STANDARD III

Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

Standard III: Resources
The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Accredited colleges in multi-college systems may be organized such that responsibility for resources, allocation of resources and planning rests with the system. In such cases, the system is responsible for meeting standards on behalf of the accredited colleges.

III A. Human Resources
The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

Descriptive Summary
San Bernardino Valley College, in recognition of our mission statement, strives to provide quality education to a diverse community of learners by assuring the excellence of our employees. The shared governance process of Program Review Needs Assessment serves as the primary tool for prioritization of personnel needs. The inclusion of student success in the SBVC Strategic Plan and in the Board Imperatives further cements the relationship between human resources and the mission of the college. Additionally, the value placed upon diversity is reflected in our mission statement and by Board Policy 7100 which expresses our commitment to diversity and equal opportunity.

Hiring policies are intended to provide the framework for careful recruitment and selection of well-qualified employees interested in student success. Evaluation procedures have been approved through bargaining or shared governance processes and are posted on the District's web site. Ethics statements and programmatic SLOs are meant to shape the professional behavior of college employees and to measure institutional effectiveness in student success. All portions of the hiring process are intended to be confidential and to be administered in a manner that is fair to all candidates; members of hiring committees are required to sign confidentiality agreements and all materials used by the committee during its deliberations are collected to ensure that confidentiality is maintained. A monitor from the Human Resources Department oversees each hiring committee to ensure that candidate pools are adequately diverse and that the process is equitable. Policies for hiring all categories of employees require that prospective members of hiring committees to receive diversity training from the Human Resources Department prior to service on a committee.

Faculty

District Administrative Procedure 7210 describes the hiring procedures for permanent and adjunct faculty. The hiring procedure and policies for determining equivalence were reviewed by the SBVC Academic Senate. The hiring procedure and equivalence policy were then reviewed by the District-wide shared governance body (District Assembly) prior to their acceptance by the SBCCD Board of Trustees. The hiring procedure and equivalence policy reflect the institutional commitment to the diversity and quality of faculty.

District Administrative Procedure 7230 describes the hiring procedures for Classified Staff [Placeholder: Include reviewed by Classified Senate/CSEA and Academic Senate if applicable]. AP 7245 addresses the hiring of Short-Term Hourly Employees and AP 7250 is directed towards the hiring of Management [Placeholder: Include reviews by Classified Senate/CSEA and Academic Senate if applicable].

III.A.1. a. *Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.*

Descriptive Summary
District Administrative Procedures 7210 Faculty, 7230 Classified Staff and 7250 Management are available to the public on the campus website. The APs address criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of campus personnel.

Faculty

Faculty, full time and adjunct, must meet minimum qualifications defined by the state in the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges," provided by the Community College State Chancellor's Office and in collaboration with the State Academic Senate. AP 7210 ensures that faculty are involved in the selection of new faculty. The AP specifically states that the majority of a faculty selection committee shall be composed of faculty. Faculty, full time and adjunct, must meet minimum qualifications defined by the state in the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges," provided by the Community College State Chancellor's Office and in collaboration with the State Academic Senate. Interviews may include a teaching demonstration, role-play, a writing sample, or skills demonstration, as appropriate. Typically, at least two topics are sent to the candidates for a choice of a teaching topic. The demonstrations are typically 10-15 minutes in length. An evaluation form is used by the committee to assess the responses by the candidate.

All faculty are hired under the same faculty hiring process. (SBCCDAdministrative Procedure 7210, line 1135) Faculty who teach online classes are held to the same standards as faculty who teach traditional, face-to-face classes. Prior to teaching a distance education section, a faculty member documents the various ways in which he or she is prepared for the delivery mode.

Record of such successful preparation for online teaching is a part of the Comprehensive Quality Control Process for online classes.

The college's Academic Senate determines equivalency or eminence based on locally published guidelines. Applicants who believe that they possess qualifications equivalent to the minimum qualifications for a position and wish to request that a determination of equivalency be made in a specific discipline must complete a [District Request for Equivalency](#) form and provide supporting documentation as appropriate. Applicants for both full time and part time positions are notified of the opportunity to apply for an equivalency at the time of application.

All candidates in the pool for adjunct positions are subject to initial screening by HR staff for sensitivity to diversity and to ensure that they meet the same minimum academic and professional standards established by the Statewide Academic Senate and approved by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Applicants for adjunct positions are subject to the same equivalency processes as candidates for fulltime positions. Potential part-time faculty may be interviewed by a single Department Chair or a departmental committee. Recommendations arising from these interviews are used by managers to make hiring decisions. It is recommended that applicants for adjunct positions be required to demonstrate teaching, counseling, librarianship, or other job related skills to demonstrate their ability to work effectively with the college's student population.

Classified Staff

The CSEA bargaining unit and the District then negotiate the job description, classification, title, required qualifications, and salary for the position in accord with Article 16.1 of the classified contract. Subsequent to that process, job duties for the classification are fixed for the position by action of the Board of Trustees at a public meeting. A hiring committee is then formed.   The composition of the hiring committee is determined by the administrator for the affected area. Administrative procedure 7230 requires that such screening committees consist of no more than seven and no fewer than three members. Each committee has at least one manager and one classified staff member appointed by the classified bargaining unit in accord with California Education Code §70901.2.   When appropriate, the committee may also include faculty appointed by the Academic Senate.   Each committee also includes an Equal Opportunity Representative from the Human Resources Department. The member from HR is present to assure that the proceeding of the committee remains confidential and that the process is fair and equitable.

Second level interviews for the finalist candidates are conducted by an appropriate administrator who sends forward their recommendation to the President then the president forwards it to the district. Successful candidates are offered employment subject to completion of a background check. Finally the hiring of a successful candidate is approved by the Board of Trustees at a public meeting.

Growth positions for faculty and classified staff are made though the campus Program Review process.   Once the Program Review Committee recommends additional personnel a request to fill the position must be made by the appropriate administrator, approved by the College President, District Fiscal Services, and by the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources.

Management

The process for hiring administrators differs significantly from the process for hiring faculty or classified staff, as decisions to fill management positions are made by campus and district administration in consultation with Fiscal Services, and the Board of Trustees.   New management positions are not prioritized by the campus shared governance process of Program Review Needs Assessment Requests and therefore, subject to the collegial consultation process that applies to other growth positions.

Once the decision to fill a new or vacated administrative position is made, the process described in Administrative Procedure 7250 is implemented.   A search committee is formed; the composition of the committee is dependent upon the type of position. If the position has a broad impact on the campus community the committee includes representatives from faculty, staff, students, and may also include representatives from the community at large.   Administrative positions are advertised for six weeks. In the case of top level positions, such as a search for a District Chancellor, an executive search firm may be retained to recruit suitable candidates.

Faculty and management openings are usually advertised in publications such as *The Journal of Higher Education*, the California Community College (CCC) Registry and the Edjoin Online system, the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) website, newspapers, job fairs, and the SBCCD website. In many cases the Human Resources Department consults with department chairs to determine appropriate media outlets for the advertisements.   Recruitment for classified positions occurs through such instruments as Ccregestry.org, Higheredjobs.com, Losangelesjobing.com, and Edjoin.org.

