REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
SPECIAL VISIT

To San Diego Christian College

March 19 -21, 2019

Team Roster

Helen Whippy, Team Chair
Provost and Professor of Mathematics, Chaminade University of Honolulu

Doretha O'Quinn, Team Assistant Chair
Former Provost, Vanguard University of Southern California

Dawn Dirksen, Team Member
VP for Finance & Operations, Providence Christian College

Thomas Fleming, Team Member
Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Loyola Marymount University

Tamela Hawley, *WSCUC Liaison*

Submitted 5/13/2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History, as Relevant to the Visit

San Diego Christian College (SDC) is a private, non-profit college located in Santee, California in the greater San Diego metropolitan area. SDC was founded as Christian Heritage College in 1970 by what is now Shadow Mountain Community Church in El Cajon, CA.

In 2005 the College changed its name to San Diego Christian College as part of a commitment to establish its identity as an independent, faith-based liberal arts college. In January 2014 the SDC completed an additional step in establishing its identity, moving from its original, church-owned facilities in El Cajon, California to a new campus developed in nearby Santee.

The College had its initial visit by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 1975 and was granted Candidacy in 1976. Accreditation was granted in 1984 and was followed by numerous challenges and Commission actions requiring several focused and special visits to the College. SDC has been placed on Probation twice and was under Show Cause by the Commission in 2006.

In 2007, changes to the Board of Trustees and the hiring of a full-time president provided a foundation to address the issues identified by the Commission in its 2006 Show Cause action. SDC had a Comprehensive Visit in 2008, followed by Special Visits in 2012 and 2014. Both special visits focused on concerns about SDC's financial sustainability (CFR 3.4), strategic planning (CFR 4.6), and continued progress on assessment of student learning. (CFRs 2.3-2.7, 4.1)

The WSCUC Action Letter following the 2014 Special Visit included five recommendations relating to: (1) attention to graduation and retention efforts; (2) framing a

unified vision for traditional and Adult and Professional Studies (APS) academic programs; (3) expanding assessment efforts to provide for educational quality comparisons; (4) defining assessment of co-curricular programs; and (5) enhancing & integrating technology systems.

Since the 2014 Special Visit, SDC developed the new Santee campus, and expanded its degree program offerings. SDC received WSCUC substantive change approvals to offer four new online degree programs (BA in Communication, BA in Psychology, BS in Aviation Management, and BA in Leadership and Justice), as well as a Master of Arts in Teaching and a Master of Science in Leadership. Despite the addition of these new programs, the fall 2015 enrollment totaled 917 students which included 483 in traditional programs, 397 in APS Face to Face (F2F), and 37 in Education-related programs. This was a decrease from the fall 2014 total enrollment of 966 students. Enrollment has continued to decline.

In 2016, SDC had its most recent reaffirmation for accreditation visit. The WSCUC Action Letter following the 2016 visit called for a Special Visit in 2019 to address five recommendations: (1) completion of all co-curricular reviews and establishment of a regular cycle of assessment (CFRs 2.7, 2.11); (2) integration of administrative technology systems (CFRs 3.5, 4.2); (3) efforts to track diverse students and to identify strategies for engagement and intervention to promote retention, persistence and graduation (CFRs 1.4, 2.2a, 2.10); (4) tracking of financial health and the application of the five-year budget forecasting tool; oversight of the admissions and financial aid functions (CFRs 3.4, 3.6, 3.7); and (5) balancing resource needs for established programs with resource needs for planned growth in programs; resourcing of existing academic and student service programs (CFRs 3.3, 3.5, 3.7). These are addressed in Section II below.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

SDC's *Special Visit Report* (self-report) was submitted to WSCUC in January 2019 along with a number of supporting appendices. The preparation for this Special Visit began with each member reading the institution's report and examining the appendices provided via Box.com. The team conference call was held on February 12, 2019. After an analysis of SDC's report and appendices, the Team noted a distinct lack of evidence and requested additional documents from the institution. SDC's staff responded to the Team's request, however not all documents were received prior to the visit. This made it difficult for the team to prepare before the visit and more time than usual was spent during the visit on document review and additional meetings.

