



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.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.

Summary

SBVC, in recognition of its mission statement, strives to provide quality education to a diverse community of learners by assuring the excellence of its employees. The collegial 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 SBVC. Additionally, the value placed upon diversity is reflected in SBVC's mission statement and by BP7100, which expresses SBVC's 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 collegial consultation processes and are posted on the SBCCD's website. Ethics statements are meant to shape the professional behavior of SBVC employees. 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 receive diversity training from the Human Resources Department prior to service on a committee.

District AP7210 (6.1) 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 districtwide collegial consultation 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 AP7230 (6.2) describes the hiring procedures for nonmanagement classified staff. AP7320 was developed in consultation with the Classified Senate, Academic Senate, and District Assembly. AP7245 addresses the hiring of short-term hourly employees (6.3). AP7250 (6.4) is directed toward the hiring of management. The policy was addressed through the collegial consultation process with review and input by the Academic Senate, College Council, and District Assembly prior to submitting the final version to the board in July 2010.

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 AP7210 (6.1), Faculty, AP7230 (6.2), Classified Staff, and AP7250 (6.4), Management are available to the public on SBVC's 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 CCCCCO and in collaboration with the state Academic Senate. AP7210 (6.1) ensures that faculty are involved in the selection of new faculty. The administrative procedure specifically states that the majority of a faculty selection committee shall be composed of faculty. 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 hiring committee to assess the responses by the candidate.

All faculty are hired under the same faculty hiring process (SBCCD AP7210 [6.1], 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 DE 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.

SBVC'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 (6.5) 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 human resource 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 CCCs. Applicants for adjunct positions are subject to the same equivalency processes as candidates for full-time 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 SBVC's student population.

Classified staff. The CSEA bargaining unit and SBCCD then negotiate the job description, classification, title, required qualifications, and salary for the position in accord with Article 16.1 of the classified contract (6.6). 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. AP7230 (6.2) 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 Section 70901.2 of the California Education Code. 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 the Human Resources Department is present to assure that the proceedings of the committee remain 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, after which the president forwards it to the SBCCD. 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 through the SBVC 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 SBVC president, SBCCD 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 SBVC and SBCCD administration in consultation with Fiscal Services, and the Board of

Trustees. New management positions are not prioritized through program review needs assessment.

Once the decision to fill a new or vacated administrative position is made, the process described in AP7250 (6.4) 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 SBVC 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 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 Ccregistry.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 Title 5, CCR, Section 53021, the vacancy is publicized internally by the processes found in Article 15 of the contract between CSEA Chapter 291 (6.6) 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 accreditation 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, in 2010 changes were made to AP7230 (6.2) to include “Each Screening Committee will also include an Equal Employment Opportunity representative designated by the Office of Human Resources” (6.7). Human

Resources uses Keenan *SafeColleges*, an online equal employment opportunity (EEO) training. New employees under EEO train (6.8) during orientation. Current and active employees are provided the online training as the need arises (6.9).

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 (6.6) were not consistently applied. That may have been because instructions to potential applicants on the SBCCD 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 SBCCD 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 was accompanied by a reason for denial. The SBCCD and classified bargaining unit have now crafted a MOU to avoid inconsistency in the future (6.10).

In other instances, hiring relied on past practices and was not part of the administrative procedure. For instance, 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 e-mail dated February 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 districtwide collegial consultation body (6.11).

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 a classified staff position. In the period between 2008 and 2011, two different procedures were used (6.12). The inconsistencies in the classified staff hiring process were resolved with the approval of AP7230 (6.2), which describes the classified hiring procedure. AP9230 was developed through collegial processes and approved in its present form in January of 2011.

There are occurrences where written procedures do not include past practice, which leads to inconsistent hiring procedures as past practice is sometimes observed and sometimes not. For instance, AP7250 (6.4) 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 VPSS or the VPAS.

All of the aforementioned occurrences may be attributed to the high rate of turnover in the Human Resources Department. The inconsistencies in hiring practices have been identified and resolved; however, as recommend in the SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 (6.14), stability in the Human Resources Department would ensure consistency in Human Resource 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 (see Table 26).

Table 26. *Student and Faculty Campus Climate Surveys*

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.	n/a	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.	n/a	81% (582) agree	79% (176) agree	80% (396) agree
In general, office workers are courteous.	n/a	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

Actionable Improvement Plan

1. The recommendations of SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 (6.14) will be reviewed in fall 2014 using collegial and transparent processes and will be implemented as appropriate.

