managers (Standard III.A.6; see also information provided by the staffing plan, and Recommendation 6)
- Equipment and facilities modifications, to improve the tools and settings needed for excellent instruction and services. (Standards III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b)
- Technology purchases and upgrades, in consultation with district and college technology staff, and guided in part by the District Technology Strategic Plan. (Standard III.C.2; see also Recommendation 6)

A draft of the model was widely communicated to the colleges, the district office, KVCR, and EDCT before adoption; feedback was incorporated as appropriate; and then the adopted model was communicated to all district employees.

Conclusion

With the development, adoption, communication, and implementation of the new resource allocation model, the district has met the recommendation that "the district's resource allocation process needs to be clarified and communicated to both colleges within the district."

During 2010-2011, the District Budget Committee, with appropriate input from the colleges, will evaluate implementation of the model, and make any necessary modifications.

List of Supporting Evidence

Statement on Report Preparation

ID	Document
RP.01.01	SBVC Sept 1 Min.pdf
RP.01.02	Minutes 8-27-10.doc
RP.01.03	ASG Minutes Sept 9-2010.docx
RP.01.04	C S Agenda 8-27-10.doc

Recommendation 5

ID	Document
05.01.01	AGENDA March 12.doc
05.01.02	AGENDA Mar 26.doc
05.01.03	AGENDA April 16.doc
05.01.04	AGENDA April 23.doc
05.01.05	AGENDA April 30.doc.
05.01.06	SLOs notes_discussions.docx
05.01.07	Aug 18 Senate Minutes.doc

Recommendation 6a

ID	Document
06a.01.01	Bus Svcs Retreat Agenda 080619.pdf
06a.01.02	Purchase Order analysis.pdf
06a.01.03	HR Prgm Rev 08-09.pdf
06a.01.04	20090627 DCS Status.pdf
06a.02.01	Timeline 100119.pdf
06a.02.02	Dist Prgm Rev Participants.pdf
06a.02.03	ProgramReviewTemplate w boxes 091120.pdf
06a.03.01	Agenda 091120.pdf
06a.03.02	Purposes of Dist PR 091120.pdf
06a.03.03	PR Dist Ops Contents 091120.pdf
06a.03.04	Foundations of Framework 091118.pdf
06a.03.05	Outcome Statements.pdf
06a.03.06	Measurement Samples by Outcome Type 091120.pdf
06a.03.07	Measures form 091120.pdf
06a.03.08	Measures form sample 091120.pdf
06a.04.01	Feedback Descriptions 100106.doc
06a.04.02	Feedback Mission & Measures 091217.doc
06a.05.01	Final Ops Satisf Questionnaire.pdf
06a.05.02	Dist Ops Survey Invitation 100223.pdf
06a.06.01	Summary of Results for Dist Distrib.pdf
06a.07.01	Ops Svy Comments Restored Negs Xd 100331 Accptd.pdf
06a.08.01	Agenda 100319.pdf
06a.08.02	Web Planning Tool Screenshots.doc
06a.08.03	Goals-Obj Distinctions-Services 100318.doc
06a.08.04	Goal & Objective Verbs.doc

ID	Document
06a.08.05	Outcome Statements-Services 100318.doc
06a.09.01	Plans for Procurement 100504.pdf
06a.09.02	Plans for Human Resources 100524.pdf
06a.09.03	Plans for Accounting 100504.pdf
06a.09.04	Plans for Distributed Education 100416.pdf
06a.09.05	Plans for DCS-Tech 100505.pdf
06a.09.06	Plans for Facilities 100419.pdf
06a.10.01	Plans for DCS-Admin 100505.pdf
06a.11.01	ML General Comments 100411.pdf
06a.12.01	https://www.sbccd.org/ProgramReview/Home.aspx/Listing
06a.13.01	Chancellor's Chat 100208.pdf
06a.13.02	Chancellor's Chat 100427.pdf
06a.13.03	Chancellor email on Dist Ops Svy Results 100426.pdf.
06a.14.01	Annl Planning Template.pdf
06a.14.02	District Planning Process graphic 100803.pdf
06a.14.03	Calendar 2010-11 100822.doc
06a.15.01	HR Newsletter 1004.pdf
06a.15.02	Blackboard Agreement.pdf
06a.15.03	Financial 2000 EduReports Online Tutorial.pdf
06a.15.04	DE satisfactionSurvey.pdf
06a.15.05	DE Fall2010Workshops.pdf
06a.15.06	Infrastructure Upgrade.xls
06a.15.07	520GESeries Press.pdf
06a.15.08	DPR Status Facilities 100616.pdf
06a.15.09	DPR Status Payroll 100616.pdf
06a.15.10	DPR Status Procurement 100616.pdf.
06a.16.01	Steering Comm Pri Rec 100803 rev.pdf
06a.16.02	Chancellors Chat 100826.pdf
06a.16.03	***DPR-DSP Allocation 2010-11.pdf
06a.17.01	Help Desk Presidium Contract approval 100513.pdf
06a.17.02	http://www.sbccd.cc.ca.us/District_Faculty_,-a-,_Staff_Information-Forms/Business_Services_For_Employees.aspx
06a.18.01	DPR Process Survey Invitation 100513.pdf
06a.19.01	Process SurveySummary_05212010.pdf
06a.19.02	Process SurveySummary_06012010 Crosstab.pdf
06a.19.03	Process Svy Comments Report.pdf
06a.20.01	Evaluation Results on 2009-10 Process 100810.doc
06a.21.01	ChancellorPresentation2.ppt
06a.21.02	Chancellor's Chat 100913.pdf

