District Services Planning and Program Review Committee
August 31, 2021, at 10:30 a.m.
Via Zoom: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/96157400569

I. Call to Order

II. Welcome from Chancellor Rodriguez

III. Approval of Minutes
- A. 2021-05-11 Minutes

IV. Recap of 2020-2021 DSPPRC
- A. Update on AppArmor implementation (Chief Jackson, Jeremy Sims, Michael Nguyen or Paul Walker)

V. Resource Request
- A. New Rubric (just an introduction)
- B. Timeline

VI. Review Planning Documents
- A. 2-year Review (TESS)
- B. 4-Year Review (HR and Police Services)

VII. Next Meeting - Committee Organizational Meeting
- A. Committee Organization - Non-Brown Act
  1. Review Membership and Voting Seats
  2. Quorum Requirements
  3. Set Agenda for the Year
  4. Review Charge
  5. Discuss need for a purpose statement
  6. Review Resource Request Application process
  7. Review Resource Request Rubric

VIII. Other Items

IX. Next Meeting
- A. Tentative: Thursday, September 14, 2021 at 10:30 a.m.
  Via Zoom: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/96157400569

X. Adjournment

District Services Planning and Program Review Committee

Via Zoom: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/92440053928

Meeting Minutes – May 11, 2021

Members Present:
Christopher Crew (Chair)
Deanna Krebhiel
Jeremy Sims
Farrah Farzaneh
Erika Menge – proxy for Farrah Farzaneh
Marcela Navarro
Al Jackson
Jason Brady
Tony Papa
Corrina Baber
Michele Jeannotte
Katherine Fonseca
Artour Aslanian
John Feist
Noemi Elizaldi
Heather Ford (recorder)

Guests Present:
Hassan Mirza

I. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

C. Crew called the meeting to order at 10:31 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MARCH 9, 2021 MINUTES

T. Papa moved to approve the minutes of the District Services Planning and Program Review committee meeting held on April 13, 2021. A. Jackson seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by the following vote.

Ayes: Unanimous

Noes: None

Abstentions: None

III. CHANCELLOR'S CABINET

Update on AppArmor Request – C. Crew reported Chancellor's Cabinet approved. TESS is charged with the implementation.

IV. TRANSITIONING THE DIEC TO THE NEW IEAC

C. Crew reviewed the transition to Chancellor's Council. There was discussion regarding the newly required quorum as the overall Council membership does not have the requirement. A minimum membership to conduct business and a best practices statement. The Black/Latino Faculty & Staff Associations are recognized as cross-district constituency groups.

V.   **RESOURCE REQUEST RANKING RUBRIC**

C. Crew reported he has been reviewing other district's to have a complete rubric.
External Mandates
Include: What is the regulation or requirement by the licensing board(s) that makes this a mandate? Ex: risk assessment, legal opinion, or what other colleges have done to address the situation.

What is a resource request and what is not? Is it a mandate that effects a resource request or not? If it goes through the budget committee it is not a resource request.

Category 1: Program Review
Overview of Program Review goals and objectives. This category will improve the entire program review process.

Category 2: Outcomes Assessment
Linked to 4/2-year review.

Category 3: Institutional Alignment
Direct link institutional Goals/ed Master Plans and/or EMP support plans.

C. Crew will work with J. Brady, F. Farzaneh, and J. Feist to complete rubric. What differentiate the different levels?

The Process: Departments will get the normal resource request and the rubric. The manager or designee will present to the subcommittee. Then the subcommittee will vote and make recommendation to IEAC.

VI.   **REVIEW COMMITTEE SELF EVALUATION**

C. Crew reported he is working on sending out surveys at different times to collect better data and a better sampling. There was conversation regarding prioritization of resource request independent of the current department's representative on the committee and their respective "pitch" for that resource. There were questions as to what the concern is.

