Districtwide Institutional Effectiveness Committee (DIEC)

9/27/2018, 10:00 a.m., Board Room – Meeting Agenda

I. Call to Order

II. Review of August 23 Minutes

III. Update on 2017-2022 District Strategic Plan Objectives with Targets

IV. District Plans and Online Locations

V. SBCCD Function Map

VI. Mapping of Accreditation Standards to District Committees
   a. Calendar of Committee Meetings
   b. District Enrollment Management Committee
   c. DIEC Standards (IB and IVD)

VII. Future Agenda Items

VIII. Next Meeting: Oct. 25, 2018 at 10am

IX. Adjournment

	Districtwide Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes	Meeting Date	August 23, 2018
		Meeting Time	10:00 a.m.
		Location	SBCCD Board Room 114 S. Del Rosa Dr., San Bernardino

Members Present

Jeremiah Gilbert (Chair, SBCCD)	President Diana Rodriguez (SBVC)	Paul Bratulin (SBVC)	President Dr. Audre Levy (Interim, CHC)
Craig Luke (SBVC)	Jose Torres (SBCCD)	Richard Galope (SBCCD)	Rebecca Warren-Marlott (CHC)
Celia Huston (CHC)	Stacy Garcia (SBCCD)	Dr. James Smith (SBVC)	Dr. Giovanni Sosa (CHC)
Keith Wurtz (CHC)	Christopher Crew (SBCCD)	Angel Rodriguez (SBCCD)	Heather Ford (recorder)

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Items/Tasks
I. Call to Order	Call to order at 10:06 a.m. by J. Gilbert (Chair)	
II. Introductions	J. Gilbert reviewed job title changes with District employees and reviewed the 2018/19 membership.	
III. Review of Minutes	Review and approval of meeting minutes dated 05-24-2018	**Action Item -** Minutes Approval **Motion – C. Huston Seconded – J. Torres Unanimous Approval** Abstained – K. Wurtz and D. Rodriguez
IV. Chancellor's Goals	J. Gilbert reviewed the Chancellor's goals and objectives	
V. 2017-2022 District Strategic Plan Objective with Targets Discussion	J. Gilbert reviewed and discussed the 2017-22 District Strategic Plan and extending target dates to 2022. J. Gilbert reported some objectives in Goal 2 could be troublesome. They are acceptable until the end of this academic year. Proposed altering these objectives by offering an addendum that focuses on student success. Discussion of extending targets. C. Huston recommended documenting meeting the targets. D. Rodriguez mentioned the colleges can and should celebrate these successes as this is a huge milestone. J. Gilbert reported not all targets have been met and will be re-evaluate. R. Warren-Marlott state some outcomes are called out and some are not. The State will be funding based on completion. IT would be in the best interest to align objectives and outcomes with state funding formula. J. Gilbert-Student Success Scorecard transfer level math & English achievement rate. First year data would be a predictor/indicator to align a realistic target. J. Gilbert will create a subcommittee to draft/re-create reports to tie it in. J. Torres was tasked to get funding formula for each college. A meeting with Andy, Steve, Jeremiah, Rebecca, and others will be scheduled to give a subset to Jeremiah's subcommittee. The process will begin with the subcommittee, present to DIEC, then present to District Assembly, final presentation to BOT. J. Gilbert reported that there is no defined measure of SEP completion and proposed a method for calculating student education plan (SEP) completion (objective 1.1.4).	TASK – J. Torres to get funding formula per each college.

