RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT – GRANTS
2016-2017 SIX YEAR PROGAM REVIEW

A. Program Description and Goals

This section addresses the big picture. Prompts should help you describe your program and goals and the relationship to the institutional mission, vision and goals, and how the program is funded.

1. Describe the program and/or service area under review and how the program supports the mission of Santa Monica College.

The primary goal of Santa Monica College's Grants Office is to support faculty, staff, and administrators in their efforts to successfully pursue, obtain, and manage public and private grant funding in support of SMC's mission and the college's goals and priorities. To accomplish this goal, the office assists interested members of the college community to navigate the college's grant development and grant management processes. In doing so, the Grants Office helps faculty, staff, and programs secure the resources necessary to develop, implement and sustain innovative services that work to achieve the mission, goals, outcomes and priorities of the college. All grants submitted by the Grants Office are aligned with the mission of the college and one or more of the college's Supporting Goals, Institutional Learning Outcomes, and/or Strategic Initiatives.

2. Identify the overarching goal(s) or charge/responsibilities of the program or service area. If appropriate, include ensuring/monitoring compliance with state, federal or other mandates.

The Grants Office is responsible for three specific activities, including:

- Prospect Research – finding potential grant opportunities and disseminating this information to the campus community;
- Grant Development – planning, writing, and submitting grant proposals; and
- Grant Management – assisting with the implementation of grant-funded projects so that outcomes are achieved on-time, within budget, and in accordance with institutional, state, and federal rules and regulations.

With regard to *Prospect Research*, the Grants Office engages in two distinct activities. First, the Office responds to requests from members of the college community, including the college's community partners, for information about potential funding for a specific project. This is one of the most difficult aspects of grant development: researching the myriad of resources available and identifying the few that best align with the goals of a particularly project. It is a time consuming and labor intensive process, and often there are only one or two sources available to support some projects. To assist with Prospect Research, the Grants Office has access to an online search tool purchased by the Santa Monica College Foundation to provide information on the large number of private grant making resources.

The second, and much less complicated, facet of Prospect Research is disseminating information about upcoming grant opportunities to the college community and identifying projects that align with the goals of the grant competition. This is often referred to as building a program around the money in contrast to finding money to support a programmatic need. However, given the robustness of federal grant making, the Grants Office is never without a federal grant to market to the campus community, and many of these projects are of interest to the college. Each year, the college has the opportunity to apply for grants from the U.S. Departments of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services, as well as

the National Science Foundation, addressing outreach, retention, curriculum development, and student services, including scholarship assistance. The federal government conducts annual competitions for the majority of its grant-funded programs, while developing several new competitions each year. Because these opportunities are widely broadcast through the list serves and media sources, they are far easier to plan for and pursue, then researching potential funding for new projects.

The second activity of the Grants Office is *Grant Development*. The Grant Development process includes project planning and development, partnership building, budget development, evaluation, writing, and submission. Many people erroneously believe that grant development is all about writing, whereas in reality writing only consumes 10 percent of the process, while project planning and development requires the other 90 percent.

To the extent possible, the Grants Office utilizes a team approach to the grant development process, working collaboratively with subject matter experts, the faculty and administrators who will ultimately be responsible for program implementation, as well as the support systems designed to support grant implementation, including Fiscal Services, Information Services, Institutional Research, and others. Through the team approach, the Grants Office assures that 1) the impacted parties are aware of the proposed grant project prior to submission and award and have the opportunity to comment; and 2) the writing team has access to the subject matter experts necessary to write a competitive proposal.

With regard to writing, the Grants Office writes the majority of grants submitted on behalf of the college, including those submitted by the Santa Monica College Foundation for the benefit of SMC students, faculty, and programs. When necessary and feasible, the Grants Office utilizes external consultants to assist with specific grant projects. However, there are other offices that regularly submit grants as well, most specifically the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. In nearly all cases, the Grants Office is not aware of the grants submitted by the Office of Workforce and Economic Department, and as such, these grants are not reviewed, tracked or monitored by the Grants Office.

The third component of the Grants Office is *Grant Management*. As with Prospect Research, the Grants Office has two areas of focus with regard to Grant Management. First, the office serves as a resource for faculty, staff, and administrators working on grant funded projects across campus, as well as the supportive units, such as Fiscal Services and Institutional Research, that provide essential services to grant-funded projects. Resources provided by the Grants Office have included:

- A web site that provides grant monitoring and tracking resources;
- A grant management manual that provides new project managers with essential information regarding grant management at SMC;
- Grant/project manager workshops that address topics of interest to managers;
- Financial resources to expand and/or enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of SMC's support services to assist grant-funded projects; and

- One on one consultation by Grants Office staff with grant/project staff.

This last bullet is the most prevalent, and perhaps most beneficial, resource available to grant funded project staff. For nearly all grants received during this review period, the Grants Office was actively involved in project start-up, and for many, maintained involvement during the grant award period through participation on the grant advisory committee and/or regular one on one meetings with the project manager and/or grant accountant. Examples include the NSF Advanced Technological Education grant, NASA's Minority Community College Curriculum Improvement grant, and grants submitted to support Guardian Scholars. In some cases, the Grants Office has served as the project director for the grant until the college could hire a full time director, as in the case of the U.S. Department of Education-funded Hispanic Serving Institutions STEM and Articulation Program grant.

Although the grant management manual clearly outlines that the project manager is the primary point of contact for his/her grant, as well as the person most knowledgeable of grant requirements, the Grants Office remains abreast of changes in institutional, state, and federal reporting and compliance requirements. The Grants Office is also situated to research questions and concerns brought forth by the project team and/or Fiscal Services, thus negating the need for project staff to redirect their attention from project services to issues of compliance.

The second area of focus for the Grant Management component is the direct management and administrative oversight of select grant-funded projects. Grants administered directly by the Grants Office tend to focus on small grants that do not have the resources to support even a part-time project manager. Management of these grants entails a number of services, including fiscal management and reporting, purchasing, outcome reporting, student tracking and assessment, and participation in grant related meetings.

Although the Grant Management function of the Grants Office clearly detracts from the Grant Development (and writing) function, it is an essential component of an effective Grant Program. Fundraising is a worthy objective of the college, but the college must be able to ensure that the funds raised will be utilized efficiently, effectively, and in compliance with grant requirements. If funding sources are hesitant regarding a potential grantee's ability to manage the funds, they may not award a grant. However, if a potential grantee has a long history of effective grant management and is known for achieving the outcomes it proposes on time and within budget, the funding source will be more inclined to fund the project. Thus, successful grant development requires effective grant management.

There has been much debate as to the role that the Grants Office should play in Grant Management. Across the country, the degree to which the Grants Office is involved varies significantly. Some offices limit their activities to grant development, while others are responsible for signing off on all purchases made by any grant-funded projects. Finding the right balance continues to be a discussion topic at SMC. Ultimately, effective grant management is the responsibility of the senior administrators overseeing staff who are working on grants. The Grants Office works closely with Fiscal Services to

support this oversight by developing standardized policies, procedures, and forms for the grant teams to utilize. The Grants Office provides technical assistance and guidance and can serve as the first line of defense against an audit finding if utilized by project staff. However, it is up to the grant team to access these services.

Another reason for maintaining a Grant Management function within the Grants Office is that effective grant development requires an understanding of effective grant management. By managing a limited number of grants within the Grants Office itself, the Grants Office remains connected to the processes and procedures of the college that grant-funded project staff will utilize. As might be expected, often the most challenging aspect of a new job is identifying how the infrastructure operates. If the Grants Office is focused solely on fundraising, it will not have this vital information, and thus when asked during the grant development process if a particular activity or direction is possible, will not be able to answer the question.

Lastly, remaining involved in grant management assures that the Grants Office is connected to the greater campus community in a direct service capacity. This focus helps to absolve any disconnect between fundraising in the abstract and generic sense and the very real needs of students, faculty, programs, and the institution in general. In addition, this involvement adds a passion that is hard to achieve from the outside looking in. It is one of the primary challenges that external grant consultants have when trying to convey the depth of need of the institution.