The team arrived at SDC to warm and welcoming staff hospitality at the hotel and on campus. Both confidential workrooms (at the hotel and on campus) were well prepared with work supplies, various additional documents and plenty of snacks.

The visit was structured around five meetings, one for each issue being addressed. At least two team members attended each meeting. This format allowed the team to interview all those involved in preparing the report and addressing each issue. The team conducted interviews and meetings with Co-Curricular committees, Multicultural Committees, CFO, Board members, President and his Executive Leadership Team, General Education Committee, the Chair and Academic Affairs Committee Chair and Chair of the Audit/Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees, Student Affairs staff and Student Leadership, and each of the Executive Task Force groups. A list of those attending the meetings is available (if needed).

Two of the meetings involved 15 or more people, so the Team divided the participants into groups and asked each group to discuss and respond to questions posed by the team related to the issue at hand. This meeting strategy was helpful to the team in gaining SDC's community perspective, involvement and understanding of this process and of WSCUC expectations.

The team spent time in the workrooms sharing findings and discovery of various issues, raising additional questions, and requesting documents and data supporting statements in the report. The confidential email account was checked daily with only one response during the visit.

The team review process challenges included the late receipt of documents and in some cases limited or no data or evidence. The commendations and recommendations in this report were developed to support the future of SDC.

C. **The Institution's Special Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence**

SDC submitted a 31-page self-report with many appendices in response to the issues. The self-report followed the guidelines outlined in the *2013 WSCUC Handbook of Accreditation* for addressing each issue. Some sections of the report were less than clear with limited evidence and analysis, particularly in the areas concerning technology and finance. While at the institution, it became evident to the team that there limited institutional participation in the preparation of the report, although each of the five task force committees had at least three members. Following meetings with the five task force committees, it was clear to the team that, in some areas, more participation from members of the institutional community would have greatly improved the written self-report.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

Issue 1*: Following unsuccessful attempts over past years to institutionalize and regularize cocurricular reviews, it is critical that SDC take immediate steps to complete all overdue reviews and continue to carry-out future co-curricular assessment processes on the established cycle. (CFRs 2.7. 2.11)*

"The issue of co-curricular assessment was first brought to light during the 2012 WSCUC visit which advised the institution to begin to address the need for appropriate assessment in all programs which possess clear learning outcomes." (CFR 2.7) "Following the 2014 WSCUC Special Visit,

developing co-curricular assessment was again highlighted including the lack of appropriate data collection." (Special Visit Report pgs. 5-6) Following those recommendations three co-curricular program assessments were completed (Student Ministry, Athletics and Library).

The 2016 visit reported "acknowledgement of improvements and gains were made, the institution still had further progress to be made." (Special Visit Report p.6) SDC indicated on p.6 of their self-report that "the team's recommendation in this area became the driving focus of the committee in the 2016-17 academic year." However, one co-curricular program (Student Ministry) was assessed and that one was already in progress in 2016. In addition, the Library was assessed during 2017-18 and produced a set of recommendations that were implemented and Athletics completed a review, and an action plan. Other co-curricular programs that were overdue for a review were combined and assessments rescheduled for 2018-19 or later. Part of the reason given was the restructuring and staff turn-over from 2016-2019 in the co-curricular areas. The report stated "Following the 2016-17 academic year, the committee was able to collect and store semester and year end assessment data for eight of the ten co-curricular programs." However, the team found limited evidence of analysis or review of this data for informed decision-making in a systematic way. The committee chose to revise the regular cycle of assessment to begin in 2018-19, thereby leaving a 2-year period without any review of co-curricular programs. The report appendices provided committee minutes as evidence of continued discussion and planning for assessment between faculty and staff, and the team found evidence of action plan for Student Ministry, Athletics and Library. SDC produced a master list of co-curricular programs with a 10-year assessment calendar. However institutional leadership confirmed that turnover in co-curricular leadership, reorganization of the co-curricular programs, and realignment of student and staff leadership made it difficult to complete co-curricular assessments on time. During this Special Visit the team received a new review schedule that indicated approximately five co-curricular programs are

currently participating in the review process. However, findings would not be available until the end of the spring 2019 semester.