	Christopher reported the challenge is the students' ed plan is not necessary linked to end plan. Ideas change, courses change, etc. Looking at cohorts and looking to better define student ed plan with ed code. It is very complicated to tract due to changes in students' original programs who eventually don't take specific classes. This is not due to the student failing courses, but possibly due to changes in classes. D. Rodriguez reported some courses that are within a program might have an alternative class to earn the same required credit. This portrays the raw data as the student did not follow their ed code when in fact they did with the alternative class. C. Crew reported this was created to measure those students who do not enroll in a program but rather take a few courses. Measuring completion of an ed plan is nearly impossible because we do not have the software available to track. R. Waren-Marlott reported there are two different measurements. 1. Measuring a comprehensive plan and 2. Completion of ed plan. Ed plan to transfer. There are two goals 1. is based on the student completing a form during enrollment and 2. matriculation goal – student end ed plan fluctuates as they progress through their program. Measuring has to be done by cohort or entire student body since they are tracking completion. This process excludes many students because not all students complete a SEP leaving ed plan tracking impossible for all students. Geo reported Ed code is mandated by the state. In which changes are not acceptable to Ed code but additions are acceptable. J. Torres mentioned three aspects; 1 – measurement with students with ed plan 2 – how prescriptive we are making ed plan – which is not accurate due to changes with alternative classes 3 - measurement of completion of ed plan – which cannot be measured due to lack of technology/software J. Gilbert will work with the researchers to create separate proposals to report to the committee.	TASK – J. Gilbert change/create new objectives.
VI. Future Agenda Items	A. Rodriguez will work with the campus' marketing directors to create a PR campaign to celebrate the upper trends. J. Gilbert – Accreditation standards have been mapped to district committees and will now be agendized so that work can begin on them. He will report back to this committee on progress. C. Huston - ACC/AJJ conference – identify funding for a few of this committee members to attend.	
VII. Other Items		
VIII. Next Steps	Next Meeting: September 27, 2018 10:00 a.m.	
XI. Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.	

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Ford
Executive Administrative Assistant
Office of the Chancellor
San Bernardino Community College District

DISTRICT PLANS AND LOCATIONS ONLINE

District Enrollment Management Plan 2016-2019
http://www.sbccd.org/District_Faculty_,-a-,_Staff_Information-Forms/District_Committee_Minutes/enrollment-management

District Support Services Program Review Plan 2018-2022
http://www.sbccd.org/research/SBCCD_Services_PPR

District Technology Strategic Plan 2014-2017
http://www.sbccd.org/About_the_District/Board_Imperatives_,-a-,_Planning_Documents/Technology_Planning

Districtwide Facilities Master Plan Project List; 2019-20 Five Year Construction Plan; SBCCD Sewer System Management Plan; and SBCCD Alternative Energy Concept Plan
http://www.sbccd.org/Facilities_Planning_and_Construction/Master_Plans

Districtwide Marketing & Community Outreach Work Plan 2018-2019
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1YUVDnyvbTsM48ZjjPye2pNddFKaR5qlv/view

Districtwide Support Services Strategic Plan 2017-2022
http://www.sbccd.org/research/Institutional_Effectiveness_and_Planning/Planning_Documents

Equal Employment Opportunity Plan 2017-2020
http://www.sbccd.org/~/media/Files/SBCCD/District/HR%20%20Documents/SBCCD%20EEO%20Plan.pdf

NOTE: District Staffing Plan – Draft coming March 2019

Mapping of Accreditation Standards to District Committees
Calendar of Meetings (September)

Sept. 4	EEO Committee [Kristina Hannon] (Standard IIIA)*
Sept. 4	District Assembly (Catalog Requirements)
Sept. 20	District Budget Committee (Standards IIID and IVD)*
Sept. 27	Districtwide Institutional Effectiveness Committee (Standards IB and IVD)
Sept. 28	TESS Executive Committee (Standards IIIC, IIID, and IVD)

Still to meet: District Program Review (October or November)
District Enrollment Management (No Standards Mapped)

*Received ACCJC's Guide to Institutional Self-Evaluation, Improvement, and Peer Review (Sept. 2018 Edition) after these meetings and re-shared standards with Possible Source of Evidence and Review Criteria with committee chairs.

Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution continuously and systematically evaluates, plans, implements, and improves the quality of its educational programs and services. The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in the performance of their duties.

B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

Academic Quality

1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

2. The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)[1]

3. The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11)

4. The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

Institutional Effectiveness

5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human,

---

[1] **Eligibility Requirement for Accreditation 11:** The institution defines standards for student achievement and assesses its performance against those standards. The institution publishes for each program the program's expected student learning and any program- specific achievement outcomes. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve the identified outcomes and that the standards for student achievement are met. (Standard I.B.2, 1.B.3, and II.A. 1)

fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

7. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.

