IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts / systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district / system and the colleges.

B.1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district / system.

> **1.a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.**
>
> **1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.**

The San Bernardino Community College District Board of Trustees is an independent governing board elected at large by voters and consisting of community members living within the San Bernardino Community College District as authorized by Education Code 70902 (IV.B.1). The Board of Trustees is comprised of seven trustees elected in even-numbered years to serve four-year staggered terms (IV.B.2.). A student trustee is elected by the student body of each campus for a single academic year term (IV.B.3). Student trustees provide advisory votes (IV.B.4).

In January 2014, the board unanimously approved to divide the San Bernardino Community College District into seven trustee areas so that board members would be elected by trustee areas rather than at large (IV.B.5.). Establishing trustee areas serves the public interest by ensuring diverse representation of the various communities within district boundaries in accordance with the California and Federal Voting Rights Acts (IV.B.6.). The new trustee areas will be in effect for the November 2014 election.

Board Policy 1100 defines the mission of the District and states the following:

> The mission of the San Bernardino Community College District is to promote the discovery and application of knowledge, the acquisition of skills, and the development of intellect and character in a manner that prepares students to contribute effectively and ethically as citizens of a rapidly changing and increasingly technological world (IV.B7).

Policy 1100 also states that the College "…provide(s) to the students and communities we serve high quality, effective and accountable instructional programs and services." To ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of the District's educational programs and services, the Board of Trustees adopts policies and reviews procedures that facilitate the acquisition of skills and the development of intellect among students as identified in the mission.

Through the Board Imperatives, the District advances its goals and supports the missions of the two colleges, which are also focused on student success. The District Board Imperatives underscore its function to promote and to provide opportunities for students to be successful in accomplishing their educational and career goals. The District's Board Imperatives are stated in BP 2270 and include (IV.B8):
- I.   Institutional Effectiveness
- II.   Learning Centered Institution for Student Access, Retention and Success
- III. Resource Management for Efficiency, Effectiveness and Excellence Enhanced and Informed Governance and Leadership
- IV.   The Board of Trustees is responsible for ensuring that policies are enacted that are consistent with the mission of the San Bernardino Community College District. The Board is committed to "…excellence and effectiveness in all operations and entities that comprise the SBCCD (IV.B8)." In addition, the Board is committed to student access, success, retention, and the prudent management of District resources.

1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.
Various Board Policies and Administrative Procedures address how governing board actions should support and improve student learning outcomes and expectations for institutional improvement:
- BP 2020 Board Self-Evaluation (IV.B.9)
- BP 2045 and AP 2045 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (IV.B.10; IV.B.11)
- BP 2110 Board Education (IVB.12)
- BP 2270 Board Imperatives (IV.B.13).

With the goal of continuous quality improvement, the governing board has progressively improved their self-evaluation and goal-setting processes. The governing board holds an annual special study session typically in August or September for the sole purpose of conducting a self-evaluation, establishing goals, and confirming board imperatives. The board minutes from August 2013, documents a discussion among the trustees about the recent board self-evaluation. The discussion was characterized by transparency, reflection, and attention to detail. In contrast, the September 2008 discussion of the board self-evaluation and imperatives featured little dialogue and no reflection (IV.B.15.).

The governing board also attended a special study session on strategic planning in June 2013 to learn about and participate in the district's strategic planning process (IV.B.16.).

Board imperatives are broad policy statements which provide guidance and support to the district and colleges as they collegially develop strategic and education master plans (IV.B.17; IV.B.18, IV.B.19). The first Board imperative is Institutional Effectiveness, which supports continuous quality improvement through data-driven decision making. The second Board imperative is Learning Centered Institution for Student Access, Retention and Success, which supports college programs focused on improving student learning outcomes. All Board imperatives reflect the standards set by ACCJC.

