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Statement on Report Preparation

College / District Preparation:

On January 31, 2005, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges informed College of Alameda and the Peralta Community College District that it had reviewed the progress report the College had submitted as well as the reports of the evaluation teams which had visited the College and District on Monday, November 8, 2004. Subsequently, the Commission moved to issue a warning to all four colleges in the Peralta Community College District as a result of the District’s failure to address satisfactorily recommendations the commission made to it and asked that the college work with the District to correct the deficiencies noted in three areas: integrated planning; long-term liability planning; and board of trustee functions. The commission required the college to complete a progress report by October 15, 2005, to be followed by a visit of commission representatives.

As part of the progress report submitted in October 2004, leaders within the College of Alameda and from the other three Peralta colleges, and District staff had been working on an integrated planning process. That work continued during the fall of 2004 under the auspices of the Council on Planning, Instruction, and Development (CIPD). However, as a result of the January letter from the Accreditation commission, Chancellor Elihu Harris designated his special assistant, Alton Jelks, and Chuen Chan, the head of Institutional Research, to convene the District Strategic Planning Committee, which first met on January 18, 2005.

The College of Alameda leadership team and shared governance committees, as well as the Academic and Classified senates, considered the warning imposed upon the colleges and District very seriously when the letter from the commission was received by the college President. She discussed the situation at a College Council meeting after the letter was received (February 23, 2005).

President Cecilia Cervantes, Vice-President of Instruction and Accreditation Liaison Officer Jamett Jackson, Vice-President of Student Services Kerry Compton, Academic Senate President Maurice Jones, and Classified Senate President PJ Santos represented College of Alameda at the meetings of the District wide Strategic Planning Committee during spring semester 2005. From January 2005 to March 2005 the District-wide Strategic Planning Committee worked to agree on a strategic planning model that would use the college plans as the basis and focus. The committee reviewed the model and reviewed models from other colleges and Districts. By March 2005 the committee had concluded that the committee would require an outside facilitator to lead the work of the committee. The District Academic Senate led the effort to convince the Chancellor that an outside consultant was necessary for the success of the District wide strategic planning effort. The committee reached consensus on a job description for the consultant.

Once the consultant was selected and had met with the Board of Trustees at a retreat in June (described in more detail in the response), the District wide Strategic Planning Committee met throughout the summer and fall of 2005. College of Alameda’s representatives include President Cecilia Cervantes, interim Vice-President of Instruction
Wise Allen, Vice-President of Student Services Kerry Compton, Academic Senate President Gary Perkins, and Classified Council President Muriel Montague.

The preparation of this report was a joint effort of a subcommittee of the District wide Strategic Planning Committee and the College of Alameda's Accreditation Team.

**Working Groups College/District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation # 1: Integrated Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Representatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Perkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Bielanski, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Branca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inger Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Classified Representatives**           |
| Muriel Montague                          | Classified Senate President/Alameda |
| Nancy Cayton                             | Classified Senate President/Vista |
| Wandra Williams                          | Classified Senate President/Laney |
| Tony Hampton                             | Classified Senate President/Merritt |
| Sheryl Queen                             | Classified Senate President/District Office |
| Local 790 Rep                            | (to be appointed) |
| Local 39 Rep                             | (to be appointed) |

| **Administrative Representatives**       |
| Cecilia Cervantes                        | College President/ Alameda |
| Linda Berry Camara                       | VP Instruction/Merritt |
| Carmen Jordan-Cox                        | VP Student Services/Merritt |
| Kerry Compton                            | VP Student Services/Alameda |
| Shirley Slaughter                        | College Business Manager/Vista |
| Margaret Haig                            | Vice Chancellor Admissions/District |

| **Students**                             |
| Lisa Watkins – Tanner                    | Student Trustee |
| Rashad Andrews                           | Student Trustee |

| **Ex Officio (non-voting)**              |
| Judy Walters                             | College President/Vista |
| Odell Johnson                            | College President/Laney |
| Mario Rivas                              | VP Student Services/Vista |
| Evelyn Wesley                            | College President/ Merritt |
| Carlos McLean                            | VP Student Services/Laney |
| Wise E. Allen                            | Interim VP Instruction/ COA |
| Craig Hadden                             | VP Instruction/ Vista |
College Researchers
Gregory Golebiewski        College of Alameda
Connie Portrero            Laney
Anika Toussaint-Jackson    Merritt