8. The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

9. The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER 19)[2]

---

[2] **Eligibility Requirement for Accreditation 19:** The institution systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. The institution provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re - evaluation. (Standard I.B. 9 and I.C.3)

- Copies of other documents or photographs of locations where the mission is published on a regular basis;
- And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

- The institution's mission is approved by the governing board.
- The mission is published in multiple locations, including the college catalog.
- The institution follows its process for reviewing and updating its mission.

B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

Academic Quality

1. **The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.**

   POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

   - Minutes from groups when and where the dialog has occurred;
   - Programs from institutional convocations or other professional development activities when the dialog occurs;
   - Minutes from different groups if the various criteria of this Standard are divided among different groups;
   - Planning or governance handbooks if the college has regularly scheduled intervals or procedures for discussing these topics and reviewing related data, or if these topics are specifically assigned to different groups for discussion, data review, and planning;
   - And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

   REVIEW CRITERIA:

   - The institution has a structured dialog on student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.
   - The dialog occurs on a regular basis and stimulates plans for improvement.
   - The dialog uses the analysis of evidence, data, and research in the evaluation of student learning.

2. **The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

− Program information in the catalog and brochures includes program-level learning outcomes;

− Support services define learning outcomes and other measures of effectiveness;

− Assessment methods for learning outcomes are documented;

− Assessment results are collected and analyzed at the program level;

− Assessment results are collected and analyzed for support services;

− And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

• Student learning outcomes and assessments are established for all instructional programs, learning support services, and student support services.

• Learning outcomes assessments are the basis for the regular evaluation of all courses and programs.

• The institution provides for systematic and regular review of its instructional and student support services.

FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH A BACCALAUREATE DEGREE:

• Student learning outcomes for upper division baccalaureate courses reflect higher levels of depth and rigor generally accepted in higher education.

• Assessment of baccalaureate degree outcomes must reflect higher levels of learning than lower division coursework in the same program.

3. **The institution establishes institution-set standards[1] for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11)**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

− Description of the process that was used to establish institution-set standards or that was used to review and update institution-set standards;

− A document that spells out what the institution-set standards are for the various data appropriate to its mission;

− Reports that include actual student achievement data compared to institution-set standards. These may include institutional evaluation reports, institutional planning documents, or program review reports;

---

[1] Glossary – *Institution-Set Standards*: Performance metrics and measures set by institutions for student achievement, both in individual programs and for institution-wide student achievement. (A useful example of Institution-Set Standards could be the three-year averages of student performance metrics and performance targets set above the averages.) Both the definition and the level of expected performance are appropriate for assessing achievement of institutional mission, for determining actions of improvement, and for analyzing institutional results in the context of higher education. Institutions assess student performance against locally set standards in order to determine institutional effectiveness and academic quality and to inform planning and action for continuous improvement.

- Reports include analysis of the data and improvement plans, especially when the data reveal underperforming areas of the college;

- And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

- The institution has established criteria and processes to determine appropriate, institution-set standards for student achievement appropriate to its mission, including standards for course completion, program completion, transfer, job placement rates, and licensure examination passage rates. The metrics both monitor and challenge institutional performance.

- In addition to the above metrics, institutions must demonstrate they are aware of, and use the key metrics used in the USDE College Scorecard.

- There is broad-based understanding of the priorities and actions to achieve and exceed institution-set standards.

- The institution annually reviews data to assess performance against institution-set standards.

- If the institution does not meet its own standards, it establishes and implements plans for improvement which enable it to reach these standards.

FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH A BACCALAUREATE DEGREE:

- The institution has institution-set standards for the baccalaureate program and assesses performance related to those standards. It uses assessment to improve the quality of the baccalaureate program.

- Student achievement standards are separately defined and assessed for baccalaureate programs to distinguish them from associate degree programs.