In instances in which there is a vacancy that does not meet the definition of a "new opening" as found in 5 CCR§53021 the vacancy is publicized internally by the processes found in Article 15 of the contract between CSEA Chapter 291 and the SBCCD. Notices of opportunities for voluntary transfers or closed promotions are to be posted for ten days during which internal candidates may apply for consideration. Internal candidates must already have been hired through an open recruitment process and be serving in the same classification. The factors upon which internal candidates are judged include "hire date, seniority within the present classification of the employee, skills, abilities, job performance, suitability, and requirements of the vacant position." If an internal candidate is not selected the opening will be filled by use of the process described for new openings. This portion of the contract also describes the processes   for   involuntary   transfers   and   voluntary   demotions.

For all hiring categories an offer of employment is made contingent on satisfactory background and reference checks.

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard

Adherence to processes used for hiring of some categories of employees has been a significant source of concern in the six years between full accreditations self-studies. In some cases adherence to written procedures has been imperfect. For instance, in all categories of employee hires the requirement that all screening committee members receive diversity training was not consistently enforced. In response changes have been made to Administrative Policy 7230   to include "*Each Screening Committee will also include an Equal Employment Opportunity representative designated by the Office of Human Resources*" [Evidence: District Assembly

Minutes 3/2/2010 p. 2-3]. Current Human Resources practice for EEO training an online Diversity Awareness training to all new employees through Keenan SafeColleges during orientation. Current and active employees are provided the online training as the need arises. [Evidence: E-mail from HR].

The procedures for voluntary transfer and closed promotion adopted by the Board of Trustees and described in Article 15 of the contract between the SBCCD and CSEA Chapter were not consistently applied. That may have been because instructions to potential applicants on the District website differed from the procedures found in the contract.

In November 2011, consulting Interim of Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, stated that the information on the District Website was not accurate and stated that it would be corrected. However, the erroneous information remained on the website until March 2013. Administrative response to transfer requests was also inconsistent. Generally, but not always, denial of such requests were accompanied by a reason for denial. The district and classified bargaining unit have now crafted a memorandum of understanding to avoid inconsistency in the future [Evidence: MOU; Long Range Staffing Plan; 2010-2013; CSEA Contract Article 15] Administrative response to transfer requests was also inconsistent. Generally, but not always, denial of such requests were accompanied by a reason for denial. The district and classified bargaining unit have now crafted a memorandum of understanding to avoid inconsistency in the future [Evidence: MOU].

In other instances hiring relied on past practices and was not part of the Administrative Procedure. For instance in regards to classified staff reliance on past practice came into question in early May 2008 when the Academic Senate presented a resolution at meeting of the Board of Trustees to protest the use of a hiring procedure that deviated from previous practice. In an email dated 2/2/2010 the Interim Chancellor directed the Human Resources Department to cease use of an unapproved hiring process and referred the issue to the District Assembly, the District-wide shared governance body.

The May 2010 minutes of District Assembly include a statement by a previous Vice Chancellor of Human Resources that there had been no hiring procedure for classified staff position. In the period between 2008 and 2011 two different procedures were used [Evidence: Tort submitted by CSEA 8/24/2009; Letter to Rene Brunelle from CSEA dated 5/27/2009; District Assembly Minutes 3/2/2010 p. 2-3; E-mail string dated 1/5/2009 -2/2/10]. Administrative Procedure 7230 which describes the classified hiring procedure was developed through collegial processes and approved in its present form in January of 2011.

There are occurrences where written procedures doesn't include past practice which leads to inconsistent hiring procedures as past practice is sometimes observed and sometimes not. For instance Administrative Procedure 7250 does not address the issue of public forums. The hiring process of the previous Chancellor did not include a public forum despite strong urging by the Classified and Academic Senates. However, subsequently, when the position was again vacant the hiring process for a replacement included a public forum.   Public forums are past and current practice for hiring of the campus president. Use of forums in the hiring of Vice-Presidents is inconsistent with forums sometimes occurring when hiring a Vice-President of Instruction, but not occurring during hiring of the Vice-President of Student Services or the Vice President of Administrative Services.

All of the aforementioned irregularities may be attributed to the high rate of turnover in the HR department. The inconsistencies in hiring practices have been identified and resolved however stability in the Human Resources department would ensure consistency in HR practices.

The collegial consultation process will review the concept and institutionalization of forums for certain administrative positions.   Periodic review and discussion of hiring processes by appropriate groups will help all personnel become more familiar with the processes.

The student and faculty campus climate surveys provide evidence on the quality of SBVC faculty and staff.

Student Campus Climate Survey	Students - 2011	Students - 2012	Students - 2013
In general, the faculty and staff on this campus make an effort to be helpful and courteous.	84% (609) agree	84% (189) agree	83% (410) agree
In general, SBVC's faculty and staff are sensitive to the needs of students from all backgrounds.	81% (582) agree	79% (176) agree	80% (396) agree
In general, office workers are courteous.	72% (523) agree	69% (154) agree	74% (363) agree

Faculty Campus Climate Survey	Faculty - 2010	Faculty - 2011	Faculty - 2012	Faculty - 2013
Faculty members whom I have observed or evaluated at SBVC are committed to high standards of teaching.	n/a	83% (57) agree	n/a	93% (37) agree

III.A.1. b. *The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.*

Descriptive Summary
The institution has written policies that require formal evaluation of the performance of all employees at regularly stated intervals. Such evaluations are to be performed using prescribed forms and processes. Institutional evaluation processes are designed to accomplish the goals of providing employees with timely feedback regarding expectations and their performance while also fulfilling the institution's mission of providing "quality education and services to a diverse community of learners."

Faculty

The process for evaluation of faculty is described in Article 16 of the contract between the SBCCD and CTA, the bargaining unit for faculty [Evidence: Faculty Contract]. Additionally, in January 2013 CTA and the SBCCD amended the evaluative process for faculty to include consideration of the effectiveness of personnel in assisting students to achieve the student learning outcomes (SLOs) established for the program area in which the faculty serves. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) was entered into by the parties and ratified by the membership of CTA. According to the MOU a "self-reflection statement in regards to the development and assessment of SLOs shall be included in the evaluation. Furthermore, the evaluator and faculty member may voluntarily discuss the SLO process and how it was used in the improvement of instruction." [Evidence: MOU]

The process used for faculty evaluation undergoes periodic review to ensure that the process remains effective, fair, and that it conforms to applicable accreditation standards. According to the CTA contract such reviews are conducted by a committee "with membership to include five faculty members, four appointed by the Presidents of the Academic Senates (two from each college), and one unit member appointed by the President of the Association, plus three administrators, one appointed by each of the college Presidents and the Director of Distributed Education. The Director of Institutional Research may be used as a resource for the Working Committee. The current process for faculty evaluations is described below [Evidence: Faculty Contract; Academic Senate Minutes].

Classified Staff

The evaluation process for classified staff is described by Article 13 of the contract between SBCCD and CSEA Chapter 291. Classified staff members complete a probationary period before becoming permanent in their positions. The probationary period for most classified employees is nine months; however, sworn officers of the District Police Department are required to complete a twelve month probationary period in order to comply with Police Officer Standard Training (POST) requirements.