Recommendation 6b

ID	Document
06b.01.01	SBCCD Institutional Goals 2008-09.pdf
06b.01.02	SBCCD '08 – '09 Institutional Goals Status Report 8-09 Fin.pdf
06b.02.01	Strategic Planning Cmt Appt 091016.pdf
06b.02.02	Strategic Planning Cmt Appt Cover 091016.pdf
06b.02.03	DSPC Roster 100111.pdf

ID	Document
06b.03.01	Purposes of Dist Strat Planning 091029a.pdf
06b.03.02	Excellent Strategic Planning Processes 0910.pdf
06b.03.03	Goals-Obj Distinctions.pdf
06b.03.04	Map of Exc Planning Procs to SBCCD Exps 091116.pdf
06b.03.05	Meeting Schedule 091113.pdf
06b.03.06	Planning Logistics 091029a.pdf
06b.03.07	Ground rules 091115.pdf
06b.04.01	DSPC Member Responsibilities.pdf
06b.04.02	Steps timeline 091207.pdf
06b.05.01	SBVC Sis and Goals 091027.pdf
06b.05.02	CHC EMP to Goals 091027.pdf
06b.05.03	Imperatives and Goals 09-10.pdf
06b.05.04	Foundational Statements.pdf
06b.05.05	CCC Sys Strat Plan executive_summary 091113.pdf
06b.05.06	ACCJC Rubric Planning Only October 2007.pdf
06b.05.07	SBCCD_IE_Industry&OccupationalAnalysis_1209.pdf
06b.05.08	Enrollment Mgmt Practices at SBVC and CHC.pdf
06b.05.09	CHC & SBVC Impact & Perf 2000-08.pdf
06b.06.01	5B Subcomm Rept Budget 100113.pdf
06b.06.02	6H Subcomm Rept Pedagogy & Outcomes 100127.pdf
06b.06.03	6I Subcomm Rept Degree-Cert and Wages 100125.pdf
06b.06.04	6J Subcomm Rept Competition for Students 100127.pdf
06b.06.05	6K Subcomm Rept Private Funding 100127.pdf
06b.06.06	7A Subcomm Rept Technology.pdf
06b.07.01	6B Working Set SDs & Goals 100115.pdf
06b.07.02	7C Working Set SDs & Goals 100129.pdf
06b.07.03	8B Working Set SDs & Goals 100220.pdf
06b.07.04	9A Working Set SDs Goals & Objs100226.pdf
06b.07.05	10C Working Set SDs Goals & Objs100322.pdf
06b.07.06	11B Working Set SDs Goals & Objs100331.pdf
06b.07.07	12A Working Set SDs Goals & Objs100418.pdf
06b.07.08	Cover email on DSP Feedback Req 100301.pdf
06b.07.09	9B Feedback Req Working Set SDs&Goals 100301.pdf
06b.07.10	10I CHC Ac Senate Discussion on District Strategic Plan ed.pdf
06b.08.01	10G Feedback Received on DSP 100323.pdf
06b.08.02	Strategic Planning Committee 3-26-10 final.pdf
06b.09.01	10F Draft Objectives with Worksheet 100312.pdf
06b.09.02	11C Draft Objectives 100404.pdf
06b.09.03	12B Draft Objectives 100418.pdf
06b.09.04	13B Draft Objectives 100423.pdf
06b.10.01	13A DSP Draft 100425.doc
06b.10.02	Cover email on DSP Feedback Req 100426.pdf
06b.10.03	Dist Assembly Agenda 100504.pdf
06b.10.04	Agenda Mar 3 10.doc
06b.10.05	April 28 10 minutes(2).doc
06b.11.01	13D Feedback Report thru 100505.pdf
06b.12.01	Strategic Planning Committee 5-7-10 final.pdf