SDC is to be commended for investing in a Learning Management System (LMS) for the collection of data and for ensuring that most faculty and staff working in co-curricular programs are trained to locate data. There were several standardized formal assessment and other measures (e.g. NSEE, SSI, SURP, etc.) used for student assessment, but there was minimal analysis of the data linked to decisions about co-curricular programs. (CFR 2.7, 2.11) The Team was informed that faculty and staff involved in co-curricular programs received no formal training in the review of collected data and its use for making informed decisions for program and student success. The team was assured that one-on-one training would occur when requested. Data analysis and its use for informed-decision making should be the next phase of SDC's training process in assessment.

There was indication in the self-report on page 8 that there were documents as evidence of program reviews and data analysis used for decision making: "data collected over the past few years has clearly and distinctly affected program improvement. Key examples for continuous improvement through the analysis of the data can be seen in the co-curricular areas." (CFR 2.11) However, at the meeting with the co-curricular committee, most attendees indicated they had not been involved in the assessment, program review process, or analysis of data and were not able to provide examples. The team noted that many of the changes made in the co-curricular areas were as a result of restructuring for financial necessity, not as a result of the program review process.

While the self-report stated there was a long-term strategy document prepared for assessing student success, SDC could not produce this document. The team was informed that the person who penned the document was no longer at SDC. In the meantime, a new assessment calendar had been created and programs combined as noted earlier. Although SDC has created a number of co-curricular programs that may potentially benefit their diverse student populations, the team found minimal to no

evidence of integration of co-curricular programs with academic programs and in some cases little alignment with other co-curricular programs. The next step for SDC will be to create this alignment as well as implement a comprehensive assessment program for curricular and co-curricular programs with an emphasis on improving student success in their increasingly diverse student population. (CFR 2.7, 2.11)

Issue 2: *SDC should continue to press forward with the in-process efforts to integrate administrative technology systems that can provide efficient access, summarization, and reporting of the institutional information critical to data informed decision-making across the Institution. (CFRs 3.5, 4.2)*

The Commission Action Letter of June 2014 endorsed the recommendation of that team "that attention be given to the acquisition, development, and integration of administrative technology systems that can provide efficient access, summarization, and reporting of the institutional information critical to data-informed decision making across the College. (CFRs 3.5 & 4.2)" Specifically, the Commission letter noted the need for "accurate, readily-available data that are available across departments in order to support continued evidence-based decision-making."

The team report of the spring 2016 reaffirmation of accreditation visit noted that, "The *SDC IR Report* did not completely address the fifth WSCUC Action Letter recommendation [from June 2014] to enhance and integrate technology systems. (CFR 3.5) in their narrative of this Component." The team report continued, "However, brief descriptions of steps being taken regarding technology development were included in several other sections of the report (e.g., pg. 11, 26, and 62). …They are currently evaluating the best strategy for upgrading or replacing their Student Information System (SIS) since it serves as a foundational component within the overall technological infrastructure."

SDC addressed this issue by describing, at length, the process of identification, procurement, and implementation of a new student information system (SIS), Populi, which was ultimately identified by the recently restructured Technology Taskforce, whose "scope of influence was to identify

administrative technology and software in use and to identify possible integration points of software to improve efficiency and quality of data flow across the institution." (SDC Report, page 11)

The team applauds SDC for the successful move to the new SIS, which is a significant and time-consuming task. SDC has made recent limited efforts at assessing the effectiveness of the new system within the community, such as surveys which were mostly positive. SDC must continue with assessment to be sure the needs of the institution are being met and for finding ways for continuous improvement, especially regarding the collection, analysis, and dissemination of accurate institutional data (CFR 4.2).

The Technology Taskforce, whose ultimate goal the self-report describes "was to improve data-driven decision making by evaluating the quality of existing data and retrieval practices" and "to normalize reporting processes" involved core users and key stakeholders, to assess the existing technology and to review each department's Standard Operating Procedures. SDC provided evidence in the form of minutes of the taskforce meetings, including actions, continuing topics, and new topics of 2017 and 2018. No evidence of actual products described in the minutes was provided for the team's review.