VII.   **OTHER/FUTURE TOPICS**

Beginning in June 2021:
2 year review - TESS
4 year review – Chancellor's Office

VIII.   **NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING**

The next meeting TBD
via Zoom https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/92440053928

IX.   **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

RUBRIC FOR PRIORITIZING PROGRAM REVIEW RESOURCE REQUEST

SBCCD PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

SPRING 2021

All requests will be scored using the rubric that follows on page 3. Use the guidance in the bullets below to strengthen your justification. This will help the scoring committee understand your request and increases the chances that your request will receive a higher score.

Please note, the rubric is **not a ranking** of which request has the most merit, rather, it is a tool the committee will use to measure **how well** the resource request has been **justified**. Keep in mind, District resource requests will go through the collegial consultation process and ultimately, Chancellor's Cabinet will make the determination on what gets funded. As such, the committee will use the rubric, and the supporting evidence, to help refine all resource requests with the goal of maximizing the possibility that the DSO needs will be clearly understood and sufficiently considered for approval.

Category 1: Program Review

Requests with strong justification will:

- Show a clear connection to Program Review planning goals and objectives

Category 2: Outcomes Assessment

Requests with strong justification will:

- Provide clear connection to results of specific goals and objectives and Service Area Outcome assessments listed in the 4-year and/or 2-year review
- Include consideration of how the request will improve outcome assessment

Category 3: Institutional Alignment

Requests with strong justification will:

- Show a direct link/support for the District Mission, Values or Goals or one or more Institutional Goals (outlined in the Education Master Plan) and/or goals outlined in an EMP support plan (e.g., Tech Plan; Equity Plan, DSO plan etc.) – need to make a note somewhere that points out that the plan referenced may be old. Ask for plan year?
- Include consideration of the anticipated effect/outcome of the resource

Additional points may be awarded based on the requested resource's potential for broad, institutional impact (i.e., how will funding this request affect other programs or departments?)

HIGH PRIORITY REQUEST (E.G., EXTERNAL MANDATE RISK ASSESSMENT)

If the requested resource supports a federal, state or local mandate, addresses health and safety, and/or is required to support programmatic accreditation or licensure already in place, that request will be pulled from the list and considered first.

Please note, simply having a resource request that is "mandated" is not a necessary and sufficient condition for placing the request at the top of the District priority list. All "mandate-related" requests will be critically evaluated by the committee to verify the provided justification of the *self-assessed priority* and *level of risk*. Requests justified as high-risk mandates will be placed at the top of the district priority list and all other mandated requests will be considered with the larger pool of requests.

Also note, it is the responsibility of the department/requestor to provide evidence and justification for their *self-assessed priority* and *level of risk*. The committee will only review evidence provided with the submission but may ask for additional evidence or explanation if something is unclear.

IS THE REQUEST LINKED TO A MANDATE?

_____ No – Complete the Resource Request Form

_____ Yes – Complete the "Explanation of Mandate" form provided below **in addition** to the Resource Request Form

---

EXPLANATION OF MANDATE

Please answer the questions below concerning the nature of the mandate, as it relates to your resource request. Please be specific in your responses and, to the extent possible, please use lay terminology that will be easily understood by the committee.

Is this a federal, state or local mandate (e.g., state licensure, sustainability, health and safety)?:	
Is this mandate given by a non-governmental governing body (e.g., accreditation, certification, contracts, etc.)?:	
When did/does the mandate take effect?:	
Please provide a reference for the mandate (e.g., an electronic document, a bill identifier [e.g., AB540], a link to a website):	
In your assessment, is this mandate a low, medium or high priority?:	
Please describe the nature of the mandate and why it is considered to have the above priority (be specific and use lay terminology)?:	
How does the resource request comply with the mandate and mitigate the associated risk?	
Is there a consequence/penalty for failure to adhere to the mandate (Yes/No)?:	
Please describe the consequence/penalty (e.g., monetary or impact on accreditation):	

Note: The levels of risk are primarily distinguished by time and penalty.

High: (1) Takes effect in 2 or fewer years or requires an implementation time greater than 2 years (2) Has a monetary penalty or has an impact on operations.