NOTE: Peer review teams will appraise the process by which the standards have been set, the appropriateness of the standards in accordance with the institution's mission, and the availability of the set standards to institutional constituencies. Teams will also review ways in which the institution regularly compares its data to its set standards, initiatives that have been planned and implemented to improve institutional performance in areas where standards are not met, and other improvements planned by the institution to increase its performance in areas where standards are met (to achieve or exceed stretch goals).

4. **The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

- Procedures that document institutional evaluation and planning processes, such as an Institutional Planning Handbook;

- Documents that demonstrate how achievement data are used in planning and how planning is intended to support student learning and student achievement;

− And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

- Assessment data drives college planning to improve student learning and student achievement.

- Institutional processes are organized and implemented to support student learning and student achievement.

Institutional Effectiveness

5. **The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.**

   POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

   − Procedures that document the program review process, such as a Program Review Handbook, including instructions or expectations how student learning data and student achievement data are used to plan program improvements;

   − Program review template, including analysis of past goals and objectives, and analysis of student learning and student achievement data;

   − The process includes disaggregation of data by program type and mode of delivery, as appropriate to the college's practices;

   − Completed program review reports that include all of the above;

   − Reports present both quantitative and qualitative data;

   − And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

   REVIEW CRITERIA:

   - The college has established and uses program review processes that incorporate systematic, ongoing evaluation of programs and services using data on student learning and student achievement. These processes support programmatic improvement, implementation of modifications, and evaluation of the changes for continuous quality improvement.

   - The program review process demonstrates how goals and objectives and the data provide information about how well the college is achieving its mission.

   - Data assessment and analysis drive college planning to improve student learning and student achievement.

   - Data used for assessment and analysis is disaggregated to reflect factors of difference among students, as identified by the institution.

6. **The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.**

− Procedures that document the program review process (or other institutional evaluation process), including necessary components of student learning and student achievement data disaggregation;

− Completed program review reports, including analysis of disaggregated data;

− If the disaggregated data show achievement gaps between subpopulations of students, the reports include plans for closing the gaps, including resource allocation requests if needed;

− Procedures that document how resource allocation requests are included as a component of program review;

− Completed program review reports or other institutional evaluations that analyze disaggregated data of past and present after plans/projects have been implemented and resources allocated—to determine if gaps are closing;

− And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

• Disaggregation of data:

  o The institution disaggregates learning outcome data for student subpopulations, as identified by the institution.

  o The institution disaggregates student achievement data for student subpopulations, as identified by the institution.

  o Student subpopulations, for disaggregation, may be defined differently for student learning and student achievement.

• Disaggregated data are analyzed, and learning and/or achievement gaps, if any, are reported.

• The institution demonstrates that institutional data and evidence, including student achievement data, is used for program review and improvement.

• The college's resource allocation is driven by program review (or other institutional evaluation process).

7. **The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

− Procedures that document the policy review process or a regular cycle of review for college policies;

− Policies that reflect the latest update or that include the dates of all reviews and updates;

− Procedures that document the evaluation processes or cycles for program review processes, resource allocation processes, and governance structures;

− Results or reports from evaluations of the institutional planning processes, program review process, resource allocation process, and governance structure;

− Analysis within such reports of those processes' effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of the mission;

− And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

• The institution has a regular review cycle for its policies and procedures to assure their continued effectiveness.

• The institution regularly evaluates its institutional planning and evaluation processes to determine their efficacy.

• The institution regularly evaluates its program review processes to determine their efficacy.

• The institution regularly evaluates its resource allocation processes to determine their efficacy.

• The institution regularly evaluates its governance structure and decision-making processes to determine their efficacy.

• The institution uses the results from assessment processes to develop and implement plans for improvement.

FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH A BACCALAUREATE DEGREE:

• The institutional evaluation policies and practices recognize the unique aspects and requirements of the baccalaureate program in relation to learning and student support services and resource allocation and management.