It is evident to this team and from previous team reports that at the root of the need for an integrated administrative system is the requirement that accurate and useful data be widely-disseminated and used for evidence-based decision-making. In meetings with SDC the team noted that there has been some effort made to meet with the various departments to understand what data is needed, however, there was no documented evidence provided. This next critical step for the taskforce is to identify what data needs to be collected, how it will be collected, and how it will be analyzed and disseminated across the institution for use in decision-making (CFR 4.2). Additionally, it will be critical to immediately understand whether the new, more integrated system(s) meets these needs (CFR 3.5).

While significant progress has been made reducing the number of disparate information systems, SDC should create a plan for integrating the remaining information systems for a seamless flow of

information. SDC reports that a (future) planned initiative includes the development of a single "reporting dashboard where all current technology systems push data" and would "allow institutional administrative reporting that can better enable data driven decisions" (*Special Visit Report*, page 16). This type of dashboard will be critical in bringing this effort full-circle and responding directly to the recommendation.

Issue 3: *SDC should engage teams such as the Multicultural Committee and the Enrollment and Retention Committee in the use of data to track diverse students (domestic and international) and to identify strategies for engagement and intervention to promote retention, persistence, and graduation. (CFR's 1.4, 2.2a, 2.10)*

The Team recognizes the improvements SDC has made for the development of the Multicultural Committee since the Reaffirmation visit in 2016. The Multicultural committee was reorganized to include members of the original Multicultural committee (including 3-4 faculty) along with representatives from the Enrollment and Retention committee. Their task was to identify diverse populations, engage the voice of diverse students and recommend strategies to support their needs. Several meetings were held with student focus groups, community diversity dialogues, and in chapel planning along with surveys to understand student experiences and identify methods to retain diverse students. As a result, the committee identified a range of diversity attributes for further study, including religious denomination, first generation, age and ethnicity. The team recognized that work was being done in this area, however, there are minimal changes and initiatives appeared scattered with no overall plan. There was no evidence of tracking or disaggregating data of diverse student populations to identify strategies for engagement and intervention unique to their experience and track the impacts. A clear plan and adequate resources would support such initiatives with the outcome being student success. (CFRs 1.4, 2.2a, 2.10)

The report provided narratives about meetings, surveys of cultural activities, chapel programs, community diversity dialogues and focus group feedback received. However, there was no evidence of

data collected or analyzed to support programs, provide direction or further development. The new committee must gather and use data to address the issue, disseminate findings to the community, and produce strategies for meeting the standards (CFRs 1.4., 2.2a, 2.10). The committee provided the team with two documents during the meeting regarding student demographics and a list of General Education courses with themes of diversity. This was a positive note, and faculty were clearly enthusiastic about culturally responsive pedagogy.

There has not been an evaluation of the General Education or diversity program to determine its effectiveness in preparing students aligned with SDC's mission and to promote retention and persistence to graduation. The team was informed that the General Education committee planned to provide sequenced outcomes in the curriculum for skills and knowledge about diversity to enhance student success for all students but had not completed the work at this time.

The team noted the lack of a plan, including best practices, targets and goals based on data and evidence, to improve the tracking of diverse students and to identify strategies for engagement and intervention to promote retention, persistence, and graduation. The team was also informed that there is no designated staff to oversee diversity initiatives on campus. The student who serves as Associated Student Body (ASB) President is the designated person for issues of diversity. It is a part of the new responsibilities of the ASB President as evidenced in the job description. The team observed that the current structure is minimal for supporting diversity. It is important to develop and resource a system to ensure students are retained and engaged, and persist to graduation for a successful student learning experience at SDC. (CFR's 1.4, 2.2a, 2.10)

Issue 4: *SDC should continue to closely monitor the 5-year budget forecasting tool and the overall financial health of the College, as demonstrated by self-identified Key Performance Indicators, such as CFI and USDE composite score. In additional, the Institution is urged to closely monitor, and refine as appropriate, the recent personnel and process changes initiated to address oversight of Admissions and Financial Aid. (CFR's 3.4, 3.6, 3.7)*

SDC described in the self-report a two-pronged response to budgeting. First the CFO is tasked to work with members of the institution to "identify key performance indicators (KPIs) that …leaders of the institution could use to understand and support the financial health of the college." Secondly, "the acting dean of enrollment services would work with select cabinet members and human resource personnel to study higher education enrollment management models to recommend a future organizational structure to support the area of Enrollment Management."