District Units (non-voting)
Trudy Largent              Vice Chancellor Human Resources
Tom Smith                  Vice Chancellor Finance
Andy Di Girolamo           Chief Information Officer
Sadiq Ikharo               Director of General Services
Jeff Heyman                Executive Director Marketing / Public Relations
Jacob Ng                   Associate Vice Chancellor for International Education
Chuen Rong Chan            Associate Vice Chancellor Research/Institutional Planning
Alton Jelks                Special Assistant to the Chancellor’s Office
Howard Perdue              Vice Chancellor Admissions/District

Recommendation # 2: Long-term Liability Planning
Edward W. (Bill) Withrow   Trustee
Elihu Harris               Chancellor
Tom Smith                  Vice Chancellor Finance
Michael Mills              PFT President

Recommendation # 4: Board of Trustees Functions
Thuy Thi Nguyen           General Counsel
Trudy Largent             Vice Chancellor Human Resources
Summary:

College of Alameda has worked closely with the District on the District integrated planning recommendation process and at the college in its local planning responsibilities. The college has responded from its own perspective regarding its collaboration with District functions and board perspectives in these areas. The recommendations dealing with the unfunded liability and board of trustee functions have been discussed in numerous meetings between the college and District including trustees with the personnel of the District assuming the major responsibility. The resulting document blends District and college points of view on the progress made on these three important recommendations.

Documents in support of conclusions drawn are listed at the end of each recommendation and will be available in the team room for review at the time of the visit.

Signed:

Cecilia Cervantes  
President  
College of Alameda
District/ College of Alameda
Timeline for Report Preparation 2005-06

Organizational Meetings of Response Units............... October 2004-ongoing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OCTOBER 25, 2004 | CIPD  Strategic Planning discussed  
                 | October 15, 2004 Report to ACCJC                                                 |
| NOVEMBER 1, 2004 | CIPD  Strategic Planning discussed                                                |
| NOVEMBER 29, 2004 | CIPD  Strategic Planning discussed                                                |
| DECEMBER 2004   | CIPD  Strategic Planning discussed  
                 | December 7, 2004 Peralta Board of Trustees workshop with Dr. David Viar, Executive Director of CCLC. |

Commission Action Letter Received by College of Alameda......January 31, 2005

Appointment of Accreditation Steering Committee.............. Ongoing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY 2005</td>
<td>Jan 13, 2-4pm District-wide Planning Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Review and Analysis of Action Letter
and Evaluation Report........................................... February 8, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FEBRUARY     | Feb 8, 1-3:30pm College Presidents’ Meeting, Planning  
                 | Feb 22, 2-4pm District-wide Planning Meeting                                      |
| MARCH        | Mar 4, 5-9pm Board Retreat on Strategic Planning  
                 | Mar 8, 11-3pm District-wide Planning Meeting                                      |
|              | Mar 28, 1-3pm District-wide Planning Meeting                                      |
| APRIL        | April 12, 2:30-4:30pm District-wide Planning Meeting  
                 | April 22, 8:30-10am District-wide Planning Meeting                                   |
|              | April 29, 8:30-10am District-wide Planning Meeting                                 |
| MAY          | May 16, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting                                       |
| JUNE         | June 6, 3-4:30pm District-wide Planning Meeting  
                 | June 24, 5-9pm Board Retreat on Strategic Planning  
                 | (Mills College)  
                 | June 25, 9-3pm Board Retreat on Strategic Planning  
                 | (Consultants)  
                 | June 20, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting  
                 | (Consultants)  
                 | June 27, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting  
                 | (Consultants) |
| JULY         | July 18, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting  
                 | (Consultants)  
                 | July 26, 3:30-5pm Board Study Session on Strategic Planning  
                 | (Consultants)  
                 | July 28 Release of District’s 13 major themes  
                 | July 29, 2-4pm Vista Community College Leadership |
Draft of District Responses ........................................ August 2005