Employees on probationary status are evaluated no less than two times during the probationary period. Evaluations usually occur about the third and seventh month from the initial date of hire. Permanent employees are evaluated once every two years in the month of April. Additional evaluations may occur when deemed necessary. Evaluations are usually performed by the staff member's immediate supervisor, but may, rarely, be performed by a designee familiar with the employee's performance [Evidence: ?]

Administrators and Managers

Board policy 7251 states that "[t]he criteria for management evaluations shall be based on board policy, the job descriptions and performance goals and objectives developed mutually by the manager and the supervisor." Administrative procedure 7251 requires that "each manager… be evaluated once per year for the first year of employment and every three years thereafter." Additional evaluations may occur in cases "when significant deficiencies are noted." The supervisor and the manager due to be evaluated are to meet by September 1 to mutually agree to the formation of an evaluation committee.

Evaluation committees for campus level managers include the manager's immediate supervisor and a manager selected by the campus president. The manager also chooses a list of three faculty and three classified staff members they find acceptable to serve on their evaluation committee. The list of three faculty candidates for service on the evaluation committee is submitted to the Academic Senate so that they may select an individual from the list for participation; similarly, CSEA selects from the list of classified employees as a representative in the managerial evaluation process.

In the case of district level managers, the committee includes the immediate supervisor of the manager and a manager appointed by the Chancellor. In a process similar to that used at the campus level the manager due for evaluation submits lists of three faculty and classified staff members they find acceptable for service on their evaluation committees. The Academic Senates from each campus and CSEA are allowed to choose a representative from the list of those approved by the manager.

Uniquely, once performed, an evaluation does not become part of the manager's permanent personnel file as is the case for other employees. Administrative Procedure 7251 states that [e]valuation reports shall not be retained in the file beyond a four year period if the manager requests they be expunged."

Chancellor

Board Policy 2175 states that the evaluation of the Chancellor shall take place "in compliance with the requirements set forth in the contract of employment with the Chancellor and Administrative Procedure 2175." Administrative procedure 2175 calls for evaluation of the Chancellor to occur once per year for the first two years of employment and every three years thereafter.

The evaluation committee produces a written advisory report no later than November 7th. The report includes: (1) the Chancellor's self-evaluation, (2) a summary of the job duties of the Chancellor, (3) a summary of prior goals and objectives provided to the committee by the Chancellor in his/her self-evaluation, and (4)" identification of any areas in which the Chancellor can improve his/her performance."

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard. The campus has policies in place for evaluation of personnel at stated intervals. All evaluations speak tor effectiveness in preforming professional duties, improvement of job performance or recommendations for professional development. Administrative policies and bargaining agreements determine who participates in an evaluation and the criteria used in evaluation. The campus believes that maintaining high quality personnel directly contribute to institutional effectiveness.

There are instances where evaluation of personnel has not occurred at stated intervals. The high rate of turnover in HR may have contributed to these lapses.

Classified Staff

Statistics presented in the 2010 Long- Range Staffing Plan indicated that as of June 30, 2010 sixteen (16) evaluations of the 225 classified staff members then employed at SBVC were overdue by more than thirty days. Data for 2011/12 indicates improvement since 2010. 100% of

respondents indicated that evaluations of classified staff occurred in a manner consistent with the contract between CSEA Chapter 291 and the SBCCD. The 2014-2017 Long Range Staffing Plan show that 26 Classified Evaluations were overdue as of March 2014. This finding tallies with reports from the bargaining units that indicate few problems with management adherence to the evaluation procedures for classified staff.

Management

The 2010-2013 Long-Range Staffing Plan authored by the Chancellor of Human Resources, presented statistics that indicated that evaluations were overdue for thirteen (13) of the twenty-five (25) managers then employed at San Bernardino Valley College. Additionally in 2010 fourteen (14) out of twenty-seven (27) management evaluations at District Office were also overdue. Management evaluation has been a subject of comment and controversy at the Academic Senate and has also been the subject of concern expressed by citizens before the Board of Trustees. On September 15, 2011 the Board of Trustees was urged by a speaker to take steps to ensure timely evaluation of managers in the District. [Evidence: Board Minutes 9/15/11; Long Range Staffing Plan 2010 – 2013; 2014-2017 Long Range Staffing Plan].

On 2/11/14 Human Resource reported that there were a total of 4 management evaluations are past due this fiscal year. The 2014-2017 Long Range Staffing Plan show that 1 management evaluation was overdue. Evaluation of interim managers was discussed at District Assembly during Spring 2013. The Vice-Chancellor of Human Resources reviewed AP 7251, and stated that an interim evaluation policy wasn't necessary as interim appointments should not exceed one year. In reference to evaluation of full-time managers currently serving as an interim it was noted that 7251 calls for managers to be evaluated in the management position they were hired for. Thus, evaluation of full-time managers on interim assignment was delayed until such time as they returned to their permanent position.

The Administrative Policy AP 7251 regarding the evaluation of managers was reviewed in College Council in Spring 2014. Changes specifically addressing the evaluation of Interim Managers were recommended. The AP 7251 was forwarded to Academic Senate, Classified Senate, District Assembly and the Board of Trustees for further feedback and approval. [Note: This process began at the 2/12/14 College Council meeting and will continue through the semester. Text addressing interims and approval dates will be inserted when final]

The district has the authority to decline to renew a manager's contract without stating cause, as long as notice to the employee is approved by the Board of Trustees by March 15 of a given year of the intent of the district not to renew the manager's contract for the subsequent fiscal year beginning on July 1. In the spring of 2013, several managers were informed they would not have their contracts renewed, although no formal evaluation process was affiliated with the decision not to renew. The ability of upper management, including the president, chancellor, and/or district to decline to renew managers' contracts without giving cause is a concern, as no determination by a balanced committee presently is required for such an action to be taken and confirmed by the district's Board of Trustees. Additionally, the ability of managers to expunge evaluative material from their personnel files after 4 years conflicts with Board Procedure 3310 which designates evaluations as permanent records.

The Chancellor

The district has not consistently evaluated chancellors in accord with stated policies. The written procedure (AP2175)   requires that he be evaluated "once per year for the first two years" of service as Chancellor. A special meeting of the Board of Trustees on 9/24/09 details trustees and the evaluation committee's concerns with AP 2175 when it was used to evaluate the previous Chancellor who was then placed on administrative leave in December, 2009. The current Chancellor served as an interim in the position from December 2009 until April 2011 and as an interim was not evaluated. He was then appointed to the position by the Board of Trustees at the public meeting on the evening of April 21, 2011. The trustees choose not to evaluate the Chancellor between April 2011 and April 2012 because they wished to review and update AP 2175. The chancellor gave a self-evaluation to the Board in Fall 2012 and was evaluated under the terms of his contract.