8. **The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

− Regularly published evaluation reports to the campus community or to constituent groups;

− Minutes of meetings when evaluation reports are disseminated and discussed, from a variety of constituent groups as appropriate;

− Presentation materials from convocations when evaluation results are shared with the campus community;

− Other presentations or reports to communities or stakeholders served by the college;

− Minutes of meetings, or reports, when goals or plans are made as a result of the sharing of evaluation results;

− Minutes of meetings when data discussions and planning lead to creation of budget assumptions and prioritizations for resource allocation;

- And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

- The institution demonstrates that communication of its assessment and evaluation to internal and external stakeholders occurs regularly.

- Institutional evaluation reports and program reviews can be accessed by constituencies.

- The strengths and weaknesses of the institution as identified by the assessment are clearly communicated to the college community.

- The data supported discussion on strengths and weaknesses is used to set institutional priorities.

9. **The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER 19)**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

- Procedures that document systematic evaluation and planning cycles and who is responsible (by position or group) ;
- Reports that demonstrate integration of institutional evaluation or program review with planning and resource allocation;
- Completed institutional plans, program reviews, and other institutional or programmatic evaluation reports;
- Reports of accomplishment of improvements;
- Minutes that record who is present or who participates in planning and evaluation committees to show broad-based participation;
- And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

- Comprehensive institutional planning is designed to accomplish the mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality.

- Institutional planning must:
  o happen on a regular basis
  o include wide participation across the college-wide community
  o use valid data sources
  o follow consistent processes

- Institutional planning integrates program review, resource allocation, strategic and operational plans, and other elements.

- Comprehensive planning addresses short- and long-term needs of the institution.

C. Institutional Integrity[1]

1. The institution assures the clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information provided to students and prospective students, personnel, and all persons or organizations related to its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. The institution gives accurate information to students and the public about its accreditation status with all of its accreditors. (ER 20)

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

− Procedures that document systematic review cycles for the information that is presented in the catalog, in brochures, and on the website, and who is responsible (by position or group) to assure clarity, accuracy, and integrity of the information related to

  o The mission

  o Information on educational programs

  o Information on student support services

  o Learning outcomes

  o Accredited status of the college;

− Page reference where accredited status can be found in the catalog;

− Screen shots of web page where accredited status is presented, and screen shot of web page where the link to accredited status is located (one click from the college's home page) ;

− And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

- The institution conducts regular review of the information it publishes to ensure its clarity, accuracy, and integrity.

- The institution can document processes for regular review of catalog information and website information.

- The institution provides current and accurate information on student achievement to the public.

- Student learning outcomes for courses and programs are published or can be accessed by the public.

---

[1] Glossary – *Institutional Integrity*: Concept of consistent and ethical actions, values, methods, measures, principles, expectations, and outcomes, as defined by institutions; and of clear, accurate, and current information available to the college community and public.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success, sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are defined in policy and are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief executive officer. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. In multi-college districts or systems, the roles within the district/system are clearly delineated. The multi-college district or system has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the colleges.

D. Multi-College Districts or Systems

1. In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system CEO provides 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. Working with the colleges, the district/system CEO establishes clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system.

2. The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate district/system provided services to support the colleges in achieving their missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.

3. The district/system has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control of expenditures.

4. The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO's accountable for the operation of the colleges.

5. District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.

6.   Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.

7.   The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

- Board delegation of administrative authority to the chief administrator is defined in policy or other board approved documents.

- Board delegation of administrative authority is clear to all parties.

- The governing board sets clear expectations for regular reports on institutional performance from the chief administrator.

- The board sets clear expectations for sufficient information on institutional performance to ensure that it can fulfill its responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

13. **The governing board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college's accredited status, and supports through policy the college's efforts to improve and excel. The board participates in evaluation of governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process.**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

- Reports to the board regarding accreditation;

- Minutes from board meetings when accreditation is discussed;

- Agenda or presentations from board trainings on accreditation;

- Documentation of board participation in institutional self-evaluation for accreditation, if any, such as rosters or minutes from committees;

- Board evaluations that include discussion of the board's role in accreditation;

- And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

- The governing board receives training about the accreditation process and Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, and Commission policies.

- The governing board participates appropriately in institutional self-evaluation and planning efforts.

- Governing board actions indicate a commitment to improvements planned as part of institutional self-evaluation and accreditation processes.