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

SBVC 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 SBVC'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 (6.15). 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 SLOs established for the program area in which the faculty serves. A 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" (6.16).

The process used for faculty evaluation undergoes periodic review to ensure that the process remains effective and fair. This process is described in Article 16, item C of the CTA contract. Accordingly, such reviews are conducted by the tools 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 in Article 16 Section D of the CTA contract (6.15, 6.17).

Classified staff. The evaluation process for classified staff is described by Article 13 of the contract between SBCCD and CSEA Chapter 291 (6.6). 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 12-month probationary period in order to comply with 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.

Administrators and managers. BP7251 (6.18) states that "the 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." AP7251 (6.19) 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 he or she finds acceptable to serve on the evaluation committee. The list of three faculty candidates for service on the evaluation committee is submitted to the Academic Senate so that the members may select an individual from the list for participation; similarly, CSEA selects a representative in the managerial evaluation process from the list of classified employees.

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 a list of three faculty and classified staff members he or she finds acceptable for service on the evaluation committee. 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. AP7251 (6.19) states that "evaluation reports shall not be retained in the file beyond a four-year period if the manager requests they be expunged."

Chancellor. BP2175 (6.20) 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" (6.21). AP2175 (6.21) 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 to effectiveness in performing 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. SBVC believes that maintaining high-quality personnel directly contributes to institutional effectiveness.

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

Classified staff. Statistics presented in the 2010 Long-Range Staffing Plan indicated that as of June 30, 2010, 16 evaluations of the 225 classified staff members then employed at SBVC

were overdue by more than 30 days. Data for 2011-2012 indicate improvement since 2010. One hundred percent of the respondents indicated that evaluations of classified staff occurred in a manner consistent with the contract between CSEA Chapter 291 and the SBCCD. The SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 shows 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's adherence to the evaluation procedures for classified staff.

Administrators and managers. The 2010-2013 Long-Range Staffing Plan, authored by the chancellor of human resources, presented statistics that indicated that evaluations were overdue for 13 of the 25 managers then employed at SBVC. Additionally, in 2010, 14 out of 27 management evaluations at the SBCCD 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 (6.22).

On February 11, 2014, Human Resources reported that there were a total of four management evaluations past due this fiscal year. The SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 shows that one management evaluation was overdue. Evaluation of interim managers was discussed at District Assembly during spring 2013 (6.23). The vice chancellor of human resources reviewed AP7251, 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 AP7251 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.

AP7251, regarding the evaluation of managers, was reviewed in College Council in spring 2014. Changes specifically addressing the evaluation of interim managers were recommended. AP7251 was forwarded to Academic Senate, Classified Senate, District Assembly, and the Board of Trustees for further feedback and is still undergoing review.

SBCCD has the authority to decline to renew a manager's contract without stating a 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 that 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 SBCCD 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 four years conflicts with BP3310 (6.24), which designates evaluations as permanent records.

Chancellor. SBCCD has not consistently evaluated chancellors in accord with stated policies. The written procedure (AP2175) requires that he/she be evaluated “once per year for the first two years” of service as chancellor. A special meeting of the Board of Trustees on September 24, 2009 (6.25), details trustees’ and the evaluation committee’s concerns with AP2175 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 chose not to evaluate the chancellor between April 2011 and April 2012 because they wished to review and update AP2175. The chancellor gave a self-evaluation to the board in fall 2012 and was evaluated under the terms of his contract.

AP2175 was accepted by the board on May 9, 2013, after being approved by the District Assembly. Human resources stated that since the revisions to AP2175 were approved, the chancellor’s evaluation was conducted according to procedure. All constituencies were invited to participate on the evaluation committee. However, AP2175 states that the 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, October 10, 2013-April 24, 2014. The chancellor’s evaluation was completed on April 24, 2014, and the chancellor’s contract was extended for four years (6.26).

Faculty. In 2012, 85 percent 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 SLOs into the faculty evaluation. A MOU (6.16) 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

1. SBVC will establish better processes for tracking and completing employee evaluations.

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

SBVC began addressing the issue of SLOs in 2006. At that time faculty and staff identified CCs that are major abilities and identified competencies expected of a student graduating from college. Faculty then identified two to four CCs for each course. Upon completion of the classes required for the associate's degree, each student will have addressed all the CCs. The practice of identifying the CCs addressed in a particular class is maintained as courses are created, updated, modified, and submitted to the curriculum committee. CCs were assessed in fall 2013 (6.27).