AP 2175 was accepted by the board on 5/9/2013 after being approved by District Assembly. Human Resources states that since the revisions to AP 2175 were approved the Chancellor's evaluation has been conducted according to procedure. All constituencies were invited to participate on the evaluation committee. However, AP 2175 states that evaluation advisory report should be signed and presented to the Chancellor no later than November 7th and that the Chancellors' evaluation should be completed within 60 days from that point, approximately January 7th. The Chancellor's evaluation was listed on the Board Agenda for Closed Session for a seven month period 10/10/13 – 4/24/14. The Chancellor's evaluation was completed on 4/24/2014 and the Chancellor's contract was extended for 4-years. [Evidence: Board Minutes 9/22/2009, 2/21/11; Academic Senate minutes 2/6/13; Board Agenda and Minutes 10/10/13, 11/14/13, 12/12/13, 1/16/14; 2/6/14; 3/13/14; 4/10/14; 4/24/2014]

Faculty

In 2012, 85% of faculty respondents to the accreditation survey agreed that performance evaluations were conducted in accordance with contract or handbook guidelines. In 2013 the faculty evaluation process was changed to incorporate responsibility for student progress toward achievement of student learning outcomes into the faculty evaluation. A memorandum of understanding between the faculty bargaining unit and the SBCCD requires faculty to include a description of their participation in the development and assessment of SLOs in their written self-evaluation. The supervisor may also engage the faculty member in a discussion of the SLO process and the manner in which it was used in improvement of instruction. Faculty participation in the SLO process is now considered to be a part of faculty acceptance of responsibility.

Actionable Improvement Plan
- Establish better processes for tracking and completing employee evaluations
- Continue to discuss the evaluation of interim managers.

III.A.1. c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary

The college began addressing the issue of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in 2006. At that time faculty and staff identified "core competencies" that are major abilities and identified competencies expected of a student graduating from college.   Faculty then identified two to four core competencies for each course.   Upon completion of the classes required for the associate's degree, each student will have addressed all the core competencies. The practice of identifying the core competencies addressed in a particular class is maintained as courses are created, updated, modified, and submitted to the curriculum committee. Core Competencies were assessed in Fall 2013.

Next, faculty identified course level SLOs, created rubrics, and began assessing course SLOs in a three-year cycle. According to the ACCJC annual report 2013, 98% of courses had defined student outcomes and 85% of course have ongoing assessment.   Following assessments, results were discussed and plans were formulated for improvement. Staff and service areas on campus also dialoged and identified student learning outcomes (see Standards IB, IIA and IIB for additional information on SLO development).

During the 2011/2012 academic year, assessment at the program level began. Department faculty wrote program SLOs for certificates and degrees. Non-instructional areas wrote SAOs. According to the 2012 ACCJC annual report 98% of programs (certificates and degrees) had established program SLOs, but only 2% of program had been assessed. By Fall 2013 the number of programs assessed had progressed to 20%. The campus responded to this in Spring 2014 by engaging Dr. David Marshall of California State University, San Bernardino, to conduct a series of workshops focusing on Program SLO assessment strategies.

Progress in SLO assessment slowed during negotiations between CTA and District regarding compensation for SLO assessment and the inclusion of SLOs in faculty evaluations. After two years of delay an agreement was reached in fall 2013. The memorandum of understanding included additional compensation for assessment and development of SLOs and incorporated consideration of faculty participation in student learning outcome achievement into the faculty evaluation process.

Since the ratification of the MOU, progress on SLOs has resumed. A short-term plan for SLO assessment was implemented in Fall 2013. The plan focuses on achieving ongoing assessment for all courses. Core competencies and program SLOs have been or are in the process of being aligned with Course SLOs. Core competencies were assessed based on alignment in Fall 2013. Course and Program SLO alignment, under the direction of Dr. Marshall, will provide the foundation for ongoing assessment of programs. These actions on outcome assessment have generated healthy dialogue in the Academic Senate, Division and Department meetings. The short term plan will culminate in with a semester long discussion in Spring 2015 to address changes to the current outcomes assessment model, best practices for ongoing assessment, future role of the Accreditation and SLO Committee, and the continuing need for faculty member to be reassigned to coordinate SLOs.

Additionally, concerns that arose from the Core Competency assessment will be addressed. Campus progress on outcomes are illustrated in the table below:

Outcomes	Identified	Assessment	Progress Fall 2013
Courses	98%	71%	**85%**
Programs (Degrees & Certificates)	98%	2.9%	**20%**
Institutional	100%	100%	**Evaluated**

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard. The college has reached a level of sustainability for assessing course level SLOs and SAOs. Core Competencies have been assessed. Program assessment is being guided through a series of workshops. The Accreditation and SLO Committee has formulated assessment plans and timelines which have been shared with the Instructional Cabinet, Academic Senate, faculty chairs, and other consultation committees and vested groups.

 As previously stated, a memorandum of understanding between the faculty bargaining unit and the SBCCD now requires faculty to include a description of their participation in the development and assessment of SLOs in their written self-evaluation. The supervisor may also engage the faculty member in a "voluntary" discussion of the SLO process and the manner in which it was used in improvement of instruction. Faculty participation in the SLO process is now considered to be part of their acceptance of responsibility.

Actionable Improvement Plan
Professional Development will continue to provide training and opportunities to engage the campus in dialogs on SLO's, learning, and success. Dialog at Academic Senate, Division and department meetings, manager meetings, and Faculty Chair meetings will continue. The SLO and Accreditation Committee will oversee progress on SLO's and periodically review progress on continuous cycle of assessment, dialog, and improvement.

III.A.1.d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel

Description Summary

In addition to the college mission statement the campus has identified values that express our basic beliefs. These tenets are widely published in venues such as the annual campus catalog and apply to all employees at SBVC. In addition, each employee category has developed specific statements regarding the ethical behavior expected of their members.

Faculty

The ethics statement for the faculty of San Bernardino Valley College was revised by the Academic Senate in April 2013 and occupies a prominent position on the Academic Senate website. According to the information published there:

The faculty of San Bernardino Valley College strives to maintain the principles of ethics in our interactions with students, colleagues, the institution, and the community. The following statement of faculty ethics is modeled on the Statement of Professional Ethics of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), 1987, and the State Academic Senate's paper "Faculty Ethics: Expanding the AAUP Ethics Statement," 1994.

The faculty ethics statement identifies and describes specific responsibilities to the discipline taught by faculty members, responsibility to students, to colleagues, to the academic institution, and to the community at large. The faculty ethics statement concludes with a commitment "to abide by these ethical principles in the spirit of collegiality, professionalism, and responsibility. By adhering to these principles we aspire to meet our goals as an institution for educational excellence."

Classified Staff

There is no ethics statement applicable to all classified staff of SBVC; however participants in the Classified Senate have adopted and adhere to an ethics statement that was incorporated into the constitution of that group in 2004. In conducting the business of the senate participants are to adhere to democratic principles, uphold the majority vote of the senate, and work to develop an inclusive shared governance process.

Administrative/Management Employees

Administrative and managerial employees developed a management ethics statement approved by the management roundtable in 2005. The statement based in part on the ethics statement published on the website of the Association of California Community College Administrators emphasizes the attributes of trustworthiness, respect, fairness, concern, and citizenship. The ethics statement for managers was reviewed in 2012.