This connectedness to the college is crucial to assuring that the Grants Office operates in a manner that achieves the mission of the college, as well as its goals and priorities. One of the primary outcomes of the Grants Office is to ensure that 100% of all grant requests address one or more student, department/program, and/or institutional goals and priorities, including SMC's Institutional Learning Outcomes, Supporting Goals, and Strategic Initiatives. Prior to the development of any grant-funded project, the Grants Office has a discussion with the proposal team, including the administrator responsible for the program, regarding the degree to which the project addresses institutional priorities. While it is conceivable that the college might decide to pursue a grant funded project that does not align with one or more of the Institutional Learning Outcomes, the Supporting Goals, the Strategic Priorities, or the Master Plan, it is not likely. In addition, these initial conversations address issues of sustainability, impact on the physical plant, likelihood for long-term success, and integration with the greater college community. By being active in both grant development and grant management, as well as on committees throughout the college, the Grants Office helps to assure that these conversations produce grant initiatives that are relevant and beneficial to the college and will have a substantial impact on the students and programs they serve.

3. If applicable, describe how the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), Supporting Goals, and/or Strategic Initiatives of the institution are integrated into the goals of the program or service area.

It is the role of the Grants Office to assist divisions, departments, and programs to generate resources that will help them achieve the college's Institutional Learning Outcomes, Supporting Goals, and/or Strategic Initiatives. The Grants Office works closely with the project team to ensure that every grant submitted by the Grants Office aligns with one or more goals, outcomes, and/or initiatives. At times, particularly with regard to projects that support specific faculty projects, the connection to institutional priorities is less obvious, such as a grant from CalHumanities to develop a film project of interest to History professor, Sang Chi. However, often with projects such as these, they align with the college's commitment to innovation, foster community relationships and partnerships (a Board of Trustees priority), and support faculty

development.

To the extent possible, the Grants Office encourages faculty-driven projects such as these to include students in the process, either as active members of the project team and/or beneficiaries. This strategy is quite common for projects that focus on a specific faculty member's research or area of interest. Through these grants, students are often included as research assistants, helping faculty carry out the goals of the project. However, as faculty complete their projects, they often integrate the finished project into their class activities so that students may observe, utilize, and/or manipulate project-related materials. When this occurs, these projects can then easily align with one or more of the institutional learning outcomes.

4. If your program receives operating funding from any source other than District funds identify the funding source. If applicable, note the start and end dates of the funding (generally a grant), the percentage of the program budget supported by non-District funding, and list any staff positions funded wholly or in part by non-District funds. Do not include awards for non-operational items such as equipment (ex. VTEA) or value added activities (ex Margin of Excellence).

The Grants Office does not receive any direct operating funding from any source other than the District. It has established a working relationship with the Santa Monica College Foundation to implement a comprehensive grant development program that includes both public and private grant submissions. In support of this outcome, the Foundation has on staff a full-time database manager/prospect researcher to help identify potential sources of support. In addition, to assist with prospect research, the Foundation has an annual subscription to Foundation Search by Metasoft, which helps facilitate the prospect research process and is used by the Grants Office to identify and research potential sources of support. The Foundation also pays for the Associate Dean, Grants, membership in the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) and prior to its disbanding in June 2016, the Council for Resource Development. Lastly, the Grants Office has access to the Foundation's administrative assistant to help assist with proposal packaging and delivery. The value of this additional assistance is approximately $75,000.

B. Populations Served

In this section you will provide information that describes who your program or service area serves. When comparing data from different periods, use a consistent time frame (ex. Compare one fall term to another fall term)

B. Information For Populations Served

Area/Discipline Information Pertains To

Grants

1. Describe who your area serves (students, staff, etc.) – both directly and indirectly. If pertinent, indicate variables such as ethnicity, race, gender, age of your client base.

The Grants Office serves as a supportive resource for faculty, staff, and administrators across the campus who are interested in pursuing grant funding. As such, the office's "clients" include all faculty, staff, and administrators acting on behalf of a program or department. During the past six years, the Grants Office has supported many of the College's instructional and student support programs through grant development and/or grant management activities. The following table provides an overview of the programs and departments supported by the Grants Office between the 2010-2011 academic year and the 2015-2016 academic year.

Areas Targeted for Grant Development	10/11		11/12		12/13		13/14		14/15		15/16		Total	
	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	**S**	A
Adult Education									1	1			1	1
Basic Skills														
Career Technical Education														
1) Health Sciences / Nursing	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	2	2	11	9
2) Sustainable Technologies	1				3	2	2	2	4	4	1	1	11	9
3) Film											2		2	
4) Recycling/Resource Mgmt	1	1											1	1
5) CSIS					2	1	3	1	1				6	2
6) Health Information Tech.	2	1											2	1
7) ECE/Education	3	2	1						1		1		6	2
8) Medical Lab Technician			1										1	
9) Promo Pathway											3		3	
10) Interactive Media							1		1	1			2	1
11) Entrepreneurism							3	2					3	2
12) CTE / Career Pathways			1	1	2	2			1	1			4	4
Student Services														
1) Low Income/First Generation/ URM Students	2	2	3	1	1	1					3	1	9	5
2) Psychological Services					1	1			1	1	1	1	3	3
3) Guardian Scholars					1	1	3	1	2	2	4	1	10	5
4) First Year Experience							1	1	1		1		3	1
5) Veterans Resource Center	2	2			1		1	1					4	3
6) Adelante/Latino Center	1												1	
Study Abroad / Global Citizenship	1				1								2	
Transfer														
1) History									1		1	1	2	1
2) GIS/Earth Science			1										1	
3) Political Science/Law									1		1	1	2	1
4) Biomedicine	1	1											1	1
5) Modern Languages	1				1	1							2	1
6) Behavioral Sciences							1						1	
7) STEM														
-Programming	3	1	1	1	1				1	1	2	1	8	4

	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A	S	A
-Scholarship Support	1				1		1	1	2	1	2	1	7	3
GRIT														
1) Center for Applied Learning											1		1	
2) Success Navigator									1		1	1	2	1
3) You + 1											2		2	
Sustainability /CEUS	1		1		1				1	1			4	1
Other														
1) Emergency Response			1	1			1	1					2	2
2) Alumni Program											1	1	1	1
3) Planetarium					1								1	
4) Faculty Prof. Development	1				1	1							2	1
TOTAL	22	11	12	5	20	11	18	11	23	16	29	12	124	66

S = Submitted, A = Awarded

Upon compiling this information into one chart, it is surprising that the number of grants submitted in 2011-2012 was significantly less than in other years during this review period. However, if staff recall correctly, 2011-2012 was the year that the federal government cancelled several large federal grant competitions, while the State of California delayed several competitions due to funding uncertainties.

2. Discuss any significant change(s) in the population(s) served since the last full program review and the possible reasons for the change(s).

Regarding program diversity and the degree to which the Grants Office serves all programs on campus equally, historically, the office's focus follows the interests of the college, as well as the interests and priorities of the region, state, and nation. This is demonstrated in the data presented in the previous section. During this review period, there continued to be significant interest at all levels to increase student preparedness to enter the workforce, and this is reflected in the large number of grants submitted to support CTE programming. Likewise, public and private funding sources have also identified student achievement in STEM and foster youth success as priorities. During the last review cycle, there were a large number of grants to support global citizenship and basic skill development, and while these areas continued as strategic initiatives, they also shared time with the GRIT Initiative. In this past year, there was an increased focus on textbook affordability, as demonstrated by the emergence of this area of interest.

During the past few years, the Grants Office has also worked to reach out to programs that have not received significant funding through grants, such as music and film. These departments are more aligned with the interests of private funding sources, and as such, the Grants Office has also seen an increase in private grant development. As the college identifies its next round of strategic priorities and initiatives, it is expected that the Grants Office will refocus its efforts in these areas while continuing to pursue other areas of interest to the college.

C. Program Evaluation

In this section programs/units are to identify how, using what tools, and when program evaluation takes place. Evaluation must include outcomes assessment as well as any other measures used by the program. Please use Section D to address program responses to the findings described in this section.

Programs/units with multiple disciplines or functions may choose to answer the following questions for each area. If this is your preferred method of responding, begin by selecting a discipline/function from the drop down, answer the set of questions and click "Save", your answers will be added to the bottom of page. Do this for each discipline/function. If you would like to answer the questions once, choose "Answer Once" from the drop down.

How would you like to answer these questions?