> **1.d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.**
>
> **1.e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.**

Administrative Procedure 2045 prescribes the process for considering and approving board policies and administrative procedures (IV.B.20). All new and changes to existing policies and procedures are required to go through the district assembly collegial consultation process. Policy proposals may be made by individuals or constituency groups and are brought to the Chancellor's Cabinet for review. Proposals are then considered by the district assembly. Items deemed academic and professional are sent to the Academic Senates for consideration and action. After Academic Senate action, the policy proposals are brought back to district assembly as information items and then taken to the governing board for action. Items deemed not academic and professional are forwarded to the constituency groups for consideration and action. After constituency group action, the policy proposals are brought back to district assembly for action and then taken to the governing board for action. The approximately three-month process is described in narrative and graphical forms in AP 2045.

According to governing board and district assembly meeting minutes, the last Board Policies to go through the district assembly collegial consultation processes were BP 2060 Student Trustees, BP 2070 Advisory Voting Student Members, BP and AP 3740 Emergency Notification System (IV.B.21; IV.B.22). The policies and applicable procedures were considered and approved by the district assembly body on May 1, 2012. The governing board subsequently considered and approved the policies on June 14, 2012.

The governing board created a policy subcommittee on March 14, 2013 to consider and recommend changes to outdated policies (IV.B.23). Since the creation of this board subcommittee, numerous new policies and procedures have bypassed the district assembly collegial consultation process: BP 2140 Public Participation at Board Meetings, BP 6610 Local Hire Policy, and BP 6320 Investments (IV.B.24; IV.B.25; IV.B.26; IV.B.27).

The governing board and district office have initiated a rigorous plan for revising and updating all policies and procedures. An expert consultant from the California Community College League is providing templates with updated language that aligns with legislative and accreditation changes. Drafts have been broadly distributed to constituencies including the colleges' councils, academic senates, and other decision-making bodies. Input is being provided to the district office and to the district assembly committee which is responsible for approving changes to policies and procedures. In addition, a subcommittee of the board is reviewing all policies related to board actions. The proposed schedule for completing these updates is December 2014.

Prior to this initiative, policies and procedures have been regularly brought to district assembly for review, input, and approval. Over the past three years, the following policies were addressed:

Date	Policy/ Procedure	Link to Evidence
9-7-10	AP 2060, BP/AP 2045	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/09-07-2010.pdf
10-5-10	AP 2225	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/10-05-2010.pdf
11-2-10	BP/AP 3580, BP/AP 3740	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/11-02-2010.pdf
12-7-10	BP 7385, AP 6330	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/12-07-2010.pdf
3-1-11	BP/AP 6340	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/03-01-2011.pdf
4-5-11	BP/AP 3720	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/04-05-2011.pdf
9-6-11	AP 2045, AP 3720, AP 5030	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/09-06-2011.pdf
12-6-11	AP 6620	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/12-06-2011.pdf
3-6-12	BP/AP 7250	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/03-06-2012.pdf
4-17-12	BP/AP 3740, AP	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/04-17-

	2260	2012.pdf
5-1-12	AP 5030	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/05-01-2012.pdf
9-4-12	BP/AP 3570, AP 2225, AP 6750	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/09-04-2012.pdf
2-5-13	AP 2260	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/02-05-2013.pdf
3-5-13	AP 3050, AP 5033	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/03-05-2013.pdf
4-2-13	BP/AP 6710, AB/AP 3590	http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/District_Committees/District_Assembly/District%20Assembly%20Minutes/04-02-13pdf
2-4-14	BP/AP 3570	http://www.sbccd.org/District_Faculty_,-a-,_Staff_Information-Forms/District_Committee_Minutes/District_Assembly (Note: this is a word doc, so I wasn't able to include the exact link)

For the most part, the Board of Trustees' actions are consistent with its policies and bylaws. In addition to the chancellor evaluation issue outlined in IVB1, there is concern about a deviation in the collegial consultation process for creating and updating district policies and procedures.