Medium: (1) Takes effect in 2 or more years (2) Has a monetary penalty or has an impact on operations.

Low: (1) No penalty but failure to implement reflects poorly on the district.

Questions for the committee:

1. *How do we determine when to ask for a resubmission (e.g., when one response is weak?)*
2. *Do we want to meet with each requestor or just those ranked as #1 and those with a score below a certain cut off?*

	CRITERIA	NONE (0)	WEAK (1)	MODERATE (2)	STRONG (3)	SCORE
PROGRAM REVIEW	Mandated Activities	Yes / No High / Medium / Low	Describes the mandate but **no link to PR Goals and Objectives** or explanation of **risk mitigation**	Describes the mandate, **links to PR Goals and Objectives**, **clear** explanation of **risk mitigation**	Describes the mandate, **clear and strong** links to PR Goals and Objectives, **clear and strong explanation** of **risk mitigation**	
	Relevance to 4-year plan	Does not address	Request includes some information, but some areas are incomplete and/or **connection** to Program Review 4-year plan is not immediately clear	Request is clear, complete, and demonstrates a clear, but weak, **connection** to Program Review 4-year Plan	Request is clear and complete, shows a clear and strong **connection** to Program Review 4-year Plan	
	Innovation: Sustainability, H&S, HR recruitment, Kiosk, Skills assessment	Does not address If not addressed it needs to be resubmitted.	Requested resource has **weak** ties to emerging technologies, techniques, processes, and applications that prove adoption of best practices	Requested resource **has clear but weak** ties to emerging technologies, techniques, processes, and applications that prove adoption of best practices	Requested resource has **clear and strong** ties to emerging technologies, techniques, processes, and applications that prove adoption of best practices	
OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT	Impact on Students	Does not address	Request addresses enrichment of students' academic experience and/or success **but not supported by SAO's** or **goals or objectives** in 2/4-year review.	**Uses SA outcomes data** to address enrichment for students' academic experience and/or success with **clear links** to goals or objectives in 2/4-year review.	**Uses SAO data** to address enrichment of students' academic experience and/or success with **clear links** to goals or objectives in 2/4-year review & considers how the request will **improve SAO's.**	
	Service Levels	Does not address	Request **acknowledges results** of SAO assessments generally, but **does not include specific details**	Request includes **clear link** to results of **specific Service Area Outcomes** assessments	Request includes (1) **clear link** to results of specific **SAO assessments** 2) considers how the request will **SAO's**	
	Effective Infrastructure	Does not address	Request **acknowledges results** of SAO assessments generally, but **does not include specific details**	Request includes **clear link** to results of specific **Service Area Outcomes** assessments	Request includes (1) **clear link** to results of specific **SAO assessments** 2) considers how the request will **SAO's**	
INSTITUTIONAL ALIGNMENT	Impact on Quality and Comprehensiveness of Program	Does not address	Request rationale **includes some information**, but connection to program health/vitality is incomplete and unclear	Request rationale is **clear**, **complete**, and **shows some connection** to program health/vitality	Request rationale is clear, complete, includes consideration of sustainability, and/or demonstrates how the impact of the resource on the program will be evaluated for ongoing effectiveness	
	The Vision, Mission, and Goals (VMG) of the District or College Ed Master Plan (EMP)	Does not address	Request **refers to** the VMG of the District **or** the institutional goals outlined in the College EMP **but fails** to demonstrate a **clear link** to or **support** for either.	Request demonstrates a **clear link** to and **support** for the VMG of the District **or** institutional goals outlined in the College EMP	Request 1) has **clear link** to & **support** for the district VMG **or** specific institutional goals outlined in the college EMP, and 2) includes consideration of **how the impact of the resource will be evaluated**	
	The district strategic plan or college resource request	Does not address	Request shows **general connection** to one or more initiative or plan	Request demonstrates a **clear link** to a specific initiative, operational plan, or EMP support plan	Request shows direct link and support for a specific operational plan or initiative, and includes consideration of how the impact of the resource will be evaluated	
					TOTAL SCORE:	