

largely from the perspective of providing fair compensation for faculty chairs. At this point, the college is looking forward to the hiring of a new vice chancellor of educational services and a new vice chancellor of human resources, both underway in spring 2022, to get some traction on this issue. Person responsible: Vice Chancellor, Human Resources.

*IV.D.2: Reform and renovate the district annual unit review process. Timeline: 2018-2019.  
Person responsible: KCCD Chancellor.*

Implemented. One of the recommendations that came out of the initial meetings of the District-Wide Budget Committee in spring 2018 was to reform and renovate the district annual unit review (DAUR) process (MR-41). The sub-committee had evaluated existing documents and processes associated with the budget development and DAUR process at KCCD, researched processes and resources for district planning at other multi-college districts, and made a series of pointed recommendations to increase effectiveness. The recommendations were acted upon in spring 2021 when the topic was picked back up again in a series of budget committee meetings (MR-42). The revised DAUR template and timeline—together with a survey instrument for gathering constituent feedback—was implemented ahead of the fall 2022 DAUR process (MR-43, MR-44).

## 6. Institutional Reporting on Quality Improvements

### 6.A. Response to Recommendations for Improvement

*In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the college should develop evaluation criteria for resource allocation decisions. (I.B.9, III.D.2, III.D.3)*

Implemented. In responding to this recommendation in academic year 2019-2020, the college's Budget Development Committee (BDC) started by establishing a rubric to be applied to resources requested through the annual integrated planning cycle. BDC minutes through the spring 2020 semester show the idea was to use the rubric to develop a ranked list of resources that would objectively guide allocation decisions (MR-45). While the rubric was being shared with the Academic Senate and Administrative Cabinet for feedback, it was simultaneously used in an experimental mode alongside the BDC's typical budget-building dialogue. Initially, this first application focused only on resources identified in the college's resource request analyses (information technology, facilities, professional development, and marketing) and one-time requests. At the end of the semester, the committee debriefed, identified several changes for improvement, and formed the following guiding principles:

- The rubric is used to predominantly guide or heavily inform the recommendation of the budget committee related to funding requests.
- Considering available funding, lower rated items may be recommended for funding, with an explanation of why the decision was made.
- Although there may be sufficient funds available to fund all requests, the BDC may not recommend all requests.

Although the original intent was to implement the rubric starting with the annual integrated planning cycle of fall 2020 for budget building 2021-22, there were too many adjustments to make. So the “go live” was delayed an additional cycle while feedback from the first year was incorporated into the rubric and workflow. The revised rubric was presented to the Academic Senate and Administrative Cabinet for review, and it was again applied experimentally alongside the budget building process in spring 2021. This time, the committee expanded the application to encompass any new line-item requests within an organizational budget. The rubric was evaluated again at the end of the budget process, several areas were identified for improvement, and it was determined that in the next cycle that the rubric could be applied to all budget increases (**MR-46**).

In fall 2021, the committee made a series of final adjustments based on feedback from the second year. It developed an explanatory document for faculty chairs and administrators that included definitions, examples, and explanations of high and low ratings. And it agreed that because transparency is crucial to the process, average ratings and the prioritized list will be posted on the annual planning website. The rubric and the explanatory document were distributed to faculty and administrators and posted to the integrated planning website at the end of September 2021 prior to the planning and budget cycle for 2022-23 (**MR-47, MR-48, MR-49**).

#### 6.B. Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance:

##### *Student Learning Outcomes*

One of the strengths of the college’s SLO system is that the college Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC) chair is a full-time faculty member with release time. For a small college, this has enabled a very hands-on coaching approach to SLO adoption and assessment by faculty. It has allowed for individual outreach and training at flex days and other faculty-centered professional development opportunities (**MR-50**). And it has enabled a very close relationship with the program review committee, which is also chaired by a full-time faculty member with release time. The first read of a program review simultaneously comes through OAC for review and evaluation. Program review drafts are objectively reviewed by a rubric and feedback and suggestions for change are provided to the program review committee chair (**MR-51**). A five-year schedule of SLO assessments is a required component of the program review template (**MR-52**). And the OAC chair and the program review chair sit on each other’s committees.

Even with individual outreach, the College is struggling with not all departments submitting assessment results or providing feedback and other assessment information to the committee. An email is sent out to faculty chairs each semester and follow up is made to see if assistance is needed. But the emails are not always responded to by some departments. SLO mapping to GELO’s and ILO’s is another area the college recognizes it can improve on. SLO mapping should improve with implementation of the new outcomes assessment system as described above in the plan arising from Standard I.B.6. The College is looking forward to having a better method of monitoring courses, being able to review completed assessments at a glance, and more easily finding and repairing missing or broken connections. One recent big step forward was the