District Services Planning and Program Review Committee
February 9, 2020 at 10:30 a.m.
Via Zoom: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/92440053928

Agenda Items	Discussion
1. Call to Order	Christopher Crew
2. Review of Minutes	Review and approval of meeting minutes dated 1/12/2020 **(pg 2 – 4)**
3. Chancellors Cabinet	Update on AppArmor Request **(pg 5 – 7)**
4. Review of Resource Request	Proposal for new process **(pg 8)**
5. Other/Future Agenda Items	Continued: Modifying Resource Request Process
6. Next Meeting	March 9th at 10:30 a.m.
7. Adjourn	

*Completed division resource request information can be found at:
http://www.sbccd.edu/research/Program_Review/Resource_Requests

District Services Planning and Program Review Committee
_____

Via Zoom: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/92440053928
Meeting Minutes – January 12, 2021

Members Present:

> Christopher Crew (Chair)
> Virginia Diggle
> Deanna Krebhiel
> Jeremy Sims
> Erika Menge – proxy for Farrah Farzaneh
> Farrah Farzaneh
> Rosemarie Hansen – proxy for Cassandra Thomas
> Marcela Navarro
> John Feist
> Michele Jeannotte
> Al Jackson
> Jason Brady
> Jessica Greenwell

I. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

C. Crew called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 10, 2020 MINUTES

D. Krehbiel moved to approve the minutes of the District Services Planning and Program Review committee meeting held on November 10, 2020, M. Navarro seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by the following vote.

Ayes: Unanimous

Noes: None

Abstentions: None

III. REVIEW OF RESOURCE REQUEST

Process and District Divisions List – C. Crew reviewed the committee structure and confirmed all members on the committee roster are voting members.

IV. CHANCELLOR'S CABINET

Response to Resource Request – C. Crew reviewed the discussion Chancellor's Cabinet had regarding resource requests. Cabinet thanked the committee. Given the current budget situation, there are not available funds to support the resources requests (AppArmor is under consideration pending further information).

Resource Request (1A): Instructional Technology Specialist
Decision: No

Rationale: Colleges recognize that there are gaps in DE capabilities and support. However, they need more time to assess the nature of the gaps and find out what is really needed. They are not sure that an ITS is what's really needed at this time.

Resource Request (1B): Business administrator
Decision: No
Rationale: There are several positions that are on hold at the district (as a whole) and conversation needs to be had about which to fill and when. Right now, although they see the importance, Cabinet feels that this is not the right time to fill this position.
Questions/issues to consider for next year:
1. HR and Business Services need to work out the specifics.
2. The true cost of the proposed position needs to be investigated.
3. The proposal includes removing/vacating a CSEA position and this would need to be negotiated.

Resource Request (1C): AppArmor
Decision: Under consideration, pending further research.
Rationale: Cabinet was impressed by the description of what the app can do but commented that we currently have software and processes in place that can achieve at least some of the things this app can offer. The district wants to move away from software proliferation and focus on identifying the issue(s) before moving to a software solution.
Questions/issues Cabinet wants addressed:
1. What is the issue that the app would solve beyond fulfilling BP requirement?
2. Would we discontinue the use of the current software (Regroup)?
3. What does AppArmor offer that Regroup does not?
4. Are there capabilities we would lose by discontinuing Regroup?
5. Would there be any cost savings from discontinuing Regroup and moving to AppArmor?

V. **OTHER/FUTURE TOPICS**

Modify Resource Request Process – There was conversation regarding the need to improve the resource request process. C. Crew presented a few ideas (see list below) that he feels would (1) help the committee refine the resource request prior to sending them to Cabinet and (2) make sure that the request incorporate the criteria outlined by the DSPPR committee process. V. Diggle commented that having the committee rank the requests individually seems to be "busy work" and this committee should trust the division rankings that were submitted. A. Jackson suggested to incorporate direct questions that relate to the criteria. J. Brady confirmed that direct questions that relate to the criteria are included in the program review web tool but they have not been used in the past few years. C. Crew acknowledged that ranking the request may not be the right way to go but reiterates his belief that the process needs to be improved and is asking the committee consider his suggestions at the next meeting. C. Crew will bring formalized suggestions to a vote at the next meeting and asked the committee to offer their suggestions as well.

1. Committee ranks requests individually

2. Have meeting to get input from district #1
3. Have follow up meeting to help improve the request by focusing on rationale and linking it to criteria
4. Invite top-3 to Cabinet

Program Review Timeline – C. Crew reported all summer 2020 review has been moved to summer 2021, and summer 2021 moved to summer 2022.

VI. **<u>NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING</u>**

The next meeting is scheduled for February 9, 2021 at 10:30 a.m. via Zoom
https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/92440053928

VIII. **<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Heather Ford, Recorder, Office of the Chancellor

CABINET DISCUSSION REGARDING RESOURCE REQUEST

Resource Request (1C): AppArmor

Decision: Under consideration, pending further research.

Rationale: Cabinet was impressed by the description of what the app can do but commented that we currently have software and processes in place that can achieve at least some of the things this app can offer. The district wants to move away from software proliferation and focus on identifying the issue(s) before moving to a software solution.

Questions/issues Cabinet wants addressed:

1. What is the issue that the app would solve beyond fulfilling BP requirement?
2. Would we discontinue the use of the current software (Regroup)?
3. What does AppArmor offer that Regroup does not?
4. Are there capabilities we would lose by discontinuing Regroup?
5. Would there be any cost savings from discontinuing Regroup and moving to AppArmor?

