



San Bernardino Community College District
DSO Planning and Program Review Subcommittee
December 13, 2022
10:30 am-12:30 pm Pacific Time

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - A. 2022-11-05 DSOPPRS Meeting Minutes
- III. CONVERSATION WITH VICE CHANCELLOR ORNELAS REGARDING DSO FUNDING PRIORITIES AND BEST PRACTICES FOR REQUESTS**
- IV. RESOURCE REQUEST REBRIC**
 - A. New District Resource Request Ranking Rubric (010)
 - B. DSOPPR Resource Request Application
- V. REVIEW COLLEGE NEEDS ASSESSMENT**
- VI. PREPARATION FOR UPCOMING RESOURCE REQUEST CYCLE**
- VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
- VIII. NEXT MEETING**

January 10, 2023, at 10:30 a.m.
Via Zoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/96157400569>
- IX. ADJOURNMENT**



DSO Planning & Program Review Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes – November 15, 2022, 10:30 a.m.
Via Zoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/96157400569>

	Present	Absent		Present	Absent
Christopher Crew (DSO)	X		Michele Jeannotte (HR & PD)	X	
Jason Brady (ESSS)	X		Al Jackson (HR & PD)	X	
Heather Ford (DSO)	X		Larry Strong (FAM)	X	
Aysia Brown (HR & PD)		X	Marcela Navarro (HR & PD)	X	
Roger Robles (ESSS)		X	Erika Menge (FAM) proxy Hassan Mirza	X	
Steve Sutorus (FAM)		X	Deanna Krehbiel (ESSS)	X	
Ben Holland (FAM)		X	Laura Van Gendersen (ESSS)	X	

Guests: n/a

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM 10-18-2022

J. Brady motioned to approved 10-18-22 minutes. A. Jackson seconded the motion.

AYES: Crew, Brady, Ford, Strong, Jackson, Jeannotte, Navarro, Van Gendersen

NOES: None

ABSENT: Brown, Robles, Sutorus, Holland

ABSTENTIONS: Krehbiel

III. IMPORTANT UPDATES

Update 1: Vice Chancellors are reviewing the “integration” document we prepared at the October meeting.

Update 2: ACCJC is currently working on new standards. This will influence the way we conduct our program review.

Update 3: The Educational Master Plans are in draft form. This will determine what information we need to include in our needs assessments and resource requests.

Update 4: The IEAC will develop new Institution-Set Standards that serve as our guiding principles and delineate the responsibilities for each college and the DSO.

Update 5: The 4-Year Self Evaluation will be distributed next week. We will use the strategic plans included in the 2017-2022 Strategic Plan.

IV. REVIEW OF NEW ACCREDITATION STANDARDS, PROGRAM REVIEW, RESOURCE REQUEST

C. Crewed reviewed the components of program review and how accreditation guides program review.

Standard 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

- Clearly defined mission
- Outlines the institution’s explicit commitment to equitable student achievement
- Serves as guiding principle for institutional planning, action, evaluation, and improvement.

Standard 2: Student Success

- Delivers high-quality academic and learning support programs that are designed to engage and support students through their unique educational journeys.
- Promote equity in student success.
- Evaluate student learning and achievement data to inform improvements and advance equitable outcomes.

SBCCD Evidence of Adherence to Standards

Standard 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

1. The institution's mission directs resource allocation, innovation, and continuous quality improvement through ongoing systematic planning and evaluation of programs and services.
2. The institution holds itself accountable for achieving its mission and goals, and for closing opportunity gaps. It regularly reviews relevant, meaningfully disaggregated qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate its progress and inform planning, improvement, and innovation.

Standard 2: Student Success

1. The institution systematically conducts program review and learning outcomes assessment that advances the institutional mission and improves equitable student achievement.

Standard 3: Governance and Decision-Making

- Clear and effective governance practices
- Meaningful participation and inclusion of relevant stakeholders.

Standard 4: Infrastructure and Resources

- Supports its educational services and operational functions
- Organizes its staffing and allocates its physical, technological, and financial resources
- Actively monitors and assesses resource capacity to inform improvements to infrastructure and ensure long-term health and stability.