C. Saved Information For Program Evaluation

Area/Discipline Information Pertains To

Grants

1. List your administrative unit UOs.

UO statements focus on service or operational outcomes such as:

- *Volume of unit activity*
- *Efficiency (responsiveness, timeliness, number of requests processed, etc.)*
- *Effectiveness of service in accomplishing intended outcomes (accuracy, completeness, etc.)*
- *Compliance with external standards/regulations*
- *Client/customer satisfaction with services*

The Grants Office is a multi-faceted unit with three distinct functions, including Prospect Research, Grant Development, and Grant Management. The following outlines the unit outcomes of the office, based on these overarching responsibilities:

UO #1 – Prospect Research*:* The institution will diversify its revenue streams to include external grant funding from public and private sources with the goal of maintaining, if not increasing, total grant funding revenue each year;
UO #2 – Grant Development: Programs will be satisfied with the quality of assistance provided to them by the department in the writing of grant proposals;
UO #3 – Grant Management: Programs will have access to the information and resources necessary to successfully implement their grant projects; and
UO #4 – Alignment with Institutional Mission, Goals, and Priorities: 100% of all grant requests will address one or more student, department/program, and/or institutional object1ive and/or Board priority.

2. Describe when and how the program assesses these UOs and uses the results to inform program planning including:

- **how outcomes are assessed and how often**
- **the assessment tool(s) used**
- **the sample (who gets assessed)**

- **how and when the program reviews the results and who is engaged in the process**

The Grants Office employs a multi-pronged approach to assess its overall effectiveness. First and foremost, the office conducts a quantitative assessment of its performance by monitoring its submission and award outputs and outcomes on an annual basis. This assessment includes:

- the total number of grants submitted;
- the total number of grants received;
- the total amount of funding received;
- the total number of grants submitted by funder type, including private, local, state, and federal; and
- the total amount of grant funds managed by the grant per year.

With this information, the office can determine its annual success ratio, which can be compared to previous year rates, as well as with other community colleges in California and nationally.

Unit Outcome 1: The Grants Office assesses Unit Outcome 1, the degree to which SMC's grant funding reflects diversity in funding sources, by tracking the number of grants submitted and received from each funding sector, including federal and state funding, local public funding, and private foundations, corporations, and organizations. Since each type of funding has its own unique benefits and challenges, this information is important for grant development and planning.

During this review period, the underlying goal was to further diversify the funding streams and increase private grant making support, so that the college was pursuing both public and private grants and reducing its reliance on public grantmaking. The reasoning for doing this is that private grant making often provides more flexibility to programs to address immediate needs without the detailed reporting and accountability requirements of public funding. In addition, private grants are often smaller gifts that can provide specific assistance to a department. Public grants generally are larger in scope and require a much more comprehensive project plan.

During this review the Grants Office has reached its goals regarding private grant submissions. The addition of a part-time grant consultant focusing on private grant submissions has helped to achieve this goal.   The following charts provide more detailed information per year.

The challenge with Unit Outcome 1 as currently written is that total grant funding for the past five years has been slowly decreasing. In 2010-2011, SMC managed approximately $5.8 million in grant funding, which dropped slightly in 2011-2012 to $5.5 million. While the amount increased slightly in 2012-2013 to $6 million as a result of several new grant awards, it fell significantly in 2013-2014 to $4.2 million as the college's U.S. Department of Labor grant ended. New grants in 2014-2015 increased the total to nearly $5 million, which remained constant in 2015-2016. However, the college

has not been able to return to the $6 million level. There are multiple factors impacting the total amount of funding received including:

1. declining state and federal budgets;
2. increased competition at all levels for funding;
3. increased pressure on the faculty and staff at Santa Monica College to do more with less and thus limited time to pursue new opportunities that will require additional time and effort; and
4. cyclical timeframe of grant awards.

In addition, internally there is ongoing discussion to establish a consistent definition of what a grant is so that the college can accurately track its total grant funding. In the past, the definition of a grant was quite broad and included any funding that required a written application, was competitive at some level (even if it meant that it was the College's to lose so to speak), had performance outcomes and budgetary limitations, and was governed by a contract between the college and the funding source. However, in the past few years, the definition of a grant has shrunk in scope, and many projects that were once defined as grants are now labeled as contracts and/or other types of funding and are no longer included in the grant totals. This is particularly true in the area of Workforce Development, which receives funding from several programs administered by the Chancellor's Office to address specific state goals and objectives. As such the total amount of funding identified as grants has decreased.

Given these factors, at this time, the Grants Office has not made any changes to Unit Outcome 1. The hope is that funding will stabilize, the college community can establish a consistent grant definition, and the office will be able to maintain current grant levels, and even begin to increase the total amount of grant funding in the future. Recent award announcements demonstrate the college's competitiveness on a national scale. The challenge is to establish the infrastructure that both supports and encourages faculty, staff, and programs as they pursue grant funding.

Unit Outcome 2 & 3: With regard to Unit Outcomes 2 and 3, which target user satisfaction with the grant development and grant management services, respectively, the Grants Office conducts a qualitative evaluation of its services, assessing the satisfaction of user groups, including faculty, staff, and administrators who pursue grants and/or manage grants. This is accomplished through an anonymous online survey distributed at the end of each academic year to all faculty and staff who accessed services from the Grants Office. The survey is included in the attachments.

The Grants Office distributed this survey for the first time in Spring 2014 and has continued to distribute it in May of each year since. There was some initial concern regarding Unit Outcomes 2 and 3 and the Satisfaction Survey that they did not provide a very deep assessment of program services. This concern arose from the fact that the first couple of times the office distributed the survey, the feedback was all positive and did not provide any critical information as to what the office might do to better serve faculty, staff, and programs. In 2015-2016, the Associate Dean was considering options for revising the survey and/or the Unit Outcomes; however, the results of the 2015-2016 were far more thoughtful and substantiated concerns that the Associate Dean had witnessed through observation and anecdotal report. While the feedback was still positive, the results identified areas in need of improvement.

Specifically, based on the results of the 2015-2016 survey, 83% of respondents (five of the six who responded) indicated overall satisfaction with the quality of the assistance provided by the Grants Office in the writing of grant proposals. In addition, 67% of respondents (four of the six who responded) indicated that they were very satisfied with the quality of the assistance provided, while one respondent indicated that he/she was satisfied and one indicated that he/she was

dissatisfied. Respondents noted dissatisfaction with 1) researching grant opportunities; and 2) disseminating information on grant opportunities, grants awarded to the college, advice on grant development and administration, grant regulations, grant trends, etc. In addition, one respondent expressed dissatisfaction overall with the timeliness of the process and proposal content, specifically the identification of unrealistic goals and outcomes proposed in the grant application that do not align with program/department goals and objectives. The Grants Office has used this feedback to strengthen its internal processes and established annual objectives focused on increasing awareness of grant opportunities and processes.

The second half of the survey asks respondents to assess the degree to which they are satisfied with grant management services. Not all of the respondents who completed the first half of the survey so only three respondents provided feedback. Having said that, 100% of respondents (3 of 3) indicated that they had sufficient access to the information and resources necessary to successfully implement their grant projects. It should be noted that the Grants Office is aware that the concern raised by respondents with regard to alignment of grant goals and objectives with program goals and objectives is also a grant management concern. However, the respondent who expressed those concerns did not indicate he/she received grant management assistance from the Grants Office. Therefore it is not clear if the respondent's dissatisfaction rose during the grant writing or the grant management process.

In the future, the Grants Office will consider strategies for increasing the number of respondents and possibly offering respondents the opportunity to follow-up individually with the Associate Dean, Grants. This will allow the office to address and clarify any misunderstandings and/or miscommunications.

Unit Outcome 4: The Grants Office assesses Unit Outcome 4, the degree to which each grant submitted by the college aligns with the college's mission, Institutional Learning Outcomes, Supporting Goals, and Strategic Priorities and Master Plan objectives, by tracking and monitoring the focus of each grant submitted and awarded. During this reporting period, 100% of grants submitted and awarded are aligned with the college's mission, outcomes, goals, and priorities. In fact, most grants support more than one of these areas. The Grants Office also assesses each grant for its alignment with priorities set by the Board of Trustees.

This information is essential for documenting relevance to the overall institution and serves as a starting point for assessing program impact at the direct service level. While direct service impact should be assessed at the program level, the process begins here. This particular assessment also helps the office analyze if it is using its time efficiently and effectively. If the office is working on grants that fall outside the goals and priorities of the college, this is problematic. Likewise if office support is targeted too heavily in one area, this may lead to revisions in office strategies and/or increased activity in other areas.

The challenge with this particular assessment strategy is that while the mission, goals, outcomes and priorities of the college change infrequently (at the most once every five years), the Board priorities and the Master Plan objectives change every year. Unfortunately, the timeline for grant development requires that project teams prepare grant applications six months to a year before the funding is available. As such, many of the grants do not fall neatly within the timeframes of the college's Master Plan objectives and/or Board priorities. It is for this reason that the majority of grants submitted by the college target strategic initiatives and/or the mission in general, as the five year timeline allows for the project teams to come together, identify need, research funding opportunities, submit proposals, and implement grant awards.