1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

1.g. The governing board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

1.i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

The governing board has attended multiple trainings which support improving student learning outcomes and institutional improvement. For example, on April 25, 2013, the governing board attended a workshop with Drs. Barbara Beno and Susan Clifford of the ACCJC regarding

accreditation and the role of trustees (IV.B.28). The governing board also attended a February 21, 2013 workshop with the Community College League of California regarding teamwork, the role of trustees, and establishing meaningful goals and standards for measuring student success (IV.B.29).

A wealth of advisory information is available to the governing board on the SBCCD Board of Trustees webpage. The site includes a training manual published by the Community College League of California (CCLC) entitled Local Trustee Orientation and Education (IV.B.30). Topics covered include organizational charts, collective bargaining processes, communication protocols, sample policies and plans, study sessions, and retreats. A checklist for CEOs and Board Chairs outlines the importance of orienting candidates for election and newly elected trustees.

Board members also have online access to the Trustee Handbook, also published by the CCLC (IV.B.31). The Handbook provides an overview of the community college system and its governance structures, the strategic plan for the California Community Colleges, and the role, practices, and ethical responsibilities of a Trustee. The Handbook also contains a section regarding board self-evaluation using such formal methods as structured surveys and interviews, as well as informal methods, such as dialogue, and an assessment of progress towards goals and objectives (p. 59).

A third publication available on the Board's website is the California Community College Trustees Board Chair Handbook, published by the Advisory Committee on Education Services of the CCLC (IV.B.32) This publication covers such varied topics as the roles and responsibilities of the Chair, elections, the Board Chair and CEO relationships, representing the Board and the District, involvement in Accreditation, responding to crises on campus, and handling the media.

Board Policy 2020, Board Self-Evaluation, establishes the process for evaluation (IV.B.33). The policy stipulates that the board and the chancellor establish the District goals and objectives. The Chancellor reports to the Board regarding progress toward meeting the planned goals and objectives. Additionally, the Board and the Chancellor are expected to develop an evaluation instrument that will be used to assess each Board member's performance of his or her role and responsibilities. The Chancellor then summarizes the results of the evaluation and shares it with the Board. The final review of the assessment is completed in open session.

Board Policy 2050 states that governing board members serve four year staggered terms (IV.B.34). Terms expire for four members in every other even-numbered year and in the alternate even-number year for the other three members. The policy does not provide for a limit to the number of terms a governing board member may serve.

The Board of Trustees adhere to various policies and procedures to ensure the public interest is upheld. BP and AP 2010 address the board's Code of Ethics (IV.B.35; IV.B.36); BP and AP

2260 address Conflict of Interest (IV.B.37; IV.B.38), and BP and AP 6320 address Investments (IV.B.39; IV.B.40).

> **1.j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district / system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district / system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him / her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him / her accountable for the operation of the district / system or college, respectively. In multi-college districts / systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.**

The selection and evaluation of both the Chancellor of the district and the President of Crafton Hills College are guided by board policies and administrative regulations. These are readily available online at the District's website and are consulted on an as-needs basis. Administrative Procedure 7250 describes the selection process for management employees, including the chancellor and college president. The current chancellor and college president were appointed after respective open searches which followed the processes prescribed in AP 7250 (IV.B.41; IV.B.42).

Selection and Evaluation of the Chancellor. The duties and responsibilities of the board are enumerated in Board Policy 2000, which assigns the Board the task of selecting the chief administrative officer of the District (IV.B.43). Board Policy 2175 specifically names the Board as the entity responsible for conducting an evaluation of the Chancellor (IV.B.44), and Administrative Procedure 2175 outlines the process for evaluation of the Chancellor (IV.B.45).. BP 2175 states, "The Board shall conduct an evaluation of the Chancellor in compliance with the requirements set 6 forth in the contract of employment with the Chancellor and Administrative Procedure 2175." Delegation of authority by the Board to the Chancellor is also codified in policy. Board Policy 2170 states, "The Board delegates to the Chancellor the executive responsibility for administering the policies adopted by the Board and executing all decisions of the Board requiring administrative action" (IV.B.46).