Board of Trustees

The ethical behavior expected of a member of the Board of Trustees of the SBCCD is specifically addressed by Board Policy 2010 adopted in January 2001 and amended in September 2006. Specific expectations of members of the Board include devotion of "time, thought, and study" to their duties as Board Members, a commitment to "work with… fellow Board Members in a spirit of harmony" and to "conduct … relationships with college staff,

students and local citizenry" with a realization of responsibility to all. Actions to be taken against any Board of Trustees Member found to have violated the Code of Ethics are described in Administrative Regulation 2010 and may include public sanction by other members of the board, ethics training as described by AB1234, or training on the Brown Act as deemed appropriate by fellow trustees.

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard. Each employee category has discussed the issue of ethical behavior to some extent. Members of the Board of Trustee, managers and faculty have written ethics statements. The ethics statement for faculty is featured prominently on the website of the SBVC Academic Senate. The ethics statement for classified staff does not address ethical behavior in general and applies only to participants in their role as representatives in the Classified Senate; the statement is featured prominently on the website for the Classified Senate. The management ethics statement is not published.

Adherence to ethical principles is reinforced by a variety of policies and procedures intended to discourage unethical behavior. Such policies include Board Policy 3410 (Non Discrimination), Board Policy 2260 (Conflict of Interest), Board Policy 3430 (Prohibition of Harassment), and Board Policy 7310 (Nepotism). Additionally the institution supplies an instrument for anonymous reporting of ethical infractions. The compliance hotline webpage states that the institution "is committed to providing an ethical place to work and go to school." Reports of suspected unethical behavior can be made anonymously by web or phone.

Actionable Improvement Plan
None

III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes.

Descriptive Summary
As previously stated in the narrative regarding Standard IIIA1, recommendations for filling faculty positions and classified staffing needs are generated through the campus program review needs assessment process. Programs may request staffing and are expected to present data (such as calculation of faculty load and weekly contact hours) indicating need. The committee as a whole considers and ranks staffing requests. Recommendations generated by the program review committee are forwarded to the campus President who, in consultation with other managers, makes final determinations regarding staffing. A long term staffing plan that resulted from recommendations subsequent to a previous accreditation report failed to predict the financial crisis looming on the horizon and was never implemented. A single update to the plan is reported to have been completed in 2011; The HR Standard Operating Procedures Manual has been completed in draft form since 2010. Absent a permanent HR Director and Vice Chancellor and the current and existing priorities, the manual has been on hold. The HR manual serves as the operating procedures and processing guidelines for the Human Resources staff.

For a significant period of time covered by this report the college, in common with other California institutions, was affected by the economic crisis that gripped the state. Consequently

the Program Review committee decided not to conduct needs assessment in 2009. In 2010 Program Review completed a full needs assessment process. In 2011, needs assessment was urgent facilities, equipment and technology needs [Evidence: Campus Wide Needs Assessment e-mail 9/9/2011]. Since 2012, a full needs assessment process has been conducted.

The crisis in educational funding in California had a profound effect on the number of employees at the college. In 2008 the college was served by 425 permanent employees. In 2010 the District offered a retirement incentive program to its employees. On 6/30/2010 thirty-five employees left the college. A selective hiring "frost" left many positions vacant; by 2012 the number of permanent employees had fallen to 383.   The number of administrators fell from 27 to 17. The number of fulltime faculty positions was diminished from 171 to 148. Classified staff positions fell from 228 to 218.

Efforts were made to mitigate the effect of employee attrition through the formation of an ad hoc committee and campus discussion of staffing needs. Additionally the classified bargaining unit negotiated the redistribution of duties among classified personnel. Over the past year some additional faculty have been hired as replacements or in areas that have experienced growth. For instance, the number of fulltime tenure track instructors increased in both anthropology and physics

Attrition among management has been particularly high; the number of administrators has fallen by nearly 40%. SBVC has not had a permanent president since early in 2012. For a lengthy period of time that office and those of all three Vice Presidents (Student Services, Administrative Services, and Instructional Services) were simultaneously vacant. For a period of time a single interim served as both the President of SBVC and as the Vice President of Student Services.

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard. The campus is served well by the current program review needs assessment model; programs with are successful in obtaining resources including faculty and classified staff positions. The committee makes a concentrated effort to set aside personal bias when participating in needs assessment prioritization and weigh the needs of the whole campus. When examining the top ten faculty prioritization rankings from the past three Needs Assessment Cycles approximately 66% of the top ten rankings were for faculty in academic department with one or no fulltime faculty. As 68% of the academic departments on campus have one or no fulltime faculty, the Program Review committee's recommendations are aligned with the campus. Similarly, when examining the top ten classified prioritization rankings from 07/08 – 10/11 36.6% of the positions represented Student Services and Instruction, 26.6% of the positions represented Administrative Services. Administrative Services departments have not submitted requests for classified employees in the past two needs assessment cycles. [Evidence: Program Review Needs Assessment Prioritization Lists 2008 – 2013]. [Evidence: Program Review Needs Assessment Prioritization Lists 2009 – 2013; Faculty Seniority List, 2013; President's Opening Day Presentation Fall 2013; Spring 2014].

The number of faculty hired since Fall 2009 does not align with the percentage of academic departments on campus have one or no fulltime faculty. Twenty-six replacement and growth faculty were hired for instructional positions from Fall 08 through Spring 14, of these 38% of those faculty were hired in departments with one or no faculty. Similarly replacement and growth positions for classified staff did not reflect the Needs Assessment prioritization with 46% Administrative Services, 41% Instruction and 59% Student Services.

It is difficult to tell which faculty & staff positions hired since the SERP retirements began are replacement positions or growth positions. Of the 26 faculty positions hired since Fall 2009, 16 were on Needs Assessment Prioritization lists, 4 faculty were hired to maintain the minimum faculty needed for accreditation.

The Program Review committee's needs assessment process and prioritized recommendations lists are advisory to the President. Using the faculty example above, the committee can recommend to the President that 66% of the faculty hired should support departments with one or no fulltime faculty. The use of these recommendations are subject to a number of factors; the number faculty growth positions funded; urgent faculty needs not addressed by Program Review, for instance, hiring faculty to maintain accreditation of the nursing program, and the President has discretion over which positions to hire.

The unpredictable pattern of staffing by attrition has resulted in significant perceived gaps. Faculty dissatisfaction with staffing decisions resulted in two resolutions from the Academic Senate. The first, in spring 2012, expressed a desire for additional fulltime faculty. The second senate resolution approved by the Academic Senate in fall 2012 addressed an 80% reduction in the number of classified staff available for student support in the Library. That senate resolution asserted that the resultant curtailment of services to students was likely to have a deleterious effect on student success.

The institution has been unable to recruit and hire desirable candidates for administrative vacancies. Vice-President of Student Services has also been filled by interims since October 2011. For a significant period of time the offices of VP of Student Services and the Presidency of SBVC were filled by a single individual. Two presidential searches resulted in refusals from the top rated candidates. Lower salaries for administrative positions at SBVC in comparison with nearby college districts has resulted in an exodus of administrators from the campus.