As an office of one, unit outcome assessment and program evaluation is carried out by the Associate Dean of Grants. The annual program review evaluation is shared with the senior administrator overseeing the Grants Office, which has in the past included the Vice President for Planning and Development and the Executive Vice President. Currently, though, the senior administrator overseeing Grants is the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Given that there is only one person

working in the office, to some extent, the annual evaluation is as much a performance evaluation of that employee as it is an evaluation of office effectiveness. However, every attempt is made to separate the two evaluation processes, as there are factors impacting the success of the Grants Office that have nothing to do with the performance of the person carrying out the activity of the office.

3. What other evaluation measures does your administrative unit use to inform planning? (For example, completion of program goals, program activity, content review, opinions of clients, etc.) Note your target goals and whether your unit is meeting them.

The Grants Office relies heavily on institutional planning to inform grant development activity, specifically the strategic planning process, which identifies the college's priorities. To the extent possible, the Grants Office pursues grant funding in support of these initiatives, while providing assistance to programs outside these priorities as time allows. During this review period, the Grants Office pursued funding in support of six distinct strategic priorities, including the two identified in the last strategic planning cycle including GRIT and I3. However, there were also grants submitted in support of other strategic priorities including CTE, Basic Skills, Global Citizenship, and Sustainable Campus Community. While the GRIT Initiative yielded a large number of proposals, strengthening CTE programming and outcomes remains a significant focus of the college, as well as the state and nation, as demonstrated in the following charts

In addition to supporting the strategic priorities, grants submitted and awarded during this period also supported other institutional planning and assessment efforts, including the Institutional Learning Outcomes and the Supporting Goals. While the process of aligning grants proposals to Institutional Learning Outcomes, Supporting Goals, and Strategic Priorities can be subjective and highly dependent on the working definition of the goals, outcomes, and priorities, a strong case can be made for how each of the grants submitted and awarded align with one or more of these institutional goals, outcomes, and priorities. However, as the college approaches its next strategic planning cycle, it would be beneficial to the grant development process if the college more clearly defines each of the proposed initiatives and identifies the specific activities and outcomes to be accomplished during the next five years. This would help ensure that the grants pursued by the college are indeed achieving institutional priorities and facilitate the grant planning process, including the development of a multi-year grant calendar aligned with each priority.

D. Objectives

As part of the planning process, programs are expected to establish annual objectives that support the program's goals. Please document the status of the program/function's previous year's objectives. Add comments if you feel further explanation is needed.

D1. Objectives

Objective: Increase communication among all groups on campus who actively pursue grant funding and adherence to established grant practices.	

Status: Completed Comments: This objective was established as a result of the 2011 Year Program Review as an ongoing objective that the Grants Office would continue to work toward during this review period. During the past six years, the Grants Office has participated in, and at times led, several efforts designed to increase communication and adherence to established grants practices. These efforts include the development of the Resource Development Committee, which met regularly from 2012 to 2014 under the leadership of then-Executive Vice President, Randy Lawson. This committee included representatives from the Grants Office, the SMC Foundation, and the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. However, with Randy's passing, this committee stopped meeting, and the Grants Office began meeting regularly with the SMC Foundation in an effort to maintain communication between the two offices. With the arrival of Dr. Kathryn Jeffery as Superintendent/President, the Resource Development Committee has begun meeting again in 2016 and will continue to meet at the direction of the Superintendent/President and/or Special Assistant to the President. At this time, this objective as written is complete, but has led to the development of two new objectives for address in the next year.	
Objective: Allocate additional hours to the writing process Status: Completed Comments: This objective was also identified during the 2011 Six Year Program Review given the desire to increase the number of grants submitted each year. During the past six years, several initiatives have resulted in an increase in hours allocated to the writing process. In Fall of 2011, Santa Monica College was ending its contract with McAllister & Quinn, an East Coast grant consulting and lobbying organization that was hired by the SMC Foundation at the request of the Superintendent/President and the Dean, Resource Development. Unfortunately, this relationship resulted in no new funding and in fact was terminated by the college in December 2011. In 2012, the SMC Foundation contracted with Russ Reid, another East Coast grant consulting agency to strengthen the college's private grant development capacity. This relationship resulted in new funding from the Parsons Foundation to support the Veterans Resource Center, although the organization later disbanded at the end of 2012. During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Santa Monica College Foundation, with encouragement from the Grants Office, contracted with a local grant writer to write grants for the Foundation under the direction of the Executive Director of the SMC Foundation. However, as with previous	

institutional efforts, the Grants Office benefitted from these efforts and the number of grants submitted increased. The SMC Foundation continued its contract with this grant writer in 2014-2015, despite changes in leadership at the Foundation. However, as a result of this change in leadership at the Foundation, the Associate Dean of Grants was given the opportunity to oversee the efforts of this grant consultant, who worked with the Grants Office to complete several grant development efforts begun in 2013-2014 and initiate new activity in 2014-2015. In 2015-2016, the Associate Dean of Grants was reassigned temporarily to work on the Accreditation Self-Study, and the college assumed the contract with the local grant writer. In 2015-2016, the local writer submitted 7 new grants that resulted in more than $660,000, including both public and private funding. The Grants Office has submitted a PBAR for 2016-2017 to continue these services.	
Objective: Institute greater reliance on institutional and/or program strategic planning in program and proposal development, particularly with respect to federal program goals and objectives Status: Completed Comments: The Grants Office identified this objective at the conclusion of its 2011 Program Review process. While the office moved forward on several activities in support of this objective, including a Master Plan for Education objective in 2011-2012 specifically addressing this outcome. The Master Plan objective tasked the Resource Development Committee with the development of a draft plan that would set annual priorities for institutional fundraising, including both public and private resource development. The committee met regularly throughout the 2011-2012 academic year to identify the best strategy for ensuring that all institutional fundraising was coordinated and aligned with institutional goals and objectives. Key components of this strategy include: 1) The Resource Development Committee will set annual fundraising priorities by October of each year, taking into consideration institutional needs and concerns, new strategic initiatives, if applicable, and current year Master Plan for Education institutional objectives established by the college; 2) The members of the Resource Development Committee will pursue funding for these priorities in a coordinated and collaborative manner; 3) Members of the RDC will share new and emerging opportunities, leverage resources, and strengthen the likelihood of success through greater integration with other efforts of campus; and 4) Each potential funding opportunity will be reviewed by the group for its	

alignment with these priorities. Unfortunately, changes in leadership, including the death of the Executive Vice President, who was leading the RDC at the time this strategy was developed, have delayed the implementation of its components. This strategy requires the buy-in and support of all members of the RDC and without consistent leadership, this has not occurred. Given that the RDC meetings have resumed, the Grants Office will consider this objective complete and continue to meet with the Superintendent/President and other members of the Resource Development Committee to review and revisit processes that have been developed in the past and/or develop new, more effective practices. As these conversations occur, it is expected that a new objective will emerge regarding alignment of grant development activity with institutional priorities.	
Objective: Coordinate with the Santa Monica College Foundation to develop more achievable private grant making targets that take into consideration the lessons learned in 2014-2015 Status: Eliminated Comments: At this point in time, as the Resource Development Committee reconvenes and the group discusses structure, processes, and priorities, it is too early to consider specific private grant making targets. The Grants Office may reconsider this objective in the future as it continues its work with the SMC Foundation.	
Objective: Update the Grants Office website to improve currency and usefulness of information Status: In Progress Comments: This objective was identified as an objective for the 2016-2017 academic year. To date, the Associate Dean, Grant, met with SMC's Web Content and Social Media Manager for one on one training on how to update the Grants Office website. The Grants Office will continue to update the website throughout the coming year as the RDC and other groups on campus work to develop process and procedure.	
Objective: Actively contribute to meetings of the Resource Development Committee Status: Eliminated Comments:	

This objective was identified as a 2016/2017 objective when it was still unclear how the college was going to move forward. However, after two meetings of the Resource Development Committee, there is a clearer understanding of how the Grants Office can contribute to these meetings. As such, upon review of this objective, it duplicates several other objectives currently underway by the Grants Office. This "objective" is a means for completing several other objectives more so than an objective in itself.	
Objective: Improve user satisfaction with grant management support and resources Status: In Progress Comments: This objective was also identified as a 2016/2017 objective. To date, the Grants Office has completed its review and update of the Grant Management Handbook with the intent to post it on the website and distribute it directly to all new grant managers. The college's new project managers for STEM/Equity and Adult Education have both received a copy. The grant managers for the two new grant awards will also receive a copy. The Grants Office is also working more closely with the ATE project team to assist with the management and implementation of that grant. The goal for this project is to be more actively involve, respond in a timelier manner, and maintain currency with project activities. This was challenging in 2015-2016, as the Associate Dean, Grants, assisted with accreditation and had a negative impact on the satisfaction of the project team with grant services. The office will be more engaged with funded projects in 2016-2017, particularly those that request direct assistance.	
Objective: Increase communication among all groups on campus that actively engage in resource development by actively participating in meetings of the Resource Development Committee Status: In Progress Comments: NA	
Objective: Establish effective grant development/management processes that are consistently implemented Status: In Progress	

Comments: NA	
Objective: Raise awareness of grant opportunities and benefits of pursuing grant activities Status: In Progress Comments: NA	

In this section, please document what you did last year as a result of what you described in Section C.