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 percent of courses had defined student outcomes and 85 percent of courses have ongoing assessments (6.28). Following assessments, results were discussed and plans were formulated for improvement. Staff and service areas on campus also dialoged and identified SLOs (see Standards IIA, IB, 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. Noninstructional areas wrote SAOs. According to the 2012 ACCJC annual report 98 percent of programs (certificates and degrees) had established program SLOs, but only 2 percent of program had been assessed. By fall 2013, the number of programs assessed had progressed to 20 percent (6.28). The campus responded to this in spring 2014 by engaging Dr. David Marshall of CSUSB, to conduct a series of workshops focusing on PLO assessment strategies (6.29).

Progress in SLO assessment slowed during negotiations between CTA and SBCCD 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 MOU included additional compensation for assessment and development of SLOs and incorporated consideration of faculty participation in SLO achievement into the faculty evaluation process (6.13).

Since the ratification of the MOU, considerable progress on SLOs has been made. A short-term procedure plan for SLO assessment was implemented in fall 2013 (6.30). The plan focuses on achieving ongoing assessment for all courses. CCs and PLOs have been or are in the process of being aligned with course SLOs. CCs were assessed based on alignment in fall 2013 (6.28). SLO and PLO 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 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 ASLO Committee, and the continuing need for faculty members to be reassigned to coordinate SLOs.

Additionally, concerns that arose from the CC assessment will be addressed. Campus progress on outcomes is illustrated in Table 27:

Table 27. *SBVC Progress on Outcomes*

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. CCs have been assessed. Program assessment is being guided through a series of workshops. The ASLO Committee has formulated assessment plans and timelines that have been shared with the Instructional Cabinet, Academic Senate, faculty chairs, and other consultation committees and vested groups.

As previously stated, a MOU 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 (6.31).

Actionable Improvement Plan

1. Professional development will provide expanded training and opportunities to engage the campus in dialogs on SLOs, learning, and success.

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

Descriptive Summary

In addition to the SBVC mission statement, the campus has identified values that express its basic beliefs. These tenets are widely published in venues such as the annual College 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 (6.32).

Faculty. The ethics statement for the faculty of SBVC 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 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 (6.33). 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 collegial consultation process (6.34).

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 (6.35).

Board of Trustees. The ethical behavior expected of a member of the Board of Trustees of the SBCCD is specifically addressed by BP2010 (6.36), 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 (6.37) and may include public sanction by other members of the board, ethics training as described by AB1234 (6.38), 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 Trustees, 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 BP3410 (Nondiscrimination), BP2260 (Conflict of Interest), BP3430 (Prohibition of Harassment), and BP7310 (Nepotism; 6.29). Additionally SBVC supplies an instrument for anonymous reporting of ethical infractions. The compliance hotline webpage states that SBVC “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 telephone.

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 III.A.1, recommendations for filling faculty positions and classified staffing needs are generated through the campus program review needs assessment process (6.40). 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. The 2010-2013 Long Range 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. The *Human Resources Standard Operating Procedures [SOP] Manual* has been completed in draft form since 2010. Absent a permanent human resources director and vice chancellor and the current and existing priorities, the manual has been on hold. The Human Resources manual serves as the operating procedures and processing guidelines for the Human Resources staff.

For a significant period of time covered by this report, SBVC, 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, the

needs assessment was urgent for facilities, equipment, and technology needs (6.41). Since 2012, a full needs assessment process has been conducted each fall.

The crisis in educational funding in California had a profound effect on the number of employees at SBVC. In 2008, SBVC was served by 425 permanent employees. In 2010, SBCCD offered a retirement incentive program to its employees. On June 30, 2010, 35 employees left SBVC. 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 full-time faculty positions was diminished from 171 to 148. Classified staff positions fell from 228 to 218 (6.14).

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 full-time 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 percent. 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 (VPSS, VPAS, and VPI) were simultaneously vacant. For a period of time, a single interim served as both the president of SBVC and as the VPSS.