STEPS TAKEN TO RESPOND TO CABINET:

1. Wrote a reply to all of their questions and concerns
2. Police, M&O, Police, TESS, Marketing met to discuss the issues, objectives, solutions
3. Looked for a vendor to help consolidate software that can provide a universal solution to being able to mass communicate with the entire district on short notice and enhance safety capabilities.
4. I the process of comparing proposals

RESPONSE TO CABINET:

it is a policy of the Board of Trustees for the SBCCD to protect members of the entire campus community and the property of the District. In accordance with this policy, the District maintains a Police Department (PD) 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, & 365 days per year.

The primary purpose for purchasing and deploying the AppArmor software is to increase the overall safety within the SBCCD and assist the SBCCD with carrying out the above policy. In addition, the AppArmor app would be used to vet students, faculty and staff using predetermined COVID-19 screening questions as they return to SBCCD.

The major benefit of AppArmor from a COVID-19/EH&S perspective is the COVID screening tool. The screening tool is embedded entirely within the app and requires no technical work or support on the part of the District. Although the CA Department of Public Health is not requiring school

districts and colleges to utilize an app for COVID screening, it does request (via the Guidance for Higher Education Institutions) that schools require any employees or students who may need to come on campus self-diagnose for COVID symptoms prior to setting foot on campus. Besides adherence to the guidelines from CDPH, utilizing AppArmor eliminates the need for District/TESS to develop a different screening tool that would otherwise be utilized on the District/campus website (e.g. form filled submission).

Questions/issues Cabinet wants addressed:

6. **What is the issue that the app would solve beyond fulfilling BP requirement?**

    a. [AP & BP 3505](#) (Emergency Response Procedures) was recently rewritten (June 2020) and approved by the SBCCD Board of Trustees. Specifically, these updated SBCCD policies clarify what actions and procedures should be followed in case of an emergency and/or major disaster within the SBCCD.

    b. With the implementation of the App, Clery Act information like the SBCCD Emergency Operations Plan, AP & BP 3505 - Emergency Response Procedures, Active Shooter protocols, Annual Security Report, Sexual Assault Resources, Mental Health Counseling, Peer Support information, Academic Counseling, Mobile Blue-Light feature, and campus evacuation maps will be electronic (within a resource library) and at the fingertips of students, faculty, and staff to enhance overall safety within SBCCD. Most importantly, students, faculty and staff will be able to easily call/summon Campus police, via CSU San Bernardino Dispatch Center, by tapping the icon "call District Police" or "Call 911." They will also be able to use the App to request a friend, contact, or family member to follow/accompany them on a virtual "friend walk" as they travel throughout the campus and/or back to their respective vehicle.

        i. **Note:** As in the past, Campus Police will continue to provide safety escorts if there is a known danger present. These requests would be routed, via the App, to CSU San Bernardino Dispatch Center, to Campus Police.

    c. If you see a safety issues on campus (e.g., down tree, broken toilet, poor lighting, etc.) a student, faculty or staff member would be able to forward an electronic request, via the App, to M&O at both campuses.

    d. The App could be connected to SBVC, CHC or the SBCCD's bulletin board and/or social media account to facilitate continuous marketing announcements or daily news feeds.

7. Would we discontinue the use of the current software (Regroup)?

    a. No, we would continue using Regroup. As discussed, Regroup is a mass notification system/software whereas AppArmor is a Public Safety App similar to LiveSafe with a COVID-19 screening component built into the App. Therefore, the District would be required to continue using Regroup or locate another vendor (i.e., Everbridge, etc.)

that could address or take the place of all three of these functions (e.g., mass notification, public safety App, and COVID-19 screening).

8. What does AppArmor offer that Regroup does not?

    a. Ability to consolidate all safety information in one location.

    b. User accessibility

    c. Regroup is a mass emergency and marketing notification system but no two-way communication

9. Are there capabilities we would lose by discontinuing Regroup?

    a. The ability to send mass notifications via SMS, voice call, RSS, social media and e-mail for emergency and marketing purposes to all staff and students.

    b. Ability to tap into electronic message boards

    c. Communicate with social media

10. Would there be any cost savings from discontinuing Regroup and moving to AppArmor?

    a. Yes but, AppArmor is a safety App and does not provide the emergency notification needed from Regroup.

    b. Contacts are loaded into Regroup daily based on student enrollment and staff/faculty hires. There is no App install needed for Regroup to function. AppArmor requires the users to download and install the application on their mobile device.

PROPOSAL FOR MODIFIED PROCESS FOR RESOURCE REQUEST REVIEW

CURRENT PROCESS:

1. Department completes resource request
2. Division ranks Resource Request Application
3. DSPPR prioritizes request through thorough group discussion and consensus

NEW PROCESS:

1. Identify the Goals and Objectives listed in the 4-year review
2. Remind the departments/divisions of their goals and objectives when they are sent the resource request application with instructions to use them as a guide
3. Also supply departments/divisions with the resource request rankings from the colleges
4. Department completes resource request
5. Division ranks Resource Request Application
6. Applications are sent to DSPPR and we review the request as a group **prior** to voting.
   a. We look at their goals and objectives to see how the request align
   b. We look at its relation to the colleges request
   c. We suggest changes to make the request better align with the criteria (e.g., Impact on students; Mandated activities related to facilities and safety; Accreditation requirements; Innovation)
   d. If there are follow-up questions we have a meeting with the division lead
7. Have one-on-one meetings with the division leads and cast our votes at the end of the meetings.