1. Describe any accomplishments, achievements, activities, initiatives undertaken, and any other positives the program wishes to note and document.

Most people assess the accomplishments of the Grants Office based on the number of grants submitted and the total amount of funding awarded. During the past six years, Santa Monica College has received 66 grant awards and more than $29 million in grant funding. On average the college has submitted (or been a partner in a grant submitted by someone else) 20 grants per year and received 11 per year, for a success rate of 55 percent. The following table provides more specific information.

Grants Office
5 - Year Submission/Award Overview

Academic Year	Grants Submitted	Grants Awarded	Total Awarded	Single Year Impact
2010-2011	22	11	$10.8M	$3.5M
2011-2012	12	5	$6.8M	$1.7M
2012-2013	20	11	$5.6M	$1.6M
2013-2014	18	11	$667,000	$450,000
2014-2015	23	16	$2.8M	$1.7M
2015-2016	29	12	$2.4M	$930,000
TOTAL	124	66	$29.07M	$9.8M
AVERAGE	20.7	11	$4.845M	$1.63M

It should be noted that not all grant funding is generated solely by the Grants Office, as there are other departments on campus that regularly submit grants, specifically the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. During this time frame, slightly more than $3 million of the total $29 million included in these numbers was submitted and received through

the Office of Workforce and Economic Development. This total includes a multi-year subaward with Pasadena City College valued at nearly $2 million. As previously noted, in recent years, the majority of funding submitted and/or managed by the Office of Workforce and Economic Development is not included on the list compiled and tracked by the Grants Office. Much of this money does not meet the working definition of grants in that while these projects do require a written application, they are not competitive, but rather funding allocations awarded by the state based on institutional factors, such as number of CTE students enrolled. When the information is available through board agenda items or other sources, the Grants Office has included the grants awarded through the Office of Workforce and Economic Development, but this is most likely an incomplete list, and therefore cannot be used as a solo point of reference for the total number of grant awards managed by the College.

Even without the Workforce Development grants, the Grants Office is pleased with its accomplishments during this review period. Not only is the award total substantial, but the impact on the college community and the success of students, faculty, and programs invaluable, even for those grants that brought in very little money. Some notable grant-related achievements include:

- Through a U.S. Department of Labor funded grant, Santa Monica College developed the first associate degree/certificate in Recycling and Resource Management in the nation;
- Santa Monica College expanded its relationship with NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory through several grants that provided students and faculty from SMC to work with researchers at JPL;
- The Student Affairs Division established targeted programs for both students who are U.S. veterans and students who are or were in foster care. These programs received an array of local, state, and federal funding to support their development and institutionalization, including a highly competitive U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education grant to support the Veterans Resource Center;
- The college received more than $100,000 in direct scholarship funding to support students pursuing Nursing and STEM, including funding from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the Edison Corporation;
- The City of Santa Monica provided two new awards to Santa Monica College to serve low-income, first generation college students living in the Pico Neighborhood;
- Santa Monica College established its STEM Initiative with a $6 million grant award from the U.S. Department of Education that included funding to replace the Physical Science Department's NMR machine;
- The U.S. Department of Education's Hispanic Serving Institutions Program provided funding for the college to establish the Center for Teaching Excellence;
- The on-campus shooting in June 2013 took a significant toll on the college community, and the U.S. Department of Education sent its support through a $75,000 grant that covered the cost of crisis counseling for students and faculty/staff;
- Santa Monica College's Sustainable Technologies Program received the College's first ever National Science Foundation grant;
- The California Department of Education accepted the college's request to provide adult education and family literacy services, targeting the ESL community, in conjunction with Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District;
- Santa Monica College received both state and federal funding to address the mental health well-being of SMC students, including a Suicide Prevention grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services;
- Santa Monica College received its first CalHumanities grant to help collect and share the perspectives of Korean Americans who were impacted by the LA Riots, building upon the story of the only Korean American killed during the riots, who was a Santa Monica College student;
- Santa Monica College was accepted into the Community College Pathway to Law School Initiative, which provides no financial award, but will help facilitate student transfer from the community college to the baccalaureate program to law school.

In addition to these program awards, the last six years generated more than $500,000 in private grant awards, including the college's first ever S. Mark Taper Foundation award. The Grants Office was diligent in its effort to apply to the S. Mark Taper Foundation each year despite feedback that the foundation "would never support the college." However, the Foundation did and has been more than impressed with the work of the Guardian Scholars Program. The Guardian Scholars Program also received more than $140,000 from the Angell Foundation through a partnership with Loyola Marymount University and the University of California, Los Angeles, as well as a $15,000 gift from Providence St. John's Medical Center. Each of these awards would not have been possible without a strong working relationship between the Santa Monica College Foundation and the Grants Office.

While $500,000 of $29 million may not seem like much, as was mentioned previously, private grant making allows the college and its many programs to engage in small, program specific activities that might get lost in a large state or federal award. As an example, while the college committed resources to fund core services to students who are or were foster youth, the private grants that the Guardian Scholars Program received allowed more specific services, including mental health counseling, field trips to local/regional universities, and networking activities.

2. Summarize how the program or service area addressed the recommendations for program strengthening from the executive summary of the previous six-year program review.

The Grants Office presented its 2010-2011 Program Review to the Program Review Committee in January 2011. Upon completing its review of the Grants Office's self-assessment, the committee provided the following recommendations:

"The committee acknowledges the limited staffing of the Grants Office and recognizes the many accomplishments related to planning, development of resources and securing grants. To further strengthen the program the committee recommends the office consider the following:

1. *Developing an annual grant calendar to aid institutional review and planning.*
2. *Setting a regular meeting schedule for the Grants Advisory committee.*
3. *Implementing a user satisfaction survey.*
4. *Working with department chairs to develop a plan to engage more faculty in writing grants that the institution identifies as priorities."*

The committee also recommended that the institution "*move forward with establishing a federally approved indirect cost rate.*"

The following paragraphs provide an overview of how the Grants Office addressed each of the committee's recommendations. However, it should be noted that in general, there has been a great deal of uncertainty and inconsistency in leadership and oversight with regard to resource development in general, and grants more specifically. To some extent, many of the same structural challenges that were identified during the 2011 program review cycle exist today, due in large part as many of the actions that did occur immediately following the review were put on hold as leadership changed at the college. However, with the arrival of a new superintendent/president, there has been renewed focus on many of the issues impacting resource development that should have a positive impact on the college's ability to successfully develop and manage grants.

Recommendation 1: Develop an annual grant calendar to aid institutional review and planning

 At the beginning of each academic year, the Grants Office identifies the state and federal grants that it will pursue in the coming year, connecting each grant project with an institutional goal, outcome, or priority. As each project is identified, the Grants Office reaches out to the faculty/staff teams, including the senior administrators, who will be working on these projects to confirm interest and establish a timeline. In nearly all cases, the college receives only 45 to 60 days notice of a grant deadline, so it is difficult to determine the exact month in which a project will be due; however, the office can estimate the date. The Grants Office documents this information using an excel spreadsheet.

The Grants Office shared its annual calendar with members of the Resource Development Committee, which met from 2011 to 2014. This committee included the executive director of the Santa Monica College Foundation, the Associate Dean, Grants, and the Dean of Workforce and Economic Development, as well as the Executive Vice President. The committee's focus was on sharing information, coordinating when possible, and making sure that the college was not competing against itself   The calendar was available to other groups on campus upon request.