The numbers and types of classified staff on campus have also not returned to the levels present prior to the SERP. In many cases work previously performed by staff members is now done by substitutes or vendors. Salary levels also play a role in the ability of the institution to attract and retain staff members. In some cases lower salaries for classified positions at SBVC in comparison with nearby college districts has resulted in an exodus of confidential and technical staff from SBVC. In some cases has been necessary for the District and the bargaining unit to enter into memoranda to increase the salary for selected positions in order to be able to muster a pool of candidates from which to hire. The District and CTA/CSEA negotiating teams reached an agreement for salary increases in Spring 2014.

Actionable Planning Agenda
- Review recommendations from the College Brain Trust in the 2014-2017 Long Range Staffing Plan.
- Additionally Salary Study by the Hays Group provided an analysis of duties and compensation within the SBCCD. The results of those efforts will improve the Districts ability to hire and retain quality personnel and combined with the needs assessment portion of program review process should be used to remedy staffing shortages.

III.A. 3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

III.A. 3.a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

Descriptive Summary

As described in the narrative for section IIIA1 the institution has written policies for hiring employees. There are additional written policies describing the procedures for evaluation of the performance of all employees. Additional procedures govern a wide variety of the aspects of the employee/employer relationship such as overtime assignment, provision of substitutes, discipline, employee absences, etc.

Policies and procedures arise in a variety of settings. Some are established through negotiation with the exclusive bargaining units for faculty and staff. Other procedures arise in District Assembly, a shared governance body with representative from SBVC, District Office, and Crafton Hills College. Additional procedures originate in the Human Resources department.

Human Resources department Program Review documents available at https://www.sbccd.org/ProgramReview/Entity.aspx/Plans/97346e71-6e5d-44ac-97dc-5dcde64684ee show that the department originally planned to review and update their policies and procedures and to produce a Human Resources Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) Manual by fall 2011. In 2011 that goal had not been reached and was rescheduled for completion by spring 2012. In 2012 the achievement of the goal was pushed back another year with an anticipated finish date of 2013. The most recent version of the Human Resources Program Review document states that review of Human Resources policies and procedures is "planned, but not yet firmly scheduled." Similarly, production of a Human Resources SOP manual and employee handbook is "planned but not yet firmly scheduled." The document goes on to state that during 2013 – 2014 there will be discussions of how to "create and implement" the work originally scheduled for completion in 2011.

Self-Evaluation

Climate surveys found that those who occupy the upper levels of the hierarchy of the organization (managers and administrators) were most likely to agree that policies and procedures that affect employees are fair to all and uniformly applied. Significant numbers of classified staff respondents were unable to agree that policies are uniform or fair. Faculty, too, are less likely to agree that policies and procedures are consistently applied and equitably administered.

There is no handbook that gathers all policies and procedures in a single reference. In some cases policies and procedures are updated but managers are not informed of changes or forms are not updated to reflect the changes. In other cases policies or procedures change, but District generated forms remain outdated and fail to reflect changes in policy or procedure.

The Human Resources Department has intended since 2010 to review and update policies and procedures but has not done so. There is no current deadline for completion of the work nor any deadline for creation and distribution of employee handbooks, or a manual, describing human resources. The HR Standard Operating Procedures Manual has been completed in draft form since 2010. Absent a permanent HR Director and Vice Chancellor and the current and

existing priorities, the manual has been on hold. The HR manual serves as the operating procedures and processing guidelines for the Human Resources staff.

Actionable Improvement Plan
None

III.A. 3.b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

Self-Evaluation
Personnel records are maintained at the district office under the supervision of the Human Resources Department.   Faculty and classified staff are allowed access to their own personnel files by their respective bargaining agreements.

Article 16.2.2 of the contract between CSEA Chapter 291 and the SBCCD allows staff members to examine the records "at a time when such person is not actually required to render service to the District." An employee may also authorize access to a representative from the classified bargaining unit. A log is maintained within the file indicating the persons who have examined the file and the date of any such examination.

In similar fashion Article 15 E of the CTA contract allows faculty members to obtain copies of the information contained within his or her personnel file.   The CTA contract also states that information contained in faculty personnel files "shall be considered as confidential. Access shall be limited to those individuals authorized by the District on a need-to-know basis."

Fewer details are available regarding personnel files for managers. Administrative policy 7250 requires that managers receive copies of any evaluations and allows evaluations to be expunged from managerial personnel files after 4 years at the request of the manager.

Self-Evaluation
The institution complies with requirements that faculty and staff members have the ability to access their personnel records. There is no indication that the confidentiality of the personnel records of faculty or staff members has been compromised. However, at a Board of Trustees meeting in 2012 a confidential report concerning a high ranking district administrator was distributed to members of the public attending a meeting of the Board of Trustees.   The information was authored by a private investigator assigned to perform a required pre-employment background check and was addressed to a Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. The items distributed included sensitive information and the current residential address and phone number of the administrator. Distribution of this information indicates a serious breach of security and confidentiality and undermines trust in the operations of the Human Resources Department as a safe repository for confidential information.

Actionable Improvement Plan
None

III.A.4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.

Descriptive Summary
The SBVC Student Equity Plan forms a foundation of information and goals that correlates with the strategic plan to improve access and student success. The Enrollment Management and Student Equity Committee promote an appreciation of and support for diverse populations of students. The committee's charge is to serve "in an advisory capacity to the President's cabinet regarding enrollment. The Committee is responsible for reviewing internal and external assessment trend data as it applies to enrollment planning, research and review of successful models of recruitment and retention programs, projecting enrollment growth/decline, and planning academic and student support service needs based on enrollment trends. The committee makes recommendations regarding recruitment and retention strategies, in the annual update of the Enrollment Management Plan. Additionally, the committee reviews and regularly updates the Student Equity Plan. Both plans are forwarded to College Council for review.

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard.

Actionable Improvement Plan
None

III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.

Descriptive Summary
The institution's commitment to diversity is clearly voiced in our mission statement which asserts that "San Bernardino Valley College provides quality education and services that support a diverse community of learner*s*." Further evidence of the institutional commitment to diversity is found among the statements of values that support the mission statement. One such declaration is that "[we] believe that our strength as an institution is enhanced by the cultural diversity of our student population and staff."

The institution demonstrates its commitment to supporting diversity in a variety of ways. For instance, a question about diversity is included in the interview of all potential employees. Additionally the program review process requires that each program analyze demographic data to insure that their enrollment reflect the diversity of the campus. The importance of diversity is also honored by the establishment of organizations for faculty and staff such as the Black Faculty & Staff Association and the Latino Faculty, Staff, and Administrators Association. These organizations maintain a strong presence on the college's website and sponsor events such as the Black History Month Film Festival in February, Indigenous Peoples Day, and an annual display of Dia de los Muertos traditional altar art pieces at the campus art gallery. Such events lend cultural vibrancy to our campus.

Our diverse student population is supported by the establishment of services dedicated to diverse student populations, such as DSP&S, EOP&S, and the STAR Program. Additionally, the institution offers programs to support specific populations, such as the Puente Program for Hispanics and the Tumaini Program for African-American students. As stated above, the

program review process asks departments to assess and evaluate the diversity of students in the program compared to the general student population.