It is significant to note that in responding to this issue, SDC focused on the identification of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) across the institution, with little to no attention or evidence provided regarding the need to closely monitor the 5-year budget forecasting tool and the overall financial health of the college, as demonstrated by self-identified KPIs, such as the composite financial index (CFI) and the USDE composite financial score (CFR 3.4).

From October 2017 until December 2018 SDC was without a full-time, permanent chief financial officer (CFO). SDC managed this period of vacancy in the CFO position by appointing an interim CFO. SDC has now moved all financial management in-house and under the oversight of the new CFO. The team applauds the institution for the recent hiring of the new CFO, who comes to the institution with education and experience that make him well-qualified for the role (CFR 3.8). Because the new CFO lacks non-profit or higher education experience, it will be important for him to take advantage of available training opportunities such as those offered by National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) and Council for Christian College and Universities (CCCU).

This period without dedicated and qualified full-time financial leadership and management at the institution has had a devastating impact on the financial status of SDC. The team is very concerned about the current financial status of SDC for a variety of reasons, including the lack of a functioning or operational 5-year budget forecasting tool. The recommendation of the 2016 visit team was clear that close monitoring of the 5-year budget forecasting tool would be imperative to the ongoing financial

health of SDC. However, the team discovered that the last time the tool had been updated was sometime in early 2017. In the Fiscal Years 2016-17 and 2017-18, SDC experienced a reduction in the total number of students and net tuition and fee income from each prior year. Without careful monitoring and the ability to respond, this situation resulted in SDC's current dire financial position and now demands an immediate and drastic response to ensure the continued viability of SDC. (CFRs 3.5, 3.6, 3.7) An integrated and closely monitored financial plan that takes into account enrollment and other revenues is important to inform future decision-making. In times of declining enrollment, it is especially crucial that SDC have a plan in place for financial stability and sustainability to be able to fulfill its mission. (CFRs 1.7, 3.4)

In addition, the Fiscal Year 2017-18 (June 30th year end) financial records were reviewed by the new CFO and have only just been closed. This internal review resulted in a restatement of the 2017 audited financial information. The restatement resulted in a decrease in net assets of $1,143,145 whereas the previously audited report showed an increase in net assets of $57,572. The restated net assets were approximately 21.45% lower than the net assets as of July 1, 2016. In Fiscal Year 2017–18, SDC had negative change in net assets of $964,208 or approximately 23% of the restated net assets as of the beginning of Fiscal Year 2017–18. The draft Fiscal Year 2017-18 audited financial statement, footnote 6, reveals that SDC as of June 30, 2018 was not in compliance with the debt service covenant on their recently (February 16, 2018) refinanced debt ($13,000,000). The footnote indicates "not satisfying the debt service coverage ratio is considered an Event of Default under the loan agreement with CLI Capital (lender) and as a result, CLI Capital has the right to enforce the payment of the outstanding note immediately or non-judicial foreclosure as allowed by the law, among other rights." As of March 20, 2019, the lender has not enforced its rights and SDC continues making its monthly loan payments. Also as of March 20, 2019, SDC had not received from its lender a waiver of the Event of Default. The composite score must also be recalculated by the US Dept. of Education for 2017–18 which could

possibly result in the requirement for a letter of credit to secure federal student aid for the coming academic year. SDC must make careful financial plans to ensure they can accommodate this potential situation as well as a plan to recover with a composite score above the required level to ensure the continued financial viability of SDC (CFR 3.4).