SBCCD Evidence of Adherence to Standards

Standard 3: Governance and Decision-Making

1. Policies, procedures, or processes that guide the institution's determination of staffing needs.
2. Periodically reviews its decision-making structure and processes to ensure that they are being used consistently and effectively to advance the mission, ensure appropriate participation from institutional stakeholders, and promote equitable student success.

Standard 4: Infrastructure and Resources

1. The institution has methods to determine the kinds of support its personnel need to be successful in their roles.
 - Funds are allocated in a manner to help achieve the institution's stated goals for student learning.
 - Documentation of how the budget development process ties resource allocation to the mission, institutional goals, and/or program review and planning.
 - Examples of how budget proposals, resource allocation decisions, and/or financial decisions are reported to institutional stakeholders.
2. Finance department program review, including evaluation of effectiveness of internal controls.

The latest version of the draft accreditation standards:

<https://accjc.org/announcement/accjc-standards-review-updated-draft-standards/>

V. RESOURCE REQUEST PROCESS

Step 1: Resource Request Application and Resource Request Division Rankings forms are sent to district department managers.

Step 2: Any departments in need of help are invited to a committee meeting.

Step 3: Resource Request Application and Resource Request Division Rankings are submitted to DSO Program Review Chair.

Step 4: Initial discussion, invite requestors to meeting to explain their needs.

Step 5: Committee gives initial feedback and requestors make edits.

Step 6: Committee ranks the requests and send to Cabinet.

Resource Request Timeline:

- **January:**
 - Resource Request Application and Resource Request Division Rankings forms are sent to district program managers.
- **February:**
 - Resource Request Question & Answer.
 - Any areas still working on requests are invited to attend.
 - Resource Request Application and Resource Request Division Rankings due to District Program Review Committee Chairs.
 - Initial discussion, invite requestors to meeting to explain their needs.
- **March:**
 - Rank requests and present to Chancellors Cabinet
- **April:**
 - Take rankings to Institutional Effectiveness Advisory Committee (IEAC), Academic Senate, and Chancellor Council as information items

VI. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESSES

Self Evaluation:

- 4-year self-evaluation and rubric
- 2-year update and rubric

Resource Requests

- New rubric

H. Ford will email the rubric later today to the subcommittee to review before implementation next term.

VII. ANNUAL GOALS

Review all departments available documentation (Spring 2023)

- TESS
- Business and Fiscal (FAM)

Finalize the new resource request rubric and process

- Ensure that every request is properly justified
- Ensure that the link to the college needs is a central component.

VIII. NEXT MEETING

- A. VC Ornelas visit – C. Crew to ask VC Ornelas to inquire with the other VCs regarding their department's feedback of their resource requests.
- B. Continue working on resource request rubric
- C. Review college needs assessment
- D. Prepare for upcoming resource request cycle

Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 13, 2022, at 10:30 a.m. Via Zoom:
<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/96157400569>

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

Final meeting minutes approved by DSPPRS _____, 2022

Heather Ford, Executive Assistant
SBCCD, Office of the Chancellor
Committee Support

NOT YET APPROVED



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
(opportunity to identify missing outcomes)

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
 - Direct impact on the college. – Ask Nohemy to speak to this.
-

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 given special consideration.**

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)?:	
Is current funding designated for the mandate? If yes, why is additional funding needed?:	
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 explanation of risk mitigation	Describes the mandate, clear explanation of risk mitigation	Describes the mandate, clear and quantified explanation of risk mitigation	
	Relevance to 4-year plan	Does not address	Request is incomplete and/or does not demonstrate a clear connection to Program Review 4-year plan.	Request is complete but does not demonstrate a clear connection to Program Review 4-year Plan.	Request is complete and demonstrates a clear connection to Program Review 4-year Plan.	
	Innovation: Sustainability, H&S, HR recruitment, Kiosk, Skills assessment CC	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 HF, JB, JF	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 (customers) HF, JB, JF	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/Processes (organizational infrastructure) HF, JB, JF	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 is incomplete and/or does not demonstrate a clear connection to program quality and comprehensiveness	Request rationale is, complete , but does not demonstrate a clear connection to program quality and comprehensiveness	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 quality and comprehensiveness	
	The Vision, Mission, and Goals (VMG) of the District or College Ed Master Plan (EMP) CC	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 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 CC	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:

** results either weak or none will be sent back to department for more information/justification

4. Indicate how this request will improve student learning.

5. Indicate any additional information you want the committee to consider (*for example, regulatory information, compliance, updated efficiency, student success data, planning, etc.*).