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard. The institution's policies and practices in promoting understanding of equity and diversity issues are fairly effective. The college's mission statement defines an accepting and welcoming environment for all students.
The effectiveness of such programs is assessed through the results of surveys and through an analysis of the percentages of students, for example, who use the services compared to the category of students in the student population overall.

Actionable Improvement Plan
None

III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses that its record in employment equity and diversity is consistent with its mission.

Descriptive Summary
The San Bernardino Community College District tracks employee diversity and reports data regarding the ethnicity of college employees to the office of the State Chancellor as required by law. Statistics regarding staff diversity are displayed for public perusal on the college website. San Bernardino Valley College is situated in an area of great cultural and ethnic diversity and the staff and faculty of the college echo the diversity of the surrounding community. As previously explained hiring pools are assessed to assure that the college has a diverse pool of qualified applicants from which to draw.

Based on data reported on the college website at http://www.valleycollege.edu/~/media/Files/SBCCD/SBVC/research/reports/StaffingReport_Gender_Ethnicity_FA12.pdf the ethnicity of the 383 permanent employees in fall, 2013, including Educational Managers, Tenure Track Faculty, and Classified staff at San Bernardino Valley college for fall 2012 was African American, 17.2%; Asian, 8.1%, Hispanic, 30.3%; White, non-Hispanic, 42.8%; and Native American, 1.0%.

A comparison of data available at the State Chancellors office of the ethnic makeup of SBVC staff in 2008 with the 2012 data reveals an increase in the percent Hispanic permanent employees, a decrease in percentage of white non-Hispanic employees and a slight decrease in the percentage of African American employees. The same trends are recognizable in comparisons of student ethnicity available at http://www.valleycollege.edu/~/media/Files/SBCCD/SBVC/research/reports/Ethnicity%20Trend.pd

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard. The College Brain Trust study (2014) ethnicity comparisons show disparity between the percentage of Hispanic students and the percentage of Hispanic employees. After several years of limited hiring, the campus is filling a number of vacancies. It is anticipated that ethnic ratios will rebalance.

Actionable Improvement Plan
None

III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.

Descriptive Summary

The institution has policies and procedures in place to protect personnel and students rights and to ensure that personnel and students are treated fairly. Board Policy 7100 addresses Diversity and Equal Opportunity Employment. BP 3410 addresses non-discrimination. BP 3430 and AP 3430 address harassment. CSEA and CTA contracts also protects personnel from discrimination.

Self-Evaluation

The institution meets the standard. Recent climate surveys of representative groups included questions designed to elicit information regarding opinion of the equity of treatment meted out to campus administration, faculty staff, and students. Managers agreed strongly that SBVC is free of bias due to gender or ethnicity and that the campus embraces diversity in sexual orientation, culture, and religion. Additionally 73% of managers agreed that "SBVC ensured fair employment practices for all personnel". A strong majority (75%) of faculty members agreed that diversity is valued at SBVC, but significant minorities expressed disagreement that hiring procedures are fair to all and are followed uniformly. A similar pattern held true for classified staff who reported that the campus is free of bias based on race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. However, only 49% found the campus "free of gender bias" and nearly a third of respondents failed to agree that hiring procedures are fair to all and uniformly followed.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

Descriptive Summary

Faculty members are offered training on a wide variety of topics. For instance, in faculty in STEM disciplines offer training about effective practices for STEM students Professional Development via the HACU grant partnered with the Community College of Denver (CCD) to explore and expand linked courses via learning communities and accelerated learning. CCD also presented two workshops at SBVC demonstrating their Learning Community and FastTrack models which include a strong counseling component. Other relevant training included electronic maintenance of student rosters, grades, and adding and dropping students, online course management systems such as Blackboard, teaching strategies, instructional skills, classroom assessment techniques, and Microsoft applications. In 2010-2011 the Professional Development program featured "The Artist's Way" workshops allowing faculty to tap into their creativity to improve instruction.

In the fall new faculty participate in a series of New Faculty Orientation meetings during which they are introduced to campus policies and procedures. Each spring, new faculty orientation culminates in the Great Teachers Retreat. This is an overnight weekend retreat principally for newly hired faculty, however all are welcome. Teaching strategies, best practices and teaching challenges are shared. Adjunct Faculty there is Orientation at the beginning of both fall and

spring semester to provide campus updates from instruction, student services, administrative services areas. In addition, items such as accreditation matters, SLO, teaching related topics are presented and discussed at times in small group format.

Professional development for managers has continued through various formats. When Dr. Daniels became the college president in fall, 2007, she initiated a new format of professional development for managers, called PALM (Program for the Advancement of Leadership for Managers.) The first set of workshops was facilitated by a consultant and focused on strengths and management skills. Following the initial phase, managers met once a month with professional development facilitated by a team of colleagues. Examples of topics include Enrollment Management, Accreditation, and Leading from your Strengths. Other meetings focused on campus business such as the rearrangement of divisions following the initial budget cuts.

Following the resignation of Dr. Daniels in February 2012, interim presidents returned to a management forum with some professional development and more dialog. In fall, 2013, the format evolved with two meetings a month. One meeting concentrated on campus dialog. The second meeting provided professional development sessions that focused on topics suggested by the managers, such as contracts. The District also provides opportunities for managers through webinars provided by a legal team, Liberty, Cassidy & Whitmore, such as a session called "Frequently Used Ed Code and Title 5 for Community College Districts."

Classified staff are welcome at all Professional Development events. Flex days and professional development days offer specialized training for classified staff. The annual Classified Appreciation Week is a campus tradition. Professional Development workshops are offered alongside lifestyle and exercise workshops.

State and federally mandated safety training such as chemical hygiene and hazardous materials communication as applicable to individual assignments is provided to all personnel. There are a variety of additional short generic online safety courses available to staff.

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard. The institution plans for and provides a variety of developmental training activities for personnel.

Actionable Improvement Plan
None

III.A.5a The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel

Descriptive Summary
San Bernardino Valley College has a Professional and Organizational Development department staffed with a Program Coordinator who plans organizes, promotes and executes events, workshops, and trainings for faculty, staff and mangers based on input from the Professional Development Committee and other campus constituencies. In fall 2011, due to the resignation of the Program Coordinator, the position was temporarily staffed by a faculty member on reassigned time. A new permanent Program Coordinator was hired during fall 2013.

Workshops on an assortment of topics are offered at varying times with varied formats (face-to-face and online) in order to meet the needs of faculty and staff. Some topics include: technology training (MS office, library systems, student services systems, and other online resources) training is regularly provided in preparation to teach online, included training in the use of Blackboard, the course management system currently used by the San Bernardino Community College District. Workshops are also conducted on personal and professional enrichment, safety and classroom assessment techniques.

Professional and Organizational Development also plans several events throughout the year; these events include: Four flex days throughout the year, Great Teachers' Seminar (a two-day seminar for faculty to meet and discuss teaching ideas, successes and challenges), New Faculty Orientation (meetings with new faculty throughout the semester to help them get acquainted with the College) and Classified Staff Appreciation Week (a week filled with workshops and social events geared towards enriching classified staff). The Program Coordinator also helps plan a portion of trainings on Opening Day for the fall and spring semester and Adjunct Faculty Orientation.