The chancellor received an evaluation from the Board of Trustees on May 17, 2012 prior to the adoption of BP and AP 2175 on May 9, 2013. According to Board of Trustee meeting minutes, the chancellor's evaluation has been an ongoing consideration during its closed session over the last two years since the approval of the chancellor's last evaluation. (Jan 16, 2014; Dec 12, 2013; Nov 14, 2013; Oct 10, 2013; Sep 12, 2013; Apr 11, 2013; Jan 17, 2013; Dec 13, 2012; Nov 15, 2012; Oct 25, 2012; Sep 6, 2012; Aug 9, 2012; July 12, 2012) (IV.B.47-IV.B.59). In Fall 2013, an evaluation committee was formed and an evaluation form sent to employees and community members. The evaluation process has not yet been completed, however.

Selection and Evaluation of the President. Pursuant to 2170, the Board delegates authority to the Chancellor to authorize all other employment, fix job responsibilities and perform other personnel actions that fall within the confines of law and the Board's own administrative policies (IV.B.60).. The Chancellor, therefore has purview over the selection and hiring of the college President. The process for selection of the President must conform to Board Policy 7250 and Administrative Procedure 7250, which guides the establishment of minimum qualifications, the composition of the screening committee, the interview process, selection process, reference check, and evaluation process (IV.B.61; IV.B.62). AP7250 stipulates the composition of the President's evaluation committee must include the Chancellor, a manager appointed by the Chancellor, two faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate, and one classified employee appointed by CSEA.

The policy pertaining to the evaluation of the President also pertains to all managers. Board Policy 7251 and Administrative Procedure 7251 outline the frequency of evaluation, the process, and the composition of the evaluation committee (IV.B.63; IV.B.64). The college president, appointed in December 2012, is receiving her first formal evaluation in Spring 2014. The district is adhering to the process prescribed in AP 7251. An appropriately representative committee has been formed, and an approved evaluation form was sent to all college employees and appropriate community members.

Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor. As indicated above, Board Policy 2170 delegates authority to the Chancellor to administer the policies and actions adopted by the governing board. In general, the governing board understands and adheres to the delegation of authority. From time to time, however, the governing board aggressively question and alter routine business items. For example, the board has adopted numerous job descriptions for management and classified job descriptions over the years. However, in August 2013, board members questioned standard language of a management job description and then acted to alter the standard language (IV.B.65).

Additionally, in May 2013, the governing board excessively questioned the necessity and use of a low-dollar value contract to JobElephant online recruitment services under a routine item (IV.B.66). A discussion commenced in which individual governing board members were encouraged to submit simple questions regarding any board items to the Chancellor prior to board meetings, so clarity can be provided timely. Some governing board members felt that asking targeted questions on specific, routine administrative items is their duty as elected officials.

B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he / she leads. He / she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

2.a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He / she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

2.b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

1. **Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;**
2. **Ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;**
3. **Ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and**
4. **Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.**

2.c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.
2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

2.e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

The College president is the leader of Crafton Hills College. The organizational structure of the College is designed to support the goals and objectives of the Educational Master Plan and the college mission.

Directly reporting to her are three vice presidents in each of three areas; administrative services, instruction, and student services. The dean of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning (OIERP), the director of Grants and Resource Development, the director of Marketing and Public Information, and personnel assigned to the Title V grant also report directly to the president.

The president has established a collegial process that emphasizes respect, collaboration, rigorous dialogue, and responsible, deliberative action. For example, at the spring, 2013 in-service meeting, Dr. Marshall outlined her leadership goals:

1. Enhance participative decision making allowing all voices to be expressed.
2. Build a cultural that is collaborative, innovative, appreciative, fun, and action-oriented.
3. Build systems and processes to sustain and enhance student success and a quality learning environment.
4. As a campus, embody our values.