ID	Document
06b.13.01	DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc
06b.13.02	Chancellor's Chat 100525.pdf
06b.13.03	Board Minutes 100708.pdf
06b.14.01	Chancellor's Chat 100208.pdf
06b.14.02	Chancellor's Chat 100615.pdf
06b.15.01	DETS Catalog of Ser 4-20-10.pdf
06b.16.01	DSPC Profl Dev PP Invit email.pdf
06b.16.02	DSPC VPI PP Invit email.pdf
06b.16.03	2010-08-27 Minutes.doc
06b.16.04	***DPR-DSP Allocation 2010-11.pdf
06b.17.01	ChancellorPresentation2.ppt
06b.18.01	Chancellor to presidents on DSP-Coll Comm 100804.pdf
06b.20.01	3A Task Schedule 2010-11 100910.doc

Recommendation 6c

ID	Document
06c.01.01	District_IT_Plan_9-07.pdf
06c.02.01	PlanNet Assessment Powerpoint version.pdf
06c.02.02	Technology Committee Minutes 04-01-09 (2).doc
06c.02.03	Technology Committee Minutes 09-02-09 (2).doc
06c.03.01	DETS Catalog of Ser 4-20-10.pdf
06c.04.01	110909 DETS Committee Purposes V2.pdf
06c.04.02	Technology Committee Minutes 11-18-09 (2).doc
06c.05.01	Survey_Dets Exec Comm.pdf
06c.05.02	DETS Ex Comm Survey Report.doc
06c.06.01	District-wide Services Survey 100903.docx
06c.07.01	Board Minutes 100708.pdf
06c.07.02	Chancellor's Chat 100913.pdf
06c.09.01	District_Information_Technology_Strategic_Plan_-_Final_Version_06.01.10.docx
06c.12.01	Infrastructure Upgrade.xls
06c.13.01	DCS working budget 2009-10.xls

Recommendation 6d

ID	Document
06d.01.01	HR Plan Outline 091125.doc
06d.02.01	Resource Allocation Committee Membership 100701.doc
06d.02.02	HR Program Review – Draft as of AUG2009.doc
06d.02.03	Human Resources Plan – Outline 01-26-2010.doc
06d.02.04	Human Resources Allocation PLAN 03-03-2010.doc
06d.02.05	2nd DRAFT Human Resources Allocation PLAN 03-12-2010.doc
06d.02.06	April 7 Min2.doc
06d.03.01	DRAFT Staffing PLAN rev ML 100513.doc
06d.03.02	Projections pages 100517.doc
06d.04.01	Resource Allocation Committee Notes 5 17 10.pdf
06d.05.02	Chancellor's Chat 100913.pdf

ID   Document
06d.06.01   Final Staffing PLAN 100902.doc
06d.07.02   DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc
06d.07.03   https://www.sbccd.org/ProgramReview/Home.aspx/Listing

Commission Recommendation 1

ID   Document
CR1.01.01   Final Prior Budget Model.pdf
CR1.02.01   agenda 10-20-09.doc
CR1.02.02   agenda 11-2-09.doc
CR1.02.03   agenda 11-30-09.doc
CR1.02.04   agenda 1-11-10.pdf
CR1.02.05   agenda 1-25-10.pdf
CR1.02.06   agenda 2-22-10.pdf
CR1.02.07   Resource Allocation Committee Notes 10 20 2009.pdf
CR1.02.08   Resource Allocation Committee Notes 11 2 2009.pdf
CR1.02.09   Resource Allocation Committee Notes 11 30 09.pdf
CR1.02.10   Resource Allocation Committee Notes 5 17 10.pdf
CR1.02.11   08 20091028 Oct 28 2009.pdf
CR1.02.12   Jan 27 10 minutes (2).doc
CR1.03.01   Chancellor's Chat 100217.pdf
CR1.04.01   Budget Model SBCCD Draft 2 22 2010.xls
CR1.05.01   Budget Model SBCCD Draft 3 22 2010 rev.xls
CR1.06.01   RAM Feedback request cover 100406.pdf
CR1.06.03   President's Report07Apr10.doc
CR1.06.04   April 7 Min2.doc
CR1.07.03   Budget Model SBCCD Final 5 23 10.pdf
CR1.07.04   Budget Model SBCCD Final Guiding Princs 5 23 10.pdf
CR1.07.06   Chancellor's Chat 100615.pdf
CR1.08.01   2010-2011 Tentative Budget.ppt
CR1.08.02   DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc