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

DISTRIBUTION DRAFT August 11, 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, help establish structures and processes to ensure continued progress, and carry out other urgently needed tasks.) Prior to submitting the Report to the Board of Trustees, the ALO will solicit input from faculty, managers, classified staff, and students by various means. The Crafton Council, which is the highest-level shared-governance body on campus, will review the draft and recommended changes. In addition, feedback regarding the accuracy and clarity of the Report will be 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 will also hold two well-advertised open forums in which she will solicit questions and comments about the draft Report. Total attendance at all presentations and forums was ***XX, including XX faculty members, XX managers, XX students, and XX classified staff. The draft will also be emailed to the entire campus community, which will be asked for feedback regarding its accuracy and clarity. As feedback is received, it will be incorporated in a final draft of the Report where appropriate.

The final Report will be approved by President Gloria Harrison and will be 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	

Candace Leonard	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.

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.

The EMPC, which operates on a consensus model, was charged with developing the integrated, long-range institutional plan called for in the Recommendation. In Spring 2010 it completed, and the President approved, an Educational Master Plan (EMP) that 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; it is long-range and comprehensive in that it attends to the big-picture, strategic needs of the institution and 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.

In weekly two-hour meetings from July 2009 to May 2010, the EMPC performed the following tasks:

- 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:
  - Enrollment Management Plan
  - Student Equity Plan
  - Facilities Master Plan
  - Technology Plan
  - Basic Skills Initiative Plan
  - Assessment Plan
  - Matriculation Plan
  - EOPS Plan
  - Title V Plan
  - Learning Communities Plan
  - DSPS Plan
  - Distributed Education Plan
  - Professional Development Plan

<div style="float:right; border:1px solid red; background:#fcc; padding:4px;">

Comment [MCL6]: Page: 8
Evidence: Crafton Council Minutes 090203.pdf; Crafton Council Minutes 090217.pdf; CHC Rec1_GnOs_Rev5-8.pdf; CHC Rec 1 Wkgrp Glossary_Rev3.pdf; CHC Rec 1 Wkgrp Key%20Performance%20Information.pdf; EMPC Roster 2009-10.doc

Comment [MCL7]: Page: 8
Evidence: EMP Final 100517.doc.

</div>

- 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 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.

The Committee received input and feedback from the Academic Senate, the other constituency groups, 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 President 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.

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 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.

Integrated Planning, Program Review, and Resource Allocation Process

Central to integrated planning at CHC is the planning, program review, and resource allocation process, 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 process, 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. 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, though the ORP provides 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.

The quality of the documents in every 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 contains the following criteria for "Meets Expectations":
- For each question:
  - Answers all parts of the question completely with relevant information.
  - 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.

A similar rubric is used for annual planning documents, and guidance for Committee members in applying both rubrics consistently is provided. The P&PRC provides written feedback on 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.

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. 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.

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.

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, with space for comments:

Comment [MCL13]: Page: 11
Evidence: Doc Eval Rubrics 090819.doc; Rubric application guidelines 091019.doc; Chemistry PPR Feedback.docx; SummaryProgramHealth (4).xls

Comment [MCL14]: Page: 11
Evidence: ProgramReviewQuestionsRev1.doc;

Comment [MCL15]: Page: 11
Evidence: Annual Planning Template Revised 2009.doc

- 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 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. 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 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 (along with copies of the final unit planning and program review documents) and to the Planning and Program Review Committee.
- 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 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

<div style="border:1px solid red;">
Comment [MCL16]: Page: 12
Evidence: ProgramHealth Rubric 090810.doc; Program Eff Noninstr Rubric 090818.doc; Chemistry PPR Feedback.docx; SummaryProgramHealth (4).xls; Summary of Program Health Memo.docx; Cover email 100426.doc
</div>

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.

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 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 in Spring 2010, and increased both tutoring and equipment in science, using Basic Skills Initiative funds. Assessment of the improvements is scheduled for Spring 2011.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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) 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.

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 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 deans 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.

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:
  - Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
  - Needs-Based Curriculum
  - Scheduling Matrix
  - Course Retention Rate
  - Course Success Rate
  - Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Ratio
  - WSCH/FTEF Ratio
  - Fill Rate
  - Alignment with CHC Mission, Vision, and Goals
  - Goals
  - Objectives
- 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.
- Substantial revision of the Handbook, including all the procedural enhancements noted above.

These changes, which were communicated to all faculty and staff at In-Service Day 2010, promise to make an already strong process even better.

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:

- 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 two years beyond the tentative 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.

> **Comment [MCL26]:** Page: 16
> Evidence: CHC Long Range Financial Plan 4-12-10.xls

The Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast is incorporated into the Educational Master Plan.

> **Comment [MCL27]:** Page: 16
> Evidence: DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc, pp. 51-53

Conclusion

The mission of Crafton Hills College is central to both the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and to 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 measurement of institutional effectiveness using both quantitative and qualitative data, the establishment of goals and measurable objectives to improve effectiveness, and the assessment of progress toward those goals and objectives 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, 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 systems and processes assure that all programs and services in instruction, student support, learning support, and administrative services examine

themselves carefully every year, and improve their effectiveness as required, in terms of the following characteristics, among others:

- Their appropriateness and relevance to 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 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 processes are made available to the entire College community. (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 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 have fulfilled the requirements of Recommendation 1.

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 will implement the revised planning and program review process beginning in Fall 2010, 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 ORP, initiated systematic corrections where necessary, and validated the accuracy of the data files.
- ORP, in concert with DETS, trained users on the importance of accurate data entry for funding, research, and reporting.
- ORP has begun a periodic series of brief *Did You Know?* reports to provide easy access to useful information on a variety of issues.
- ORP has redesigned its webpage to improve both access and clarity; it is scheduled to go live by September 1, 2010.
- ORP has established a research calendar to keep the campus apprised of research projects that occur on a cyclical basis.

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. The ORP will also update the quantitative evidence for progress on the QEIs annually.
- The ORP provided all the data on CHC student and employee characteristics in the EMP, and will update those data annually as well.
- 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.
- 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.
- The ORP redesigned the standard planning and program review performance reports for instructional programs to match the revised program health rubric (see *Recommendation*

Comment [MCL28]: Page: 18
Evidence: MIS_Email_20100601.htm; MIS_Everett_Email.htm; MIS_Dianna_Email.htm; Sample_FA09_DatatelRecords_Not_in_MIS_SIDRemoved.xlsx

Comment [MCL29]: Page: 18
Evidence: MIS_Presentation_Importance97.ppt; Effective MIS Data Entry Training_June2nd_4th_Presentation.ppsx; MIS_CHC_Diagram.docx

Comment [MCL30]: Page: 18
Evidence: DidYouKnow1_CCSSE_SP09.pdf; DidYouKnow2_CCSSE_SP09MR.pdf; DidYouKnow3_Transfers.docx

Comment [MCL31]: Page: 18
Evidence: ORP_Web_Pages Design.doc

Comment [MCL32]: Page: 18
Evidence: Research Calendar.xls

Comment [MCL33]: Page: 18
Evidence: EMP Final 100517.doc, pp. 40-50; Research Calendar.xls

Comment [MCL34]: Page: 18
Evidence: EMP Final 100517.doc, pp. 54-60; Research Calendar.xls

Comment [MCL35]: Page: 18
Evidence: EMP Final 100517.doc, pp. 20-37

Comment [MCL36]: Page: 18
Evidence: SummaryProgramHealth (4).xls; PPR_SP10_Survey_Results.pdf; Instructional Rubric Suggestions rev7.docx; ProgramEffectivenessNonInstructionalRubric7.docx

1 section), and distributed them to all instructional units. The reports are also available online to all units.

- The Director beta-tested the WebPPR tool during Summer 2010 and made several suggestions that were incorporated into the final implementation for Fall 2010.
- The ORP has systematically analyzed SARS data, linked with Datatel data, for the assessment of counseling and orientation services.

Surveys are useful tools in ensuring that the opinions of targeted groups or the wider College population are heard, and the ORP provided leadership in numerous survey projects. For example, the ORP provided consultation support on the District Operations Satisfaction Survey (see *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 *Recommendation 6* section)

The Director has also redesigned the annual campus climate survey, which will be administered in Fall 2010 (see *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.

The ORP also 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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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 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 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. 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.

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. The main 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.
- Administrative Services was also underrepresented in committee participation compared to the proportion of managers in that Area, while Instruction was substantially overrepresented compared to the proportion of managers in Instruction.
- 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.

21

- President's Area committee participation compared with the proportion of managers in that Area improved dramatically over the same period, while Administrative Services participation declined.

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.
- Compared to College personnel overall, Student Service is overrepresented on the Crisis Intervention Committee, and the President's Area and Instruction are underrepresented.
- Compared to the average Area participation across all these committees, Administrative Services is overrepresented on the Safety Committee, and the President's Area is underrepresented.

In some of these cases and others, however, Area underrepresentation call 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 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 Vice President of Student Services, since assuming the position over a year ago, has been just as involved in Cabinet-level discussions, committee work, and Area leadership and advocacy as the other vice presidents, 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.

- The Crafton Council has recommended a substantial revision of the CHC portion of Administrative Procedure 2225, to clarify governance structures and processes.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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."
- For the first time, the College is closing offices for a portion of In-Service Day, so that all classified staff may attend the all-campus meeting.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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.
- 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."
- 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. 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.

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

Comment [MCL52]: Page: 23
Evidence: Crafton Council Minutes 020210 final.doc; Crafton Council Minutes 041310 rev.doc; Crafton Council Minutes 033010 final.doc; CHC Organizational Handbook 100806.doc

Comment [MCL53]: Page: 23
Evidence: CHC Proc 2225 Final Rec 100330.doc

Comment [MCL54]: Page: 23
Evidence: ***Copies of a selection of President's Letters.

Comment [MCL55]: Page: 23
Evidence: ***President Gov memo 100804.doc [replace with final when available]

Comment [MCL56]: Page: 23
Evidence: MemoClassifiedParticipation.docx

Comment [MCL57]: Page: 23
Evidence: ***Memo from Gloria or other evidence of invitation to classified staff, or office closure?

Comment [MCL58]: Page: 23
Evidence: ***Documentation needed (e.g., attendance figures, outline of an update or two)

Comment [MCL59]: Page: 23
Evidence: ***Documentation needed (e.g., agendas, outlines of presentations)

Comment [MCL60]: Page: 23
Evidence: CHC Organizational Handbook 100806.doc, pp. 7-9, 31-32

Comment [MCL61]: Page: 23
Evidence: Student_Gov_Survey2.docx; CHC_StudentLeadersinGovernance_SurveyResults_SP10.pdf

Comment [MCL62]: Page: 23
Evidence: ***Draft copy of new climate survey; CHC Organizational Handbook 100806.doc, p. 14

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. 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.

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 comprised 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.

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.

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. In mid-January, the committee reviewed progress to date, and decided

that the most effective method for completing 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.

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:

- 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. 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

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.

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 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 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.

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. 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. 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.

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.

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.

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 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.

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 changes with rationales][made no changes], and notified all unit participants and the rest of District community of the results in his *Chancellor's Chat* newsletter on ***_____. The Interim Chancellor has made available 2010-11 resources to provide support for implementation of objectives on the final approved list.

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.

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. 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:

- 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.

The Interim Chancellor 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 ***_____.

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,

Comment [MCL81]: Page: 32
Evidence: Evaluation Results on 2009-10 Process 100810.doc

Comment [MCL82]: Page: 32
Evidence: ***Copy of applicable Chancellor's Chat

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 college 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.

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 on their tasks, which included reviewing extensive materials before and after every meeting (e.g., the agenda, detailed minutes, reports, reference documents, transcriptions of posted comments, updates of action documents) as well as subcommittee work. 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

<div style="margin-left:60%">

Comment [MCL83]: Page: 33
Evidence: SBCCD Institutional Goals 2008-09.pdf, SBCCD '08 - '09 Institutional Goals Status Report 8-09 Fin.pdf

Comment [MCL84]: Page: 33
Evidence: Strategic Planning Cmt Appt 091016.pdf, Strategic Planning Cmt Appt Cover 091016.pdf; DSPC Roster 100111.pdf

</div>

- 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

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.

Over the next several meetings, the Committee reviewed and discussed numerous additional sources of information, including the following:

- 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.

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.

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.

The DSPC spent a substantial portion of the meetings in March and April developing and refining one to three objectives with tentative timelines, point persons, measurements of progress, and concrete actions for each goal. 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:

- 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.

A greater amount of feedback was received this time, and at its meeting on May 7, the Committee seriously considered all of it. 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.

The DSPC approved the DSP with these changes by consensus, and submitted 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.

<div style="color:#888">

Comment [MCL92]: Page: 36
Evidence: 13A DSP Draft 100425.doc, pages 47-67, 21, 4-6, 35-37, 68-70; Cover email on DSP Feedback Req 100426.pdf; Dist Assembly Agenda 100504.pdf

Comment [MCL93]: Page: 36
Evidence: 13D Feedback Report thru 100505.pdf

Comment [MCL94]: Page: 36
Evidence: Strategic Planning Committee 5-7-10 final.pdf

Comment [MCL95]: Page: 36
Evidence: DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc; Chancellor's Chat 100525.pdf; [***Minutes of the July 8 meeting, when available.]

</div>

The District Strategic Plan is composed of the following sections:

- Preamble
    - o Main Purposes of the District Strategic Plan
    - o Background and Process
    - o Evaluation and Revision of the Plan
    - o Participants
- District and College Foundational Statements
- Effectiveness and Impact Indicators
    - o ARCC College-Level Indicators
    - o 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
    - o Forecast, 2010-11 through 2012-13
    - o Revenue, Expenditure, and Other Forecast Assumptions
    - o 2010-11 District Resource Allocation Model
- Characteristics of the Colleges
    - o Student Demographics
    - o 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.
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.
3.3.1	Determine resources available to colleges.	See Objective 3.1.2 above.

Comment [MCL96]: Page: 37
Evidence: Chancellor's Chat 100208.pdf, Chancellor's Chat 100615.pdf

Comment [MCL97]: Page: 37
Evidence: DETS Catalog of Ser 4-20-10.pdf

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 made available 2010-11 resources to support pursuit and achievement of DSP objectives.

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.

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.

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 follow up, and facilitate corrective action as needed.

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:

- 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.

> **Comment [MCL103]:** Page: 39
> Evidence: District_IT_Plan_9-07.pdf

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.

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.

- 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:

- 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 late Summer 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….

To determine the effects of the structural changes from the college users' perspective, the Executive Director distributed a survey to all District employees in early Fall 2010. Preliminary results indicated that …. The DETS Executive Committee will consider the results of both surveys in its recommendations for improvements, if any.

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 District Technology Strategic Plan 2010-2013 (DTSP) contains the following sections:

- 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."

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.

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, beginning in Fall 2010.

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.

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 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

Comment [MCL112]: Page: 42
Evidence: District_Information_Technology_Strategic_Plan_-_Final_Version_06.01.10.docx, pages 2, 6

Comment [MCL113]: Page: 42
Evidence: District_Information_Technology_Strategic_Plan_-_Final_Version_06.01.10.docx, pages 13-17, 6

Comment [MCL114]: Page: 42
Evidence: Infrastructure Upgrade.xls; DCS working budget 2009-10.xls

Comment [MCL115]: Page: 42
Evidence: District_Information_Technology_Strategic_Plan_-_Final_Version_06.01.10.docx, page 19

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 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.

Comment [MCL116]: Page: 44
Evidence: HR Plan Outline 091125.doc

In late Fall 2009, the District Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) 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.

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

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.

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 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.

[***Insert RAC actions and final recommendation when available after the August 30 meeting, and the Interim Chancellor's action that follows.]

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

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.

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

Comment [MCL121]: Page: 45
Evidence: ***Final version of the plan, when available.

Comment [MCL122]: Page: 45
Evidence: ***Final version of the plan, when available, pp. XX, XX; DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc, pp. 28, 30, 32; https://www.sbccd.org/ProgramReview/Home.aspx/Listing

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 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 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.

- 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.

- 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.

The ETC has also gathered 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.

- The ETC also evaluated retention and success rates in DE courses compared to those in comparable face-to-face courses. Results indicated that success rates are comparable when controlled for term, course, and instructor, while retention rates are somewhat lower in DE courses. Results of the evaluation were shared with DE faculty and instructional deans.

The ETC has directed 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.

Conclusion

The improvements in operations, procedures, evaluation, and implementation described above have 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.

<div style="border:1px solid #000; padding:4px;">

Comment [MCL126]: Page: 48
Evidence: SP10_DEEValForm.docx;
FA09_DE_CourseEvals.pdf;
SP10_DE_CourseEvals.pdf

Comment [MCL127]: Page: 48
Evidence:
0910_CHC_DE_SuccessRetention_0405to0809.pdf;
***other reports from ORP mentioned in DE Status
Report Aug 2010.doc

Comment [MCL128]: Page: 48
Evidence: ***Documentation of direction to
instructional deans; brown-bag schedule or
announcement

</div>

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 two years beyond the tentative 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.

Financial Information and Training

All College staff now 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.

EduReports, the reporting tool for the District's Financial 2000 system, is now available to all department chairs as well as to cost center managers. Online instruction for EduReports is now 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.

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).

49

Comment [MCL129]: Page: 49
Evidence: CHC Long Range Financial Plan 4-12-10.xls; DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc, pp. 51-53

Comment [MCL130]: Page: 49
Evidence: SBCCD Budget Information Screenshots.doc

Comment [MCL131]: Page: 49
Evidence: Financial 2000 EduReports Online Tutorial.pdf; EduReports Reporting Training 8-20-09.doc; Basic Budgeting II Presentation 2-8-10.ppt

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.

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.

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. 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

Based on the committee's discussion, 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:

Comment [MCL132]: Page: 51
Evidence: Final Prior Budget Model.pdf

Comment [MCL133]: Page: 51
Evidence: agenda 10-20-09.doc, agenda 11-2-09.doc, agenda 11-30-09.doc, agenda 1-11-10.pdf, agenda 1-25-10.pdf, agenda 2-22-10.pdf, Resource Allocation Committee Notes 10 20 2009.pdf, Resource Allocation Committee Notes 11 2 2009.pdf, Resource Allocation Committee Notes 11 30 09.pdf, Resource Allocation Committee Notes 5 17 10.pdf; no docs have been posted for 3/22/10 meeting

Comment [MCL134]: Page: 51
Evidence: Chancellor's Chat 100217.pdf

Comment [MCL135]: Page: 51
Evidence: Budget Model SBCCD Draft 2 22 2010.xls

- 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.

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.

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

- The historical FTES data column used funded FTES, not 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.

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.

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

Comment [MCL136]: Page: 52
Evidence: Budget Model SBCCD Draft 3 22 2010 rev.xls

Comment [MCL137]: Page: 52
Evidence: RAM Feedback request cover 100406.pdf; ***Agendas of Academic Senate and Classified Senate meetings if available; ***agenda of management team meeting if available; RAMSurvey.pdf; CHC_RAM_Survey_Results.pdf

Comment [MCL138]: Page: 52
Evidence: Budget Model SBCCD Final 5 23 10.pdf, Budget Model SBCCD Final Guiding Princs 5 23 10.pdf; Resource Allocation Committee Notes 5 17 10.pdf; Chancellor's Chat 100615.pdf

Comment [MCL139]: Page: 52
Evidence: 2010-2011 Tentative Budget.ppt; ***need updated version after approval of State budget; DSP Final Corrected 100630.doc

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

To be completed before submission