AUGUST
Aug 1, 9:30-11:30am Laney College Leadership
Aug 1, 12:30-2:30pm College of Alameda Leadership
Aug 8, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants)
Aug 22 3-5pm Merritt College Leadership
Aug 29, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants)
District Service Center Managers' Report

First Draft of College Responses ................................ September 8, 2005

Planning Meeting for Mid-Term Report .................. September 14, 2005

Final Draft of College and District Responses .......... September 21, 2005

College Council Recommends Progress Report to President ... September 28, 2005

Editing and Final College Review of Report .................. September 30, 2005

SEPTEMBER
Sept 6 12pm Merritt College – Town Hall meeting
Sept 7 2pm Vista Community College – Town Hall meeting
Sept 8 12pm College of Alameda – Town Hall meeting (video)
Sept 8 2:30pm Laney College – Town Hall meeting
Sept 15, 1:30-3:30pm Combined CPAC, Presidents' and
District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants) –
Draft Strategic Plan
Framework with Strategic Initiatives
Sept 27, 3:30-5pm Board Study Session on Strategic Planning
(Consultants)

Report to District Office ................................................ October 5, 2005

Report Presented at Board Meeting .................. October 11, 2005

Report Mailed to Commission .................................. October 12, 2005

Report Due to Commission .................................. October 15, 2005

Planning Meeting for College Mid-Term Report .......... October 21, 2005

OCTOBER
Oct 10, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting (Consultants) –
Draft Strategic Plan
Oct 11, 3:30-5pm Board Study Session on Strategic Planning
(Consultants)
Oct 19 Professional Development Day – Focus on Strategic Planning
Oct 24, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
(Consultants)

WASC Visit .......................................................... November 2005
Progress Report of College of Alameda / Peralta Community College District – October 15, 2005

Planning Meeting for College Mid-Term Report ............. November 18, 2005

NOVEMBER
Nov 7, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
Nov 21, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

First Draft of College Mid-Term Report

DECEMBER
Dec 5, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

First Review of College Mid-Term ................................ January 2006

JANUARY 2006
Jan 9, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting *Possibly to change to Jan 23

Editing and Final College Review of Mid-Term................ February 15, 2006

Mid-Term Report to District Office............................. February 21, 2006

Mid-Term Report to Board ........................................ February 28, 2006

FEBRUARY
Feb 6, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting
Feb Alameda College – Town Hall meeting
Feb Laney College – Town Hall meeting
Feb Merritt College – Town Hall meeting
Feb Vista Community College – Town Hall meeting

Mid-Term Report Due to Commission............................ March 15, 2006

MARCH
Mar 6, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

APRIL
April 3, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting Final Strategic Plan

MAY
May 8, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

JUNE
June 5, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

JULY
July 10, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

AUGUST
Aug 14, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting Strategic Plan Implementation

SEPTEMBER
Sept 11, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

OCTOBER
Oct 16, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

NOVEMBER
Nov 13, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting

DECEMBER
Dec 4, 3-5pm District-wide Planning Meeting Strategic Plan Evaluation Plan

******************************************************************************

All meeting dates and times subject to change.
Recommendation One:

The team recommends that a District wide plan and an implementation process should be created that is strategic and systematically integrates the educational, financial, physical and human resources of the District. All planning processes should be inclusive of the four colleges and communities served by the District. The plan should include identified institutional outcomes with criteria for evaluation on a periodic basis. It is recommended that the District wide plan integrate the educational master plans and program reviews of the colleges. The chancellor should ensure that the plan and the ongoing planning processes are communicated throughout the District. (Standards 3.B.1, 3.B.3, 3.C.3, 10.C.1, 10.C.6)

Progress to Date:
District Response as of September 30, 2005:

Creation of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee
In October 2004, the college/District responded to recommendation # 1 with a proposed model that involved the Council on Instruction, Planning and Development (CIPD). In that report, we indicated that the governance body at each college campus would review the model. Subsequently, in November of 2004, the steering group proposed that the colleges consolidate their recommendations through a consultative process to prepare for strategic planning that would begin in the spring of 2005. Through the consultative process it became apparent that the strategic planning process would need to encompass a larger and more representative group than the CIPD.