There has been no approved budget for 2018-19. For the 9 months of the current fiscal year SDC has been operating under the prior year's budget and an understanding from institutional leadership to "only spend what is needed". There are no current year financial statements, nor have the financial records been closed for any month yet in the current 2018-19 fiscal year, which is the consequence of not having entered data into SDC's general ledger. The next major task the new CFO will assume after this visit is getting the current year financial information entered and validated. The lack of current year actual financial information precludes the SDC management from having comparative information to evaluate current financial status. SDC is monitoring its cash, receivable and payables. The receivables as of June 30th had a large balance ($2,851,780 net (2018) compared to $1,602,720, net (2017)) and that balance has not changed significantly as of December 2018. Unless these and other matters mentioned here are resolved SDC is in danger of being out of compliance with Standard 3.

The new CFO is preparing to begin the process of developing the Fiscal Year 2019-20 budget. As part of this process he plans to meet with each budget department head to review the previous year's actual results and to closely examine each area for expense reduction strategies. Also, the new CFO intends that part of the budget development process will also include examining the key performance indicators (KPIs) used for benchmarking that were developed by each of the departments as well as those established and used regularly by institutions of higher education to monitor fiscal health, including the composite financial indicator (CFI) and the composite score published by the US Department of Education (CFR 3.7).

The KPIs that have been developed by the departments in response to this recommendation do not

show evidence of being functioning tools within their regular operations. They were presented as

evidence to the team, but they did not include analysis and comparison to SDC or clear targets or goals

that resulted from the use of the KPI data. It will be important for each department to not simply identify

the KPIs that are relevant to their areas, but also demonstrate that they use them to determine appropriate

goals, analyze and then monitor regularly for progress and adjustment (CFR 3.7).

In response to the final component of this issue, SDC evaluated the personnel within enrollment

services/management. Since the 2016 visit SDC hired a new dean of enrollment who oversees

admissions and student financial services. SDC utilizes a 3rd party administrator for their back-end

financial aid services providing additional expertise and support for the management of the federal

student aid program. The report states that SDC intends to move "all of campus financial services under

the supervision of the new CFO to allow the dean of enrollment management to focus solely on

increasing student enrollment, retention, and persistence to graduation." The team supports this decision

and encourages SDC to examine roles and responsibilities in all financial service areas to ensure proper

internal controls (CFRs 3.6, 3.7).

Issue Five: *SDC should carefully balance its vision and planning for future programmatic expansion with the present foundational need to adequately equip current personnel and the need to resource existing academic and student service programs. (CFRs 3.3, 3.5, 3.7)*

SDC created a Strategic Planning Committee tasked "to define objectives and deliverables that

would provide assurance that resources would develop sufficiently to support the academic and student

services programs and personnel. To provide direction for this recommendation, it was determined that

SDC should study what resources it has, what is needed for the future, and to plan development

activities for today and tomorrow's employees. To accomplish this objective, the following action steps

were taken: (1) Understand the college's desired FTE budget ratio; (2) Research peer institutions in

higher education for service personnel ratios to identify best practices; (3) Involve stakeholders to build

a foundation for desired performance levels through the annual evaluation process; (4) Create

conversation with divisional and departmental leadership to define and identify superior performance

level". SDC has developed extensive documentation and training on its vision for faculty, staff and

students. The vision is primarily theological.

SDC indicated and provided evidence that it has done extensive benchmarking for various areas

within the College to inform decision making and resource allocations. SDC provided documentation

that for the Library its budget for 2017-2018 had been reduced to 85% of the prior year as a result of the

benchmarking. SDC also used benchmarking to review its Athletics scholarships by sport and

compensation for its coaches; however, the 2018 athletic budgets declined by approximately $200,000.

SDC selected a number of colleges to benchmark against; however, the report did not indicate how those

colleges were selected or how it was determined to classify the competitors into three categories. A chart

was prepared showing the Co-curricular programs for three competitors; however, it didn't show SDC,

or what actions were expected to be taken as a result of the benchmarked data. It was unclear on what

next steps were being taken to act upon the benchmarking on other areas of SDC.

