Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2015

Name of Department: Grant Development and Management

Efficacy Team: Todd Heibel, Melinda Moneymaker, Sheri Lillard

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Continuation

This report is thorough, well-organized, and contains abundant examples to validate the efforts and successes (and challenges) of this program. This report reflects much work that was created from the ground up, in order to portray the purpose and functions of the Grants program. This office is generating significant grants income with a skeleton staff, and they indicate repeatedly the dire need for additional personnel.

The committee recognizes the significant work put forward by this Program to create an EMP and develop SAOs in preparation for this efficacy review. Although the EMP does contain all of the narrative areas, in the future, it should follow the specific formatting developed by the Research Office for consistency across the programs.

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	**Meets**
Part I: Access		
Demographics	*The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population*	*The program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance.* *If warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet.
Our assumption is that this demographic information has been obtained from the submitted grant proposals targeted for HSIs and MSIs (Hispanic and Minority Serving Institutions). The author provides a unique view of the demographics of their program, by looking at it in this way.

Although the data are provided, there is not an <u>analysis</u> of these data. Moreover, there is not a comparison of these program demographics to the campus demographics. Because the comparison is missing, there is also not a discussion about any identified variances.

In the future, please be sure to compare the demographics associated with your targeted demographics, to those of the overall campus.

Pattern of Service	*The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.*	*The program provides <u>evidence</u> that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs.* *If warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.

This pattern of service meets the needs of the institution. The office is open M – F, 8:00 – 5:00. In addition, the grant department communicates in person and by phone or email with faculty, staff, and administrators as needed.

Part II: Student Success		
Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success	*Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.*	*Program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.* *If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.
The grant department indicates that they respond explicitly to funding opportunities designed to improve student success. Through narrative, tabular, and graphical means, the program provides ample evidence for how it supports student success. The committee appreciates these specifics. For example, for the HSI STEM PASS GO grant, data are provided that compare success and retention of students attending Supplemental Instruction (SI) funded by the grant, compared to the campus. The results show an improvement in biology, chemistry, and math from about 60% to about 90% in terms of success, and improvement in retention from about 85% to nearly 100% (for those students attending SI sessions).

There are several other examples provided that demonstrate how the grants awarded to the campus are favorably impacting student success.

Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes	*Program has not demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*	*Program has demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.
This is the first efficacy report ever required by this program. As such, there has not been any work in this area thus far.

The author has done an outstanding job writing concrete SAOs, as well as including specific measurable outcomes. It is our understanding that these outcomes will begin to be measured, and the next full efficacy should reflect these measurements and evaluation.

Part III: Institutional Effectiveness		
Mission and Purpose	*The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.*	*The program has a mission, and it links clearly with the institutional mission.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.
The program has a mission and it clearly links with the mission of the institution by supporting student learning.

Productivity	*The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.*	*The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.
This section is very well-organized, addressing many different areas and measures to assess productivity (such as partnerships, compliance with federal and state regulations, time to respond to requests, and increasing grant awards). For grant developers, a grant department is generally considered to be effective when it generates approximately $300,000 per year per FTE employee. This program shows that for 2012, 2013, and 2014, it has generated $377,908, $641,227, and $729,354 per FTE, respectively.
.
Although they have tried unsuccessfully to advocate for additional staff, the program indicates that their productivity could be further improved if they had a clerical staff assigned to their area.

Relevance, Currency, Articulation	*The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.*	*The program provides evidence that the curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program. Appropriate courses have been articulated or transfer with UC/CSU, or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses.*
	Out of date course(s) that are not launched into Curricunet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.	

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: N/A

Part IV: Planning		
Trends	*The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.*	*The program identifies and describes major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.
The program lists a major trend as being the funding directions of the state and federal agencies (e.g., the State is focused on K-12 to college career pathways, and the Federal Dept. of Education is focusing on the importance of noncognitive factors in student success). They are being proactive to stay on top of current trends by reading grant literature, soliciting information from faculty and staff based on these ideas, and developing projects to meet these needs.

The program states:

> For grants such as the National Science Foundation Grant in water technology, new courses were developed in water distribution and conservation. These should attract new students and increase enrollment in this discipline. Also, the grant aimed to increase the number of women and minority students enrolled in water fields, so enrollment is impacted this way as well.
>
> In developing proposals, we take into account timelines for approval of new curriculum, inserting required material into the course catalog, and scheduling of classes. We try to anticipate actual usage of services, and sometimes we succeed and sometimes vastly underestimate the success of project elements, such as tutoring. For the PASS GO grant, the tutoring component was so successful, we met our 5-year objective in the first term.

In addition, they include a strategic role of grants and planning to incorporate strengths.

Accomplishments	*The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.*	*The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.
The strengths of the Grants program are that they are timely and strategic, respond to trends in education and funding agencies, and the ability to highlight SBVC as a successful institution for purposes of grant funding.

They are incorporating these strengths into their planning by building on successful programs, such as incorporating the grant-funded Supplemental Instruction into other programs across campus. Also, they took components of the HACU Walmart grant (paired and accelerated courses) and will build these aspects into future grant proposals. Finally, they took a research opportunity with UCR (from the MSEIP grant) and have expanded it in an application to the US Dept. of Agriculture.

Weaknesses/challenges	*The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.*	*The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.
This program identifies the following challenges: The need to institutionalize programs and positions previously grant-funded, the ability to be able to discern the many grants that exist for our college's demographics, and the success in receiving grants (and shortage of human capital) impeding the ability to develop new project proposals. The program reiterates that challenges AND weaknesses at the highest level of SBVC include a resistance to institutionalizing people as part of this plan (including many details documenting such resistance).

Planning includes building new projects and programs, based on successful ones, and seeking and responding to additional opportunities for partnerships as they arise from funders or potential partners. For example, the Grants office works closely with the Office of Research and Planning, to align grant objectives with the college's strategic plan. The overload of work in their department (due to lack of staff) diminishes their ability to develop new projects. Since the office opened in 2010, they have had to start everything from scratch. These challenges have been addressed by utilizing grant-searching software, to assist with locating grant opportunities. Now that they have this software in place, it should allow them to become both accountable and efficient.

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate		
	Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.	*Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.*
	Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.	*Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets.
Technology. The program now has Streamlink, a software that provides them a searchable grants database and management of the grant awards. Given the increase in awarded grants, the management software is a key component of being a fully functioning and compliant grant office. They are also incorporating technology requests into grant projects, which will in turn increase the technology on campus to support student instruction.

Partnerships. The grants program has *numerous* partnerships, both internal and external. Examples include, CSUB, UCR, California State Dept. of Energy, among others.

Campus Climate. The office uses the campus climate survey, works with the Office of Research and Planning, and attends faculty, staff, and student meetings in order to gain the perspective of the campus in order to fill gaps or address pressing needs.

Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories	
Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.	*Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no "Does not Meets" in the previous efficacy review):
N/A