- The governing board is informed of institutional reports due to the Commission, and of Commission recommendations to the institution.

D. ==Multi-College Districts or Systems==

1. **In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system CEO provides 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. Working with the colleges, the district/system CEO establishes**

clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system.

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

− Presentations by or communications from the district/system CEO that express expectations for educational excellence and integrity;

− Policies and/or procedures that delineate roles and responsibilities between district/system and the colleges;

− And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

• There are established policies and/or practices which demonstrate the delineation of roles and responsibilities for the district/system and the colleges.

2. **The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate district/system provided services to support the colleges in achieving their missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

− The functional map (see Appendix D);

− Policies and/or procedures that delineate roles and responsibilities between district/system and the colleges;

− Communications from the district/system CEO regarding operational responsibilities of the district/system and/or colleges;

− Evaluations of the district/system completed by CEOs of the colleges;

− Summary of district/system role in institutional evaluation and planning, if described in greater detail in Standard I;

− Summary of district/system role in resources and allocation of resources, if described in greater detail in Standard III;

− And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

• The district/system is knowledgeable regarding the established policies and/or practices which demonstrate the delineation of roles and responsibilities for the district/system and the colleges.

• The delineation of responsibilities is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.

- District/system services are regularly evaluated with regard to their support for institutional missions and functions.

3. **The district/system has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control of expenditures.**

   POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

   − Policies and/or procedures for allocation and reallocation of resources to the colleges;
   − Policies and/or procedures for internal controls of district/system finances;
   − Resource allocation model or plan;
   − District/system budgets and college budgets;
   − District/system and college audit reports;
   − And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

   REVIEW CRITERIA:

   - The district/system's has an established policy for distributing resources to its institutions.
   - The policy is well-understood across the district/system.
   - The distribution method reflects the needs and priorities of the colleges.
   - The institution's most recent annual independent audit reports and audited financial statements demonstrate the district reviews and controls system-wide expenditures.

4. **The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO's accountable for the operation of the colleges.**

   POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

   − Policies and/or procedures that describe delegation of authority to the CEOs as described in this Standard;
   − Procedure or evaluation instrument for district/system CEO evaluation of college CEOs;
   − And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

   REVIEW CRITERIA:

   - The institution has policies and practices that demonstrate delegation of authority to college CEO.

5. **District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

− District/system evaluation and planning manual;

− District/system plans;

− District/system reports on student learning and student achievement;

− Minutes of district/system governance or planning committees;

− And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

- The district/system and the colleges engage in an integrated planning and evaluation process.

- District/system plans include analysis of student learning and student achievement in the district/system.

6. **Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.**

   POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

   − Policy, procedures, and/or protocols for communications between district/system and colleges;

   − Reports from district/system to colleges and from colleges to district/system;

   − Minutes from district/system committees, with evidence of dissemination to colleges;

   − District/system website, used for sharing information with colleges;

   − Examples of timely communications between district/system and colleges regarding operational matters;

   − And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

   REVIEW CRITERIA:

   - The district/system and the colleges have an established communication protocol to ensure effective operations of the colleges are timely, accurate and complete.

   - The colleges are well informed about district/system issues, governing board actions and interests that have an impact on operations, educational quality, stability or the ability to provide high quality education.

7. **The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.**

POSSIBLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE*:

- Policy and/or procedure for district/system evaluations;

- Timeline or cycle for regular evaluations of district/system;

- Evaluation instruments used for evaluating effectiveness of district/system on governance, decision-making, district/system and college relationships, and resource allocation;

- Minutes that document discussion of the effectiveness of district/system governance, decision-making, district/system and college relationships, and resource allocation;

- Documentation of dissemination of evaluation results;

- Program reviews or other system evaluations of district/system services;

- Reports of improvements in subsequent program reviews or system evaluations;

- And/or other documents that demonstrate the institution is aligned with this Standard.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

- The district/system and the colleges have a robust evaluation process on college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes which ensure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting college in meeting their goals.

- The evaluation process is conducted regularly and results of such evaluations are widely communicated.

- Improvements are made as a result of these evaluations.