The president also exhorted the college community to experiment, examine the results of innovation, tolerate mistakes, and have fun (IV.2.).

The organizational structure of the College is clearly articulated in the Organizational Handbook, which is updated annually with input from shared governance committees, the academic, classified, and student senates. Feedback and input from the campus is reviewed by Crafton Council, which is chaired by the president. Recommendations are incorporated into the finalized document and it is published online in early August.

The president ensures that evaluation and planning rely on high-quality research and analysis. The dean of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning (OIERP) meets with the president twice a month and the research office reports directly to the President and has easy access to the president's office.

OIERP generates data reports for the President and reports and presentations for standing strategic planning committees that analyze internal and external conditions and are used to inform decision-making. Two of the most recent projects developed for the President to help facilitate planning included the research projecting high school graduation rates (IV.B2.1), and research and presentations analyzing the environmental scan data (IV.B2.2, IV.B2.3, IV.B2.4). The research on the projecting high school graduation rates has been used to inform discussion around revising the District Resource Allocation Model. In addition, the environmental scan data is being used to inform the development of the District Strategic Plan (IV.B2.5), the Crafton Hills College Educational Master Plan, and decision-making on campus. Results from the Environmental Scan have been presented to the CHC managers on January 24, 2014 (IV.B2.6), Crafton Council on January 28, 2014 (IV.B2.7), the Student Success, Engagement, Enrollment and, and Management (SSEEM) Committee on January 29, 2014 (IV.B2.8), the Chairs Council on February 7, 2014 (IV.B2.9), the All Student Services Meeting on February 11, 2014 (IV.B2.10), and the Academic Senate on February 5 and February 19, 2014 (IV.B2.11, IV.B2.12). Crafton's Continuous Quality Improvement process described in Standard IA is being used to inform planning and decision-making (IV.B2.13).

The OIERP regularly examines research on student learning, widely shares the information with the campus community, and facilitates the use of evidence to inform decision-making. There are multiple examples of this process on the OIERP Web Site (IV.B2.14). One of the more recent examples is the research conducted on the impact of course length on student success (IV.B2.15). In the Summer of 2013 an instructor at Crafton observed abnormally high course completion and success rates in a 5-week lower division general education course, which prompted an inquiry to the OIERP on whether there was a statistical difference in student success when comparing coterminous (i.e. full-term or traditional) and non-coterminous (i.e. short-term or compressed) courses. At the same time, faculty in other disciplines, particularly in math, were also interested in offering more short-term classes that could increase the likelihood

that students would successfully complete transfer level math. Based these requests, the OIERP conducted research on the impact of short-term classes on student success which led to an increased offering of short-term math classes in the 2014-2015 academic year. The OIERP is very accessible to managers, faculty, and staff and seeks to provide evidence to help facilitate decision-making. For instance, on the most recent Fall 2012 Campus Climate Survey, 90% of Crafton employees agreed that research was used to inform-decision making (IV.B2.16). Moreover, 92% of Crafton employees agreed that the evaluation and fine-tuning of Crafton's organizational structures and processes to support student learning is ongoing.

Crafton has numerous research mechanisms to evaluate institutional planning processes including the process for evaluating shared governance, planning and program review, and resource allocation. Every year the Crafton Council evaluates all of its shared governance committees through the Committee Evaluation process (IV.B2.17). The Crafton Council is chaired by the President and its purpose is to be the central deliberative collegial consultation body at Crafton Hills and seeks to provide information, facilitate communication, and solve problems related to shared governance. Each year, one of the ways in which the Crafton Council facilitates the evaluation of its shared governance committees is through Committee self-evaluations (IV.B2.18). Each spring the Crafton Council administers the Committee Self-Evaluation Surveys, reviews the results, and discusses approaches for improving the shared governance processes at Crafton. These changes are reflected in the CHC Organizational Handbook (IV.B2.19).