Many resources are offered online and readily available to faculty and staff such as, @ONE trainings, webinars and other California Educational Technology Collaborative programs. Our Distance Education department also conducts monthly webinars on topics such as Blackboard, accessibility, MS office software, and general computer use, they record each session and make them available online. The College has a license for Lynda.com which offers tutorials on software, leadership, interpersonal skills, etc. Professional and Organizational Development at San Bernardino Valley College also works with our district office, through Keenan and Associates, to schedule trainings on campus and at the district office   Topics include safety, sexual harassment, work station ergonomics, and stress management. District campus police works with Professional and Organizational Development to provide training for dealing with irate people, active shooter, threats and behavioral indicators and general safety. There is also environmental health and safety and emergency preparedness training for San Bernardino Valley College employees that is coordinated through Professional and Organizational Development.

Funding through Professional and Organizational Development provides the opportunity for staff and faculty to attend outside conferences, workshops, and seminars related to teaching, their discipline or general job duties. These requests come to the Professional and Organizational Development Committee for review and approval. Criteria are in place to establish that each department receives a maximum amount of funding to ensure that all faculty and staff from a variety of departments have the opportunity to attend outside activities.

Self-Evaluation
The institution meets the standard.

Actionable Improvement Plan
None

III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

At each event the program coordinator collects a sign-in sheet and for most activities we send out a survey to the attendees for feedback. Once a year, we also send out a larger Professional and Organizational Development survey campus wide to gain insight on planning for the upcoming year. The Professional and Organizational Development Program Coordinator also receives feedback at various campus committee meetings. Every spring, the Professional and Organizational Development Committee holds a planning retreat to evaluate the feedback received during the academic year and uses this information to start planning for next year's activities.

The Professional and Organizational Development Committee spends time at each meeting reviewing conference requests, discussing planned activities and brainstorming upcoming events. The committee is comprised of faculty, classified staff and management. This brings several perspectives to the discussion when planning activities for each group that Professional and Organizational Development works to serve. The Committee also works together to review faculty flex hours and sabbatical applications. In May 2013, the vision of the Professional and Organizational Committee was updated. And with the hiring the new program coordinator, a one year plan for the department was also created with guidance from the Committee. This plan will be updated annually during the Professional and Organizational Development Committee Planning Retreat.

Mission

The Professional Development Committee provides resources and leadership that actively engage all members of San Bernardino Valley College (SBVC) in continuous personal and professional growth

Vision

The Professional Development Committee will prepare and promote opportunities to improve knowledge, instruction, performance and services that support the success of SBVC's diverse community of learners for a changing educational environment. Updated 5/6/13 – by committee vote.

Self-Evaluation

The institution meets the standard. The college surveys professional development needs and evaluates activities.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

III.A.6. Human resources planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Descriptive Summary

To determine the need for more classified staff or faculty, the institution relies primarily on program review documents. The current model of Program review has a separate Needs Assessment in which staffing needs of the programs, departments, and divisions are reported and evaluated. In the Needs Assessment document, data such as program growth, faculty load, and weekly student contact hours (WSCH) are required to substantiate the need for classified staff or faculty. The Program Review Committee evaluates the data and the arguments for personnel. The needs are ranked across the campus. If there are funds for a position, the ranking from this document is used. The district works with the vice presidents and president to identify the number of positions that can be supported. Final decisions in regard to staffing are made by the president.

During the recent budget crisis, a hiring frost was placed across the district and the program review needs assessment process was suspended for a period of time. Only essential positions were replaced as staff retired or resigned, such as a nursing faculty position. New positions, such as the District's Health Safety Officer, were staffed due to safety considerations.

The decision to hire new managers is now most often a result of the strategic plan and is a decision made by the college president in conjunction with the Chancellor's Cabinet at the district level. The college president can move managers into other areas as he or she deems best. Typically, the president of the college dialogs with the Academic Senate about whether the position should be a management or faculty position. A recent example is the creation of a new management position, converting the Director of Nursing from a faculty to an Associate Dean position. As of late there has been a lack of collegial consultation with the Academic and Classified Senates concerning managerial positions and internal reorganization and alignments. The last examination of job duties for managers occurred in 2007/08. A job analysis of management positions was conducted by an external source. Job descriptions were reviewed with the consultant in spring 2008. Managers were allowed input into the drafts they received in the summer of 2008. The outcome was dismissed by then Chancellor Noelia Vela and managers were not informed of the consultant's conclusions. Reorganization of the managerial structure due to vacancies caused by retirements and other forms of attrition has led to an expansion of duties for many managers who now work outside their job descriptions

Human Resource planning at the District level is rudimentary. The 2010-2013 Long Range Staffing Plan offered little in way of analysis, anticipated increased staffing rather than the decreased staffing that occurred due to budget cuts, and offered no mitigation for the problems that arose due to the unpredictable pattern of attrition that occurred as a consequence of the large SERP that took place in 2010. The intended 2011 was unavailable when requested by members of the campus accreditation committee. Further updates to the plan were to have occurred annually, but have not. The District contracted with the College Brain Trust to create the 2014-2017. This plan was submitted to the Board in March 2014 [Evidence].

Self-Evaluation

The institution meets the standard. The Program Review process has had a meta-evaluation of its processes and as a result changes were implemented. For example, committee members are assigned as mentors to specific areas writing their program review (done every 3 years).

These mentors provide a review and suggestions to the authors of the document before the document is evaluated by the committee. This process is more supportive and less threatening for programs which in the past had difficulties presenting and explaining their program. Another change in recent years has been the contribution of the Research Department. Every department receives updated information on enrollment and success, as seen in the Education Master Plan, thus eliminating the need for the authors to find the needed the data. Finally, Needs Assessment separated from the former Program Review documents, so that every department with need can define and support their need each fall semester. The Program Efficacy portion of Program Review is conducted every three years. In conclusion, the Program Review format is continually evaluated and updated so that program effectiveness and need are clearly defined.

As previously stated, the current staffing pattern at SBVC is less a result of design than a result of the loss of employees due to the 2010 SERP, other forms of attrition, and the hiring "frost" imposed due to budget constraints during the period of fiscal crisis in California. Also, as previously stated identification of staffing needs through the current program review needs assessment process favors large academic programs which profit from the current program model because they can produce the type of data (faculty load and WSCH) used to substantiate need for resources including faculty and classified staff positions. The system does not work well for administrative support areas such as maintenance, custodial, and grounds. It also does not work well for vocational programs or academic programs that lack fulltime faculty. Such programs often are unable to produce data that results in access to fulltime faculty and support staff that might be able to build the program. Many such programs remain caught in a downward spiral due to their inability to access resources.

The 2014-2017 Long Range Staffing plan reviews and makes recommendations on district hiring and recruitment processes, addresses failed recruitments and the number of interim managers. The 2014-2017 Long Range Staffing plan proposes a simple decision making model to determine if vacancies should be filled or if duties of the position can be redistributed [Evidence].

Actionable Improvement Plan
Review recommendations set forth in the 2014-2017 Long Range Staffing Plan