6. Indicate any related costs (including any ongoing maintenance or updates) and program/area's plans to support those costs.

7. Given that district resource requests are assessed to the colleges, what is the benefit of this request to the colleges?

8. What are the consequences of not funding this request?

District and Campus Master Planning

	District Wide Strategic Support Services Plan: Recommendations
DR.1	Complete and regularly update the three-year staffing plan and develop a process to increase the number of full-time faculty and increase the ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty in the District.
DR.2	To stabilize staffing levels, the District Human Resources department must address upcoming retirements and hiring procedures that include strategies for interviewing candidates from across the country. Additionally, consider completing a market study to understand the levels of salary, compensation, and benefits that will attract highly qualified candidates.
DR.3	Complete and regularly update the District Enrollment Management Plan. Support the Colleges' community outreach and marketing efforts in order to increase campus visibility, highlight instructional opportunities, and increase FTES
DR.4	Support each Colleges' effort for addressing basic skills needs.
DR.5	Support the Colleges' effort to work with K-12 entities, the EDCT, adult schools, and the Inland Adult Education Consortium to become a leader in providing education to adults in the region.
DR.6	Support Distance Education at each campus with the software, hardware, training, and support mechanisms as identified through local processes by the Colleges.
DR.7	Continue to sustain funding for technology in order to support the needs of students, faculty, and staff.
DR.8	Establish a full-time and robust facilities department within the District to secure state funding through the Capital Outlay Process, manage construction projects, oversee and integrate maintenance and operations, implement design standards, coordinate sustainability efforts, and implement a Total Cost of Ownership model for facilities.
DR.9	Continue to sustain funding for site security and safety and proactively design outdoor and building spaces using best practices for creating secure environments.
DR.10	Establish and maintain a cyclical process through which college planning informs the development and revision of District plans, including the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, College Strategic Plan, and Technology Plan.
EDCT.1	Each college should explore the EDCT as a resource to support grant development, contract education offerings, non-credit and not-for-credit courses and short-term vocational training opportunities.
KVCR.1	Reevaluate the role and function of the radio and television station to operate as a fiscal asset that is an economically viable and self-sufficient entity. Develop a process for resource distribution between the District, EDCT, KVCR, and the Colleges.
	Crafton Hills College Major Strategies
CS.1	Promote Student Success
CS.2	Build Campus Community
CS.3	Develop Teaching + Learning Practices

CS.3	Expand Access
CS.4	Enhance Value to the Surrounding Community
CS.5	Promote Effective Decision Making
CS.6	Develop Programs + Services
CS.8	Support Employee Growth
CS.9	Optimize Resources
	San Bernardino Valley College Strategic Directions + Goals
SBS.1	Increase Access
SBS.2	Promote Student Success
SBS.3	Improve Communication, Culture + Climate
SBS.4	Maintain Leadership + Promote Professional Development
SBS.5	Effective Evaluation + Accountability
SBS.6	Provide Exceptional Facilities

2022-23 Resource Request Timeline

December 9 – Resource Request Application and Resource Request Division Rankings forms are sent to district program managers.

January 10 – There is a DSO Program Review Committee meeting scheduled that is intended to be a Resource Request Q&A. Any areas still working on requests are welcome to attend.

January 17 – Resource Request Application and Resource Request Division Rankings due to District Program Review Committee Chair (me).

February 14 – Committee will discuss the submitted resource requests. All applicants should attend to help answer any clarifying questions that the committee might have about the request.

February 21 – Committee ranks the requests.

February 23 – Rankings taken to IEAC as information item

March 1 – Rankings taken to Academic Senate as an information item

March 7 – Rankings taken to Chancellors Council as an information item

March 14 – Rankings taken to Chancellors Cabinet for conversation