In addition, the Planning and Program Review Committee (PPRC) evaluates and makes improvements every year to the Planning and Program Review (PPR) and Resource Allocation processes (IV.B2.20). In the spring of every year the PPRC administers a survey to the programs that completed a four-year plan asking for their feedback to help improve the PPRC processes (IB.B2.21). The results of the surveys are reviewed and discussed in the PPRC (IB.B2.22), and changes to the PPRC processes are reflected in the PPRC Handbook (IB.B2.23).

The College also evaluates planning and resource allocation processes through the Employee Campus Climate Survey, which is administered every other year (IB.B2.24). The Employee Campus Climate Survey evaluates outcomes assessment processes, inclusiveness, planning and program review processes, shared governance, and resource allocation processes (IB.B2.16). The results from the Fall 2012 Employee Campus Climate Survey indicated that there were dramatic increases in employee satisfaction from Fall 2010 to Fall 2012 with outcomes assessment, inclusiveness, planning and decision-making, shared governance, resource allocation, and with working at Crafton.

IV.B. 3. In multi-college districts or systems, the district / system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district / system and assures support for the effective operation of

the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district / system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

> **3.a. The district / system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district / system form those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.**
>
> **3.b. The district / system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.**
>
> **3.c. The district / system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.**
>
> **3.d. The district / system effectively controls its expenditures.**

Statements from the chancellor and from the board setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity can be found in several sources. The Chancellor's 2012 address to the colleges on in-service day focused on his vision of excellence, student success, innovation and new programs, and a healthy culture. He has emphasized the need to work on the district culture by bringing both campuses together more often, evidenced in a 2011 edition of the Chancellor's Chat, August 29, 2013). He shared the District's strategic goals in the September 15, 2011 version of his newsletter:

- Implement best practices
- Improve student access and success
- Develop and efficiently use resources
- Review governance and organizational structures
- Promote professional development
- Value and promote diversity
- Enhance the image and reputation of the district and colleges

The Board of Trustees published a printed brochure, which is also available online, describing the mission statements of the District, CHC, and SBVC, and showing the alignment between District Strategic Directions and Goals and those of the Colleges. It is also important to note that the service aspects of the District regularly assess their effectiveness through the annual planning and program review process. Feedback and input is solicited from the college, analyzed, and the results are published online for all staff to review.

The District provides several valuable services to Crafton Hills College to support the institution's mission and goals. Fiscal services, human resources, and educational technology services are critical in the smooth operations of the colleges. However, as noted in Standard

III.C., the discontinuity of staffing in human resources has a direct impact on recruitments and hiring, causing the College to have multiple vacancies.

The fair and equitable distribution of resources was a matter of much dialogue among the colleges and the district during 2013-2014. The district developed a resource allocation model in May 2010 to be made effective for the 2010-2011 fiscal year. The resource allocation model, adopted through a participatory governance structure with input from all interested constituency groups, established a baseline allocation in which 100% of district unrestricted revenues were allocated to the colleges. The larger college, San Bernardino Valley College, received 70% of the allocation to match the percentage of the district's total FTES at its campus, and Crafton Hills College received 30% of the allocation to match its percentage of the district's total FTES. The district then assessed a portion of the allocations made to each campus in order to provide centralized services and costs (e.g. fiscal services, human resources, distance education and technology services, police and safety services, property and liability insurance, and district-wide software expenses).

A component of the resource allocation model was its annual evaluation by the District Budget Committee to determine whether the assumptions made in the creation of the allocation model realistically assessed the needs of the institutions. The resource allocation model was reviewed by the District Budget Committee in April 2011, May 2012, and May 2013.