In 2014-2015, the Grants Office worked with the Santa Monica College Foundation to establish a yearly calendar for private grantmaking that was reviewed and approved by the Foundation and the Grants Office in coordination. However, it turned out to be a bit ambitious and the goal was to review the effectiveness of this calendar attempt during the summer of 2015 and establish a more realistic calendar for 2015-2016. However, shortly thereafter, the college reassigned the Associate Dean, Grants, to the accreditation self-study project, which required that the grant consultant initially hired to focus on private grants would also write public grants. This decision essentially reduced the number of staff in the Grants Office from two to one and hindered the college's ability to pursue private grants. As such, the Grants Office delayed the implementation of a private grant making calendar for 2015-2016, focusing solely on a public grant making calendar.

In June of 2016, Dr. Jeffery, SMC's Superintendent/President, reconvened the Resource Development Committee, which had been on hiatus. The office has prepared a tentative calendar for 2016-2016 and will share it with the Resource Development Committee at its next meeting. This calendar identifies the grant program, the funding source, focus of grant, potential due date, internal grant lead/team, and relevance to mission.

As the committee moves forward, the Grants Office will revisit the development of a private grantmaking calendar to augment the public funding. The reasoning behind two calendars is that, as noted by the Program Review Committee in 2011, the Grants Office was, and still is, an office of one. It is not feasible to establish both a public and private grant making calendar without the addition of a second writer. While the Associate Dean, Grants, can and does submit private grants as they arise, this effort is responsive, not proactive. If the office is aware of a private grant application process that is relevant to the mission of the college, it will include this effort on the college, but it will not actively research private grantmaking opportunities with the goal of identifying new sources to pursue.

Recommendation 2: Set a regular meeting schedule for the Grants Advisory Committee

Prior to the 2011 Program Review, the Grants Office had established a Grants Advisory Committee with the goal of establishing processes and procedures for the college community to follow. After several meetings, the Associate Dean, Grants, in consultation with her supervisor, determined that the timing was not ideal nor was this committee the best means of achieving these outcomes. As such the Grants Advisory Committee did not meet again beyond 2011. However, from these initial efforts, the Resource Development Committee emerged, which brought together the offices actively engaged in resource development. As noted, the goals of this committee are to share information, coordinate efforts, and reduce duplication of effort and internal competition. The Grants Office will discuss the usefulness of a separate Grants Advisory

Committee with other members of the Resource Development Committee during the coming year and act accordingly.

Recommendation 3: Implement a user satisfaction survey

As previously reported, the Grants Office began distributing a user satisfaction survey in 2013-2104 and continues to do so today.

Recommendation 4: Work with department chairs to develop a plan to engage more faculty in writing grants that the institution identifies as priorities

All grants submitted by the Grants Office are vetted for their relevance to the goals, outcomes, and priorities of faculty, students, programs, and the institution as a whole. Prior to moving forward with any grant submission, the Grants Office meets individually with the project team to clarify goals and objectives, shares this information with the appropriate vice president responsible for project oversight, and connects with other offices and programs on campus that will be impacted, such as Institutional Research, Information Technology, and Facilities. In addition, for interdisciplinary proposals, the Grants Office reaches out to and informs the faculty chairs and/or leads of other instructional and student support programs identified for participation in a project. To the extent possible, the commitment of other departments to participate in a proposed project is verified in writing through a letter of support or commitment.

The challenge with this process is that often grant timelines are short, and there is often not enough time to work with everyone's calendar to schedule a meeting or meetings for thoughtful review and discussion of project details. For the larger grants, such as Title V, the college community can know months in advance of a deadline, but other projects, including many state awards provide less than 8 weeks notice. Therefore meetings are often scheduled within a week's notice with the hope that whoever can attend will attend. This method of grant planning can hinder effective communication and some individuals and/or groups may be left out of the discussion. In nearly all cases, when the participation of other programs on campus is required and they cannot attend grant meetings, the Grants Office will reach out to these groups to have separate follow-up meetings to ensure that they are actively involved in the planning.

The Grants Office has considered establishing rigid timelines for grant development similar to that of many university sponsored research offices. These timelines help ensure that all impacted offices are involved or a grant will not be submitted. However, these timelines and processes also do not allow for flexibility that is often needed in the grant world. It is a fine line, and one that the Grants Office believes it has worked out for the benefit of the college community.

Recommendation 5: Establish a federally approved indirect cost rate

The Fiscal Services Office has decided not to pursue a federally approved indirect cost rate.

3. Describe any changes or activities your program or service area has made that are not addressed in the objectives, identify the factors (e.g., licensure requirements, state or federal requirements, CCCO mandates, regulations, etc.) that triggered the changes, and indicate the expected or anticipated outcomes.

The Grants Office has not made any additional changes or activities.

4. If your program received one time funding of any kind indicate the source, how the funds were spent and the impact on the program (benefits or challenges).

Not applicable

D2. Moving Forward
Discuss and summarize conclusions drawn from data, assessments (SLO, UO) or other evaluation measures identified in Section C and indicate responses or programmatic changes planned for the coming year(s) including: • **how the assessment results are informing program goals and objectives, program planning, and decision-making** • **specific changes planned or made to the program based on the assessment results**

During the past six years, the Grants Office has continued to achieve great successes in grant awards and funding and has provided a substantial return on investment. However, these years have been difficult for the Grants Office, with deaths personally and professionally, as well inconsistencies in leadership that have hindered the office's ability to grow and achieve several of the outcomes that it wanted to achieve, particularly with regard to process. Although the numbers for the most part tell a different story, feedback from end users in recent years supports staff assessment that the grant development/management process cannot continue to operate as it has in years past and/or the Grants Office needs additional staffing. The following provides a summary of these following conclusions:

- Grant development activities need to be more strategic, thoughtful and timely. The College may need to establish internal timelines that if not met would forgo the submission of an application: In recent history, the College has not followed a consistent internal grant development process, including identified timelines and communication structures. In addition to comments on the user satisfaction survey regarding dissatisfaction with the timeliness of the grant development process, the Grants Office experienced multiple delays this spring on several grants that meant that the grant writing process did not begin until a week or less of the due date. This occurred despite awareness by the grant development team of the pending due date and in several occasions, planning meetings that occurred weeks in advance of the date but did not result in the necessary follow-up actions to move forward on the writing. A factor that played into this of course is that every office on campus is busy and many are short-staffed. Given that many of the college's activities are deadline driven and grants are often not a first priority, the Grants Office understands why grant teams may have to delay. However, this hinders the grant development process.
- Grant management activities need to be closely monitored by both the assigned grant manager, as well as his/her immediate supervisor and the division vice president, and/or a different structure needs to be established that creates a more centralized grant management system: In at least one incident this past year, the College lost a grant in part because the grant manager did not have the resources necessary to adequately monitor grant performance and subsequently, did not achieve program objectives. On another grant, the grant manager is struggling to manage the grant and receives very little support from the division overseeing the grant. These assessments by the Grants Office coincide with feedback from grant users that more training and oversight needs to be available. Unfortunately, given that the Grants Office is a one-person shop, more training and oversight will be hard to deliver without an understanding that fewer grants will be submitted.
- The placement of the Grants Office within a division that actively pursues grants makes it difficult for the Grants Office to effectively develop, support, and manage the grants process in general: Until August 2014, the Grants Office was housed under a vice president with college-wide responsibility. As such, when there was conflict with a division pursuing grants and/or the Grants Office wanted to establish new procedures, the respective senior administrators could address these concerns at a macro-level for implementation by the Grants Office. However, the current structure houses the Grants Office within Academic Affairs, which places an unintentional priority on projects and grants that support Academic Affairs and creates a distance with Student Affairs and Enrollment Development.
- Additional staffing in the area of grant writing, grant management/compliance, and/or program assistance will have

a positive impact on program effectiveness: Multiple respondents to the User Satisfaction Survey indicated dissatisfaction with areas that can only best be addressed through the allocation of additional resources, specifically personnel, to the Grants Office.

At this time, none of these changes can be implemented by the Grants Office without a conversation with senior administration. The Associate Dean, Grants, will pursue these conversations with members of the Resource Development Committee, which is now led by the Superintendent/President.

Please note that these comments are not a reflection of the specific skills or actions of any one person. More so, these comments demonstrate a system that is currently not structured in a way as to manage effectively the multiple grant projects it has. These existing limitations also hinder the effectiveness of the Grants Office in generating additional revenue and increasing the total grant revenue the college receives.