Self-Evaluation

The institution meets the standard. The campus is served well by the current program review needs assessment model; the programs 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 weighs the needs of the whole campus. When examining the top ten faculty prioritization rankings from the past three needs assessment cycles, approximately 66 percent of the top ten rankings were for faculty in academic departments with one or no full-time faculty. As 68 percent of the academic departments on campus have one or no full-time faculty, the Program Review Committee’s recommendations are aligned with SBVC. Similarly, when examining the top ten classified prioritization rankings from July 2008 through October 2011, 36.6 percent of the positions represented student services and instruction, 26.6 percent of the positions represented administrative services. Administrative services departments have not submitted requests for classified employees in the past two needs assessment cycles (6.42).

The number of faculty hired since fall 2009 does not align with the percentage of academic departments on campus that have one or no full-time faculty. Twenty-six replacement and growth faculty were hired for instructional positions from fall 2008 through spring 2014; of these 38 percent 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 percent administrative services, 41 percent instruction, and 59 percent student services.

It is difficult to tell which faculty and 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 and four faculty were hired to maintain the minimum faculty needed for accreditation (6.43).

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 percent of the faculty hired should support departments with one or no full-time faculty. The use of these recommendations is subject to a number of factors: the number of 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 full-time faculty. The second Senate resolution approved by the Academic Senate in fall 2012 addressed an 80 percent 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 (6.44).

SBVC has been unable to recruit and hire desirable candidates for administrative vacancies. The VPSS position has also been filled by interims since October 2011. For a significant period of time the offices of VPSS 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 may explain the exodus of administrators from the campus (6.14).

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 SBVC to attract and retain staff members. In some cases, lower salaries for classified positions at SBVC in comparison with nearby college districts may have contributed to the departure of confidential and technical staff from SBVC. In some cases, it 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. SBCCD and CTA negotiating teams reached an agreement for salary increases in spring 2014 (6.45).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None.

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 III.A.1, SBVC 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, and so forth.

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 collegial consultation body with representatives from SBVC, SBCCD, and CHC. Additional procedures originate in the Human Resources Department.

Human Resources Department program review documents are available online (6.46) and show that the department originally planned to review and update its policies and procedures and to produce a Human Resources 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 completion 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

The institution meets the standard. Although, here is no handbook that gathers all policies and procedures in a single reference, policies and procedures are established. A high rate of turnover in Human Resources has resulted in some cases when policies and procedures are updated but managers are not informed of changes or forms are not updated to reflect the changes.

Climate surveys found that 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 (6.47).

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 Human Resources SOP Manual has been completed in draft form since 2010. Absent a permanent human resources director and vice chancellor and the current and existing priorities, the manual has been on hold. The Human Resources 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.

Descriptive Summary

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 (6.6) 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 (6.15) allows faculty members to obtain copies of the information contained within their personnel files. 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 SBCCD on a need-to-know basis.

Fewer details are available regarding personnel files for managers. AP7250 (6.4) requires that managers receive copies of any evaluations and allows evaluations to be expunged from managerial personnel files after four years at the request of the manager.

Self-Evaluation

The institution meets the standard. SBVC 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, a one-time incident occurred at a Board of Trustees meeting in 2012. A confidential report concerning a required preemployment background check that included

sensitive information was distributed. Distribution of this information indicates a serious breach of security and confidentiality.

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 (6.48) 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 promotes 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 they apply 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 (6.49). Additionally, the committee reviews and regularly updates the Student Equity Plan. Both plans are forwarded to the 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

SBVC's commitment to diversity is clearly voiced in its mission statement, which asserts that "San Bernardino Valley College provides quality education and services that support a diverse community of learners." Further evidence of the institutional commitment to diversity is found among the statements of values that support the mission statement (6.32). 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."

SBVC 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 (6.50). Additionally, the program review process (6.51) requires that each program analyze demographic data to ensure that its enrollment reflects 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 and 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 (6.52). Such events lend cultural vibrancy to the SBVC campus.

SBVC's 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, SBVC offers programs to support specific populations, such as the Puente Program for Hispanics and the Tumaini Program for African American students (6.53). 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. SBVC'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 SBCCD tracks employee diversity and reports data regarding the ethnicity of college employees to the CCCCO as required by law. Statistics regarding staff diversity are displayed for public perusal on the College website. SBVC 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 SBVC has a diverse pool of qualified applicants from which to draw.