The benchmarking for Marketing, Advancement and Operations has been delayed until 2020 –

2021. These three areas are essential to resources and the delay is significant. The delay has been caused

by the timing on the hiring of a new Vice President for Advancement and a new CFO. The delay in the

hiring of the CFO was because SDC needed an individual with skills to bring the accounting and finance

operations back into appropriate and necessary levels. Previously the accounting operations (except for

A/P) were outsourced to a company operated by SDC's former CFO. It was decided to bring the

accounting operations back into SDC. After bringing the accounting function back in-house, SDC

management determined the 2017 audited financial statements required restatement, which was done in

connection with its 2018 audit. The delays in addressing these three critical areas are expected to impact SDC's ability to adequately resource existing academic and student service programs.

There are two major items that have been on-hold or delayed and were identified as follows by SDC: "Identification of Other Changes or Issues the Institution is Facing Currently, the institution is in a transition phase with the new CFO. This includes a shift in the Dean of Enrollment Management role and brings all campus financial services under the supervision of the CFO to allow the Dean of Enrollment Management to focus solely on increasing student enrollment, retention, and persistence to graduation. Feedback loops will be implemented spring 2019 and will include campus-wide input." As of the visit this change has not been made nor announced to the SDC community. The delay was the result (in part) of the CFO's focus on the restatement of the FY 2017 financial statements and with the FY 2018 financial audit. It appears that extensive conversations have been held by SDC to identify needs; however, the operational plans to execute those observations do not appear to have been developed, resourced nor executed.

Material provided did not address CFR 3.3 about appropriate and sufficient support, nor did the budget material provided for FY 2018 or FY 2019 indicate budgetary support. The budgetary process indicates the CFO will be meeting with department heads and other leaders with budgetary responsibilities to develop budgets for subsequent periods. Critical to the budgetary process will be the enrollment management process to enroll the students needed to operate the College on a sound fiscal basis.

It was not clear how other decision-making structures and processes are in place (CFR 3.7). It appears to the team from observation and limited documentation that, absent a clear data-driven process for decision making, that the primary decision maker is the President.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Commendations

San Diego Christian College is commended for

1. The hiring of a new, local, permanent, full-time CFO who has demonstrated transparency in interactions with the visiting team.

2. The Board's clear understanding of its' role and understanding of the seriousness of the current financial situation.

3. Progress made in building and developing a team to address the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. This includes the combined committees, the engaged faculty, and the recognition and incorporation of multicultural perspectives within the curriculum. While there is still much work to be done, this is a sound base with which to proceed.

Recommendations

The team recommends the following:

1. SDC has established a timeline and cycle for assessment of co-curricular programs, but it has not yet been completely implemented. Since the reaffirmation visit in 2016, one co-curricular program (Student Ministry) has been assessed and that one was already in progress at that time. Other programs that were overdue for a review were instead combined and assessments rescheduled. SDC should implement a comprehensive assessment program for curricular and co-curricular programs with an emphasis of improving student success in their increasingly diverse student population by the time of their reaffirmation in 2023 (CFRs 2.7, 2.11)

2. While SDC has made progress in integrating technology systems and making data more accessible, it continues to be critical that the reporting and analysis of data be documented,

implemented, disseminated and used for planning and decision-making throughout the institution. (CFRs 4.2)

3. While the institution has made progress in identifying diverse student populations across a wide range of attributes including ethnicity, socio-economic status, and religious denominations, it is imperitive that SDC take steps to devote fiscal and human resources to increasing the success of these students. Evidence-based interventions and strategies must be researched, deliberately chosen, resourced, and implemented to improve retention and graduation. (CFRs 2.2a, 2.10, 3.1, WSCUC Equity and Inclusion Policy)

4. Team found that SDC does not have a functioning or operational 5-year budget forecast. An integrated budget that takes into account enrollment and other revenues is important to inform future decision-making. In times of declining enrollment, it is especially crucial that SDC have a plan in place for financial stability and sustainability to be able to fulfill its mission. (CFRs 1.7, 3.4)

5. The team found in the notes of the Draft Audit that SDC is not currently in compliance with their loan agreement stipulations. This financial situation must be resolved. (CFRs 1.7, 3.4, 3.6)