D2. Objectives (Moving Forward)

Objective #1
Objective: Update the Grants Office website to improve currency and usefulness of information

Area/ Discipline/ Function Responsible: All

Assessment Data and Other Observations:

External Factors:

Timeline and activities to accomplish the objective:

Describe how objective will be assessed/measured:

Comments:

Objective #2
Objective: Improve user satisfaction with grant management support and resources

Area/ Discipline/ Function Responsible: All

Assessment Data and Other Observations:

External Factors:

Timeline and activities to accomplish the objective:

Describe how objective will be assessed/measured:

Comments:

Objective #3
Objective:

Increase communication among all groups on campus that actively engage in resource development by actively participating in meetings of the Resource Development Committee

Area/ Discipline/ Function Responsible: Grants

Assessment Data and Other Observations:
UO Assessment Data
Other data or observed trends

External Factors:

Timeline and activities to accomplish the objective: Throughout the 2016-2017 academic year, the Grants Office will participate in all meetings of the Resource Development Committee, providing feedback and sharing projects under development by the Grants Office. In addition, the Grants Office will continue to attend monthly meetings of the Santa Monica College Foundation.

Describe how objective will be assessed/measured: Attendance at these meetings; overview of information shared; number of processes/procedures developed; number of projects that resulted from greater communication and coordination of committee members; overall assessment of effectiveness of communication

Comments: NA

Objective #4
Objective:

Establish effective grant development/management processes that are consistently implemented

Area/ Discipline/ Function Responsible: All

Assessment Data and Other Observations:
UO Assessment Data
Other data or observed trends

External Factors:

Timeline and activities to accomplish the objective: The Grants Office will work on this objective throughout the year in consult with the Resource Development Committee, one or more members of the Grant Advisory Committee, and grant managers. Members of these teams will review the Grant Management Handbook for currency and accuracy and updates will be made as needed.

Describe how objective will be assessed/measured: Number of processes/procedures developed with regard to grant development processes. If possible, develop a handbook related to grant development. For grant management, number of

grant managers who report the information in the handbook is useful. Meeting minutes and outcomes from individual meetings with Fiscal Services and IR.

Comments: NA

Objective #5
Objective:

Raise awareness of grant opportunities and benefits of pursuing grant activities

Area/ Discipline/ Function Responsible: All

Assessment Data and Other Observations:
UO Assessment Data
Other data or observed trends

External Factors:

Timeline and activities to accomplish the objective: Year round. Grants Office will participate in Flex Day activities, conducting workshops when allowed. Grants Office will update website to include information about the benefits of grants, including highlighting existing grant projects and benefits to faculty and programs.

Describe how objective will be assessed/measured: Feedback from faculty and programs regarding usefulness of information. Self-reported interest in pursuing grant coupled with the number of new programs/faculty who request assistance with grant development.

Comments: NA

F. Community Engagement

In the prompts that follow, please delineate the partnerships you have with the rest of the SMC community as well as those you have with external organizations.

1. If applicable, describe how your department staff members engage in institutional efforts such as committees and presentations, and departmental activities.

The Grants Office is comprised of one full-time staff member who participates on institutional committees and projects as assigned, while also engaging with other programs and services as grant development and management activities dictate. During this review period, the Associate Dean, Grants, was a member of the DPAC Budget Committee, the Program Review Committee, the CTE Committee, and the Global Council. In addition, as noted, the Associate Dean, Grants, also participated in the Accreditation Steering Committee, providing writing support to the four standard committees as they developed their responses to the Self-Study prompts.   The Associate Dean, Grants, has also served on one faculty hiring committee per year, and has served as the administrator on three faculty evaluation panels. As time allows, she also engages in other college activities, including guest speaker events, particularly those targeting institutional priorities, including STEM, first year experience, GRIT, and other topics.

2. If applicable, discuss the engagement of program members with the local community, industry, professional groups, etc.)

During this review period, the Grants Office maintained professional connections with two national organizations serving

community college fundraisers, including the Council for Resource Development (CRD) and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

CRD was established by the American Association of Community Colleges to serve community college resource development officers, both foundation and grant staff. Up until June 2016 when is disbanded with very little notice, it managed a very active national list serve for resource development professionals that was used regularly by grant officers throughout the United States. It was a good source of information, particularly on federal programming and requirements. In addition to the list serve, it organized a national conference in Washington, DC, each fall, which the Associate Dean attended in the past. As part of this conference, the group convened the Federal Funding Task Force to meet with program officers from many of the federal agencies to identify the best sources of federal funding for community colleges. The Task Force presented this information at the conference, while also making the information available online. The Associate Dean of Grants had been an active CRD member since 1998, serving on the planning committees for both regional and national conferences, editing the organization's national publication,*Dispatch*, and participating on the Federal Funding Task Force.

CASE has traditionally served the four-year college and university system; however, in the past five years, CASE has developed programming for community colleges and now holds a conference for community college fundraising in California each year, which the Associate Dean, Grants, has also attended. This conference is developed in conjunction with the Foundation for California Community Colleges. In addition, with the closing of CRD, CASE has assumed responsibility for the national list serve for grant writers and the Federal Funding Task Force. The focus of CASE is private fundraising, targeting community college foundations. While there has historically been very little offered through CASE for grants personnel, it is clear that Corporate and Foundation Relations is becoming increasingly more grant focused. This was very apparent during the annual Corporate and Foundation Relations Officers conference in San Francisco in May 2016, which the Associate Dean, Grants attended. As Santa Monica College continues to pursue private grant making, involvement in CASE activities will become even more relevant.

At the local level, the Grants Office attends meetings conducted by the City of Santa Monica, particularly with regard to Community Development funding, as well as meetings of the SMC/SMMUSD Collaborative.

3. Discuss the relationship among program staff and unit engagement with other units or areas of the college.

The Grants Office works closely with many different groups on campus to develop, submit, and manage grant projects. First and foremost, the office works with instructional and student support programs with an interest in augmenting their current budgets with grant funding. In any given year, this outreach can include five to fifteen unique offices housed in Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Enrollment Development. During this review period, the programs most often pursuing grant awards was Guardian Scholars in Student Affairs (which emerged as a new program during this period) and Sustainable Technologies in Academic Affairs (which extends to the Center for Environmental and Urban Studies). However, the Grants Office also provided regular assistance to the Nursing Department in Academic Affairs, Veterans Resource Center in Students Affairs (which also emerged as a new program during this period) and the International Education Center in Enrollment Development. However, this review period established new connections with the History Department, the Political Science Department, the Alumni Office, Center for Wellness and Well-being (formerly Psychological Services), the Music Department, and Film Studies. The ability to work effectively with many different and diverse groups on campus ensures that the Grants Office can achieve its goal of grant development/submission.

The Grants Office also provides post-award assistance, the degree to which varies by program. Often the extent of this assistance expands as the number of grant awards in that area increase, as in Guardian Scholars, Sustainable Technologies, International Education, and Nursing. In addition, some budgets are so small that they do not allow for dedicated grant

management support, and thus the Grants Office is available to provide support. While the grant development relationship is a very creative and flexible one, the grant management relationship is a bit more rigid and prescriptive. This can be problematic as the Grants Office is not responsible for program compliance and has no supervisory authority over grants. The office's role is to provide technical assistance and guidance upon request. While there are a few groups on campus that are not responsive to Grants Office support post-award, most projects recognize the benefits of this assistance as needed.

While grant development and management would not be possible without the interest and commitment of groups on campus willing to pursue grant funding, the Grants Office also maintains effective working relationships with several other groups on campus, including Fiscal Services and Institutional Research. The Grants Office has worked diligently to develop and maintain strong collaborative relationships with each of these offices, including providing funding and support to ensure that these offices have the resources they need to support the grants. As an example, the Grants Office oversaw a federal Title V grant that helped to train several grant accountants on federal grant management, while providing technology equipment and software to the Office of Institutional Research. The Grants Office has also used its Fund 01.0 account to support the participation of others on campus in grant development/grant management training, such as sending the Project Manager of Upward Bound to a proposal writing workshop for the upcoming competition. The office also used its state funding to send a member of the Office of Workforce and Economic Development to a national conference focused on economic recovery and student success. The Grants Office considers this use of its resources as an investment in the overall success of grants at Santa Monica College.