Based on data reported on the College website, the ethnicity of the 383 permanent employees in fall 2013 (6.54), including educational managers, tenure track faculty, and classified staff at SBVC for fall 2012 was African American, 17.2 percent; Asian, 8.1 percent, Hispanic, 30.3 percent; White, non-Hispanic, 42.8 percent; and Native American, 1.0 percent.

A comparison of data available at the CCCCO of the ethnic makeup of SBVC staff in 2008 with the 2012 data reveals an increase in the percentage of Hispanic permanent employees, a decrease in percentage of White non-Hispanic employees and a slight decrease in the percentage of African American employees, which is comparable to trends of student ethnicity (6.55).

Self-Evaluation

The institution meets the standard. However, the SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 (6.14) notes that ethnicity comparisons show disparity between the percentage of Hispanic students and the percentage of Hispanic employees. After several years of limited hiring, SBVC is filling a number of vacancies. It is anticipated that ethnic ratios will rebalance.

Actionable Improvement Plan

1. The recommendations of SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 will be reviewed in fall 2014 using collegial and transparent processes and will be implemented as appropriate.

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. BP7100 addresses diversity and equal opportunity employment. BP3410 addresses nondiscrimination. BP3430 and AP3430 address harassment (6.39). CSEA (6.6) and CTA (6.15) contracts also protect personnel from discrimination.

Self-Evaluation

The institution meets the standard. Recent climate surveys (6.47) of representative groups included questions designed to elicit information regarding opinions 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 percent of managers agreed that "SBVC ensured fair employment practices for all personnel." A strong majority (75 percent) 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 percent 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, faculty in STEM disciplines are offered training about effective practices for STEM students Professional development via the HACU/Walmart grant partnered with the Community College of Denver to explore and expand linked courses via learning communities and accelerated learning. The Community College of Denver also presented two workshops at SBVC demonstrating their Learning Community and FastTrack models, which include a strong counseling component (6.56). 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 (6.57).

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. For adjunct faculty, there is orientation at the beginning of both fall and spring semester to provide campus updates from instruction, student services, and administrative services areas. In addition, items such as accreditation matters, SLO, and teaching-related topics are presented and discussed at times in small group format (6.58).

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 the Program for the Advancement of Leadership for Managers (PALM). 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 (6.59).

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. SBCCD 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” (6.60).

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 (6.61).

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 (6.62).

Self-Evaluation

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

Actionable Improvement Plan

None.

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

Descriptive Summary

SBVC 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 managers 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 (Microsoft [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 SBCCD. Workshops are also conducted on personal and professional enrichment, safety, and classroom assessment techniques (6.63).

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 toward 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 (6.58).

Many resources are offered online and are readily available to faculty and staff, such as @ONE trainings, webinars, and other California educational technology collaborative programs. SBVC's DE Department also conducts monthly webinars on topics such as Blackboard, accessibility, MS Office software, and general computer use; the department records each session and makes the session available online. The College has a license for Lynda.com, which offers tutorials on software, leadership, interpersonal skills, and so forth. Professional and Organizational Development at SBVC also works with SBCCD, 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 shooters, threats and behavioral indicators, and general safety. There is also environmental health and safety and emergency preparedness training

for SBVC employees that is coordinated through Professional and Organizational Development (6.64).

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 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, SBVC sends out a survey to the attendees for feedback. Once a year, SBVC also sends out a larger professional development survey campuswide 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 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 (6.65).

The Professional Development Committee spends time at each meeting reviewing conference requests, discussing planned activities, and brainstorming upcoming events. The committee is composed of faculty, classified staff, and management. This brings several perspectives to the discussion when planning activities for each group that the Professional and Organizational Development Department works to serve. The committee also works together to review faculty flex hours and sabbatical applications. In May 2013, the vision of the Professional Development Committee was updated. And with the hiring of 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 Development Committee Planning Retreat (6.66).

Mission. The Professional Development Committee provides resources and leadership that actively engage all members of 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. This was updated May 6, 2013, 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, SBVC 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 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. SBCCD 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 (6.40, 6.42).

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 (6.43).

The decision to hire new managers is now most often a result of the Strategic Plan and is a decision made by the SBVC 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 (6.66). There has been limited collegial consultation with the Academic and Classified Senates concerning managerial positions, internal reorganization, and alignments in student services and administrative services.

The last examination of job duties for managers occurred in 2007-2008. 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 Resources 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 CBT to create the SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017. This plan was submitted to the board in March 2014 (6.14).