In October 2013, the district retained the services of the College Brain Trust to study the district and college budgets and assess the allocation model. The College Brain Trust recommended adjustments to the resource allocation model, financing of various expenses (e.g. OPEB costs and KVCR TV-FM), and college operations. The Chancellor's Cabinet and the District Budget Committee provided recommendations to the governing board based upon the College Brain Trust report in order to improve the resource allocation model.

In May 2013, the District Budget Committee developed a process to adjust the resource allocation model based upon data and institutional planning. Rather than relying on a stagnate 70/30 split allocation model, the District Budget Committee agreed to utilize district and college master plans, enrollment and environmental scan data, and other sources (i.e. Office of the Controller, California Community College Chancellor's Office, and the Community College League of California) to determine the appropriate allocation to and assessment of the college budget.

Additionally, the College Brain Trust study provided data on other community colleges for the District Budget Committee to consider. This data included comparisons on budget expenditures and staffing levels of Crafton Hills College in comparison with other similar colleges. Attachment D provides data which shows that the college's total expenditures are in line with other similar colleges.

The San Bernardino Community College District received the Government Finance Officers Association award for Distinguished Budget Presentation for its 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 budget documents. The award reflects the commitment of the governing board and staff to meeting the highest principles of governmental budgeting. SBCCD was the only community college in California to receive the award both years.

The district follows all standard good business practices in regard to fiscal management. The annual audits for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, which reviewed the internal controls and fiscal management of the district, identified no deficiencies or material weaknesses in the district's internal controls.

Administrative Procedure 6300 describes the fiscal management of the district and its financial and accounting processes. The policy explicitly describes the importance of internal controls which prevent any single person from controlling an entire process in the expenditure of funds, requires expenditures have a three-way match.

In managing expenditures, all contract authority is centralized to a limited number of positions at the district office in order to control contracted liabilities. Administrative Procedure 6340 Contracts further requires all contracts for goods and services to be encumbered on a purchase order for the full amount of the contract preventing any unknown liabilities.

According to the 2013-2014 budget document, the district ended fiscal year 2012-2013 with an Unrestricted General Fund balance of $24,062,724.76 or 37% of the Unrestricted General Fund expenditures. The minimum recommended budget reserve set by the California Community College Board of Governors is 5%, which means the district is in a remarkably healthy financial position.

The district has consistently been in a healthy financial position. According to the 2012-2013 and 2011-2012 budget documents, the Unrestricted General Fund balance was 33% of expenditures in 2011-2012 and 39% in 2010-2011. The lowest fund balance in the last five years was 24% in 2008-2009.

The district maintains a strong financial position and excellent control of expenditures. In both fiscal years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, the district's independent auditor, Christy White Accountancy Corp, produced no findings or questioned costs on the district's financial statements, federal awards or state awards. The audit included an evaluation of the district's internal controls and compliance to various laws and grants received by the district.

Christy White Accountancy Corp also conducted a financial and performance audit on the district's significant bond construction program. Again, the auditors produced no findings in either fiscal year 2011-2012 or 2012-2013. The financial and performance audit included an

evaluation of internal controls, site walks of projects, and tests on expenditures and contracting procedures.

3.e. The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district / system policies without his/her interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.

3.f. The district / system effectively acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district / system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.

3.g. The district / system regularly evaluates district / system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district / system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

The Chancellor's Cabinet acts a primary conduit for exchanging information and ideas between the district and campuses on topics of importance for the district and the campus. The Chancellor's Cabinet is comprised of the two District vice chancellors of fiscal and business services and of human resources, the associate vice chancellor of technology and education support services and the two College presidents. The chancellor's cabinet meets twice each month. Quarterly retreats are also part of the meeting pattern. Recent topics addressed by the Chancellor's Cabinet have been the College Brain Trust Report and the Hay Salary Study, AB 867, parking fees, accreditation, district strategic plan goal 3, the district's crisis communication plan, and requests for information from the board of trustees (Chancellor's Cabinet agendas, April 2, 2014; April 30, 2014).