Lastly, the Santa Monica College Grants Office and the Santa Monica College Foundation work very closely together to pursue private grantmaking in support of the students, faculty, programs, and initiatives of the college. Many private grants requires that a 501(c)3 organization submits the application. The SMC Foundation serves in that capacity for the college. In addition, the Grants Office provides writing assistance to the Foundation as the Foundation connects with individuals, corporations, and organizations that require a written proposal. Since 2014, the Associate Dean, Grants, has actively participated in monthly team meetings of the Foundation. This relationship is critical to a successful private grant campaign.

G1. Current Planning and Recommendations

The following items are intended to help programs identify, track, and document unit planning and actions and to assist the institution in broad planning efforts.

1. Identify any issues or needs impacting program effectiveness or efficiency for which institutional support or resources will be requested in the coming year. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request support or resources through established channels and processes].

The most pressing issue impacting the effectiveness and efficiency of the Grants Office is a lack of staff to write grants and/or provide pre-award and post-award support to grant writers and the grant managers. For several years now, the Grants Office has received informal and formal feedback from end users, other program administrators, and even the Board of Trustees that additional staffing in the Grants Office is necessary. However, for multiple reasons, the Grants Office did not take action on this feedback, encouraging the college instead to strengthen first the offices that support grant development/grant management, including the Office of Institutional Research and the Fiscal Services Office. Now, though, the time has come to institutionalize additional staffing in the Grants Office or at least maintain the college's contract with a private grant consultant.

For the past two years, the Grants Office has benefitted from additional grant writing assistance, funded by the Foundation in 2014-2015 and by the College in 2015-2016. This additional assistance helped to increase the number of applications submitted during the academic year and significantly increased the number of proposals submitted to private foundations. In addition in 2015-2016, the additional grant writing support ensured that the College was able to submit several federal proposals while the Associate Dean, Grants, was engaged in the accreditation self study process. However, even though the accreditation self study process is complete, the Grants Office will still benefit from additional support.

As noted in the user response surveys, there are several areas in which the Grants Office is not meeting user expectations, particularly with regard to prospect research (researching grant opportunities), disseminating information regarding grant development/grant management to the college community, and post-award management and reporting activities. With regard to prospect research, there is a great deal of concern by multiple offices on campus regarding program sustainability – how are they going to maintain their programs once grant funding ends? While this is technically a program concern or a division concern, the Grants Office (as well as the Foundation) can provide additional support in this area, although program staff must take the lead and begin developing sustainability plans several years before funding ends. Grants are generally not a good strategy for maintaining ongoing operating costs, but there are ways of packaging program activities to address funder needs and interests.

The Grants Office can improve its capacity for disseminating information about grant development/grant management to the college community through enhanced web site communication and/or faculty/staff workshops. The need to do this was noted as part of the Grants Office's 2014-2015 Annual Program Review response to projected trends that could impact the office's activities in the next five years. That report noted a need by the College to be proactive in its responses to increased accountability measures on the part of funding sources. As a review of past program review reports indicate, the Grants Office established a web site presence several years ago, but most of the information on that page is static and in need of updating. In addition, very few individuals on campus are aware of its existence. Likewise, the Grants Office offered workshops for grant managers, as well as those interested in applying for grants, several years ago but discontinued these workshops as other work took priority.

Activities in support of post-award management are closely aligned with the need to disseminate information regarding grant development/grant management to the college community. At this time, while the Grants Office is available to provide technical assistance upon request, post-award grant management is decentralized at Santa Monica College. The programs, departments, and divisions that pursue grant awards are responsible for the successful development and implementation of their grants. The Grants Office is available to manage small grant awards and/or serve on implementation teams, at least during the first year after grants are awarded. However, grants that require ongoing assistance are often a second priority to grant development.

Each of these activities can be carried out by the Associate Dean, Grants, if she has additional writing assistance, or by a program assistant, while the Associate Dean, Grants, allocates the majority of her time to grant writing. At this time, given current funding concerns, it is more realistic to request additional grant writing assistance, which can be funded through a professional services/consultant contract and can be used as necessary. A program assistant would be hired through the Personnel Commission and would become a permanent member of the College. In addition, the Grants Office does have access to the program assistant who works for the Santa Monica College Foundation, as well as the program assistant who supports the Division of Academic Affairs.

2. If applicable, list additional capital resources (facilities, technology, equipment) that are needed to support the program as it currently exists. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request resources through established channels and processes].

Not applicable.

3. If applicable, list additional human resources (staffing, professional development, staff training) needed to support the program as it currently exists. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request resources through established channels and processes].

The Grants Office will be able to expand and enhance existing services to the college community, including both grant development and grant management services, if it is able to maintain additional grant writing support offered in years past.

G2. Future Planning and Recommendations

The following items are intended to help programs identify, track, and document unit planning and actions and to assist the institution in broad planning efforts.

1. Projecting toward the future, what trends could potentially impact the program? What changes does the program anticipate in 5 years; 10 years? Where does the program want to be? How is the program planning for these changes?

As noted in the 2014-2015 Annual Program Review, in the next five years, the Grants Office expects that funding sources, both public and private, will require increased accountability on the part of grantees and a closer adherence to program policies and procedures. This process has begun with the development of the new supercircular from the federal government that combines into one document many of the previous circulars that guided federal grant management. This new circular from the Office of Management and Budget, Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards, outlines the policies and procedures for managing federal grants and changes some of the previous practices. The Fiscal Services Office, with input from the Grants Office as necessary, is still in the process of redefining practices in accordance with Part 200.

Likewise, with a new administration projected to take office in January 2017, the College should expect further scrutiny and oversight into federal grant management. The impact of this increased focus on accountability will require the College to:

- Establish written policies and procedures for fiscal monitoring and project management that are consistently implemented across programs (working in conjunction and/or under the leadership of the Office of Fiscal Services);
- Demonstrate increased consciousness of effective grant management practices during the grant development process;
- Increase the availability of professional development to faculty, staff, and administrators who are actively involved in grant management;
- Be more proactive in the hiring or assigning grant managers who have the appropriate skills and experience to implement projects that are in compliance with relevant policies and procedures (working in conjunction with department deans and division vice presidents, as well as the Office of Human Resources);
- Provide ongoing technical assistance to grant managers as they implement their projects either one-on-one or as a group;
- Assess institutional capacity to effectively monitor grant projects for compliance and consider expanding human resources to carry out this function (working in conjunction with the Office of Fiscal Services).

To date, there has been limited discussion regarding the need for a more centralized approach to grant management that will provide direct oversight to grant managers and help ensure that the college is implementing its grants according to federal, state, and institutional policies and procedures. A more centralized approach would reduce the need for direct oversight by division vice presidents and help ensure that all grant-funded projects are managed in a similar fashion. However, this would be a significant change for the College that may be best implemented slowly. The Grants Office will work with Fiscal Services, the Resource Development Committee, and other members of senior administration to further assess if this is the best course of action for the college.

2. If applicable, list additional capital resources (facilities, technology, equipment) that will be needed to support proposed changes. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request resources through established channels and processes].

The Grants Office does not anticipate any additional capital resources as a result of this increased focus on accountability.

3. If applicable, list additional human resources (staffing, professional development, staff training) that will be needed to support proposed changes. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request resources through established channels and processes].

At this time the Grants Office is not proposing any additional permanent or temporary staff. However, the Grants Office does have a PBAR pending for additional grant writing assistance through a professional services contract.

4. If applicable, note particular challenges the program faces including those relating to categorical funding, budget, and staffing.

Not applicable

5. Summarize any conclusions and long term recommendations for the program resulting from the self evaluation process.

Based on this annual review, the Grants Office will:

- Continue to engage in institutional conversations regarding the direction of resource development at Santa Monica College and the appropriate model for carrying out this function, using the Resource Development Committee as the focal point of these discussions;
- Continue to expand and enhance the Grants Office's partnership with the Santa Monica College Foundation so as to increase effectiveness, leverage resources, and build upon respective talents;
- Serve as a resource for the Office of Fiscal Services as written policies and procedures for grant management are established and consistently implemented across programs;
- Provide additional technical assistance and support to faculty, staff, and administrators who are actively managing grants and/or who want to secure grant funding; and
- Continue to raise institutional awareness of issues that are impacting grant development and management success.

6. Please use this field to share any information the program feels is not covered under any other questions.

Not applicable

Evaluation of Process

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Program Review process in focusing program planning.

None

Executive Summary

These fields to be filled out by the Program Review committee. Reports will be sent to the program and will be available on-line to populate relevant fields in the annual report and the next 6 year report.

Narrative

Program Evaluation

Commendations

Recommendations for Program Strengthening

Recommendations for Institutional Support

Attached Files	
User Satisfaction Survey	