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 three 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 that 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 EMP, thus eliminating the need for the authors to find the needed data. Finally, needs assessment separated from the former program review documents, so that every department with a need can define and support its need each fall semester. The program efficacy portion of program review is conducted every four 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.

The SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 (6.24) reviews and makes recommendations on district hiring and recruitment processes, addresses failed recruitments and the number of interim managers. The SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 proposes a simple decision-making model to determine if vacancies should be filled or if duties of the position can be redistributed (6.14).

Actionable Improvement Plan

1. The recommendations of SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017 will be reviewed in fall 2014 using collegial and transparent processes and will be implemented as appropriate.
2. The Hayes Group Salary Study will be reviewed using collegial processes and implemented as appropriate.

Evidence—Human Resources

- 6.1 AP7210
- 6.2 AP7230
- 6.3 AP7245
- 6.4 AP7250
- 6.5 District Request for Equivalency
- 6.6 California School Employees Association Contract
- 6.7 District Assembly Minutes March 2, 2010, pp. 2-3
- 6.8 Keenan Safe Colleges Website
- 6.9 E-mail from Human Resources
- 6.10 Representative Evidence: Memorandum of Understanding; 2010-2013 Long-Range Staffing Plan; California School Employees Association Contract Article 15
- 6.11 Senate Resolution SP08-06; E-mail Dated February 2, 2010
- 6.12 Representative Evidence—Tort, Letters, E-mail, Minutes
- 6.13 May 2010 Minutes of District Assembly
- 6.14 SBCCD Three-Year Staffing Plan 2014-2017
- 6.15 California Teachers Association Faculty Contract
- 6.16 SBCCD/California Teachers Association Memorandum of Understanding Regarding SLOs
- 6.17 Academic Senate Minutes
- 6.18 BP7251
- 6.19 AP7251
- 6.20 BP2175
- 6.21 AP2175
- 6.22 Representative Evidence: Board Minutes September 15, 2011; 2010-2013 Long-Range Staffing Plan; 2014-2017 Long-Range Staffing Plan
- 6.23 District Assembly Minutes spring 2013
- 6.24 BP3310
- 6.25 Minutes of Board of Trustees on September 24, 2009
- 6.26 Representative Agendas and Minutes: Board of Trustees, Academic Senate
- 6.27 Core Competency Assessment PPTs
- 6.28 ACCJC Annual Report 2013
- 6.29 Representative Samples—Dr. Marshall’s Training
- 6.30 Outcomes Processes
- 6.31 Faculty Evaluations
- 6.32 Mission and Values Statements
- 6.33 Faculty Ethics Statement
- 6.34 Statement and College Council Minutes
- 6.35 Representative Samples
- 6.36 BP2010
- 6.37 AP2010
- 6.38 AB1234
- 6.39 Policies and Procedures Page
- 6.40 Program Review Needs Assessment
- 6.41 Campuswide Needs Assessment E-mail September 9, 2011

- 6.42 Program Review Needs Assessment Prioritization Lists 2008-2013; Faculty Seniority List, 2013; President's Opening Day Presentation fall 2013, spring 2014
- 6.43 Opening Day PPTs with New Hires
- 6.44 Senate Resolutions
- 6.45 California Teachers Association Agreement
- 6.46 Human Resources Program Efficacy
- 6.47 Campus Climate Surveys
- 6.48 SBVC Student Equity Plan
- 6.49 SBVC Enrollment Plan
- 6.50 Sample Applications
- 6.51 Representative Samples—Program Efficacy
- 6.52 Representative Samples
- 6.53 Correct Student Services Page
- 6.54 SBVC Employee Gender and Ethnicity fall 2012
- 6.55 SBVC Ethnicity Trends
- 6.56 Representative Samples—Learning Community and FastTrack Workshops
- 6.57 Representative Samples—Artist's Way
- 6.58 Representative Samples—Professional
- 6.59 Representative Samples—Program for the Advancement of Leadership for Managers
- 6.60 Representative Samples—SBCCD Manager Training
- 6.61 Representative Samples—Classified Week
- 6.62 Representative Samples—Hazardous Materials Courses
- 6.63 Representative Samples—Professional Development Workshops
- 6.64 Representative Samples—Safety Training
- 6.65 Representative Samples—Professional Development Retreat
- 6.66 Minutes of Professional Development Committee