In response to this issue, the chancellor of the Peralta Community College District in January 2005, called for the establishment of a strategic planning steering committee comprised of representatives from College of Alameda, Laney College, Merritt College, and Vista College and of staff from the District office. An “interim” steering committee determined the specific membership of the official steering committee. This committee includes 23 voting members and 17 nonvoting ex officio members. The representation (listed under “Documents” below) reflects the desire to have an effective cross section of the colleges representing all constituencies as well as to ensure that the needs of the four colleges drive the actions developed from the planning process. Critical to the effectiveness of the committee and the integrative planning process was inclusion of the heads from the various District office departments.

The charge of the steering committee was as follows:
1) to establish a planning process;
2) to identify key issues for inclusion in the plan; and
3) to ensure that the planning process interfaces well with the four colleges and the individual plans under development at each college.
PLANNING MEETINGS
The initial interim steering committee, comprised of individuals from the four colleges and the District office held their first planning sessions on January 18, 2005. Dr. Chuen-Rong Chan, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Institutional Development, and Alton Jelks, Associate Vice Chancellor and Special Assistant to the Chancellor, facilitated the initial planning sessions. The group accepted the core charge of reviewing possible scenarios for strategic planning and for determining at what point the District would secure the services of an outside planning consultant. The group also undertook the task of reviewing steering committee membership to ensure that it reflected the various constituencies of the colleges and that the appropriate constituencies appointed members to the steering committee (i.e., college administrators, district classified senate, and district academic senate).

From January to May 2005, the steering committee met twice a month to address these and other issues important to the long-term success of the planning process, which included the following:

1. Developing a common mission, vision, and values for the entire District. The individual mission, vision, and values statements from each college were reviewed to identify the common concepts and language that served well to integrate the colleges and the District.
2. Defining the planning process itself, which involved preparing various diagrams demonstrating how the process would flow and ensuring that it would be a “bottom up” process, fully engaging the needs of the colleges.
3. Strategizing on how the decisions made during the planning process would impact the priorities of the processes and procedures of the District office so that they would enhance and support the education mission of each college.

In March, the steering committee and the Chancellor launched a request for proposal for a planning consultant. In June 2005, following the Board approval on June 14, the District contracted the firm of Moore, Icafano, and Goltzman (MIG) to facilitate the planning process. The RFP review process included representatives of the steering committee in concert with the Chancellor. The committee reached consensus on the decision.

Once the consultant began work, their team undertook the following series of steps:

1. They facilitated a second retreat for the board of trustees on June 24 and 25, 2005. (The first retreat had been held in November 2004, at which time the board reviewed their role as a governing board.) At the June retreat, the board addressed overall issues and priorities of the District that provided guidance to the strategic planning process and produced 12 general goals for the District;
2. MIG also immediately began facilitating the steering committee planning meetings. At the planning session, the committee worked through consensus to reach a priority list of issues that the colleges and District office needs to address based on the 12 goals set by the Board and added a 13th goal, Human Resources Development;
3. They conducted sessions at each of the four colleges during August to present the general District goals to a leadership team at each college to obtain college responses to these goals and ways in which the District goals also reflect the college goals and vice versa;
4. By late August, the steering committee developed a draft framework and strategic directions for the strategic plan and recombined some of the initial 12 goals into 7 broad District goals;

5. The consultant also scheduled town hall planning meetings at each of the colleges. During these meetings, the consultants facilitated a dialogue with the members of the general college community on the issues and priorities they felt necessitated addressing through the planning process in relation to the seven general goals that had emerged from the June retreat with the board of trustees and which had been refined; and

6. On September 12, 2005, MIG worked with the steering committee to develop an initial draft framework and strategic directions for the strategic plan in relation to the seven broad district goals for presentation and discussion to the board of Trustees on September 27. MIG is to present an updated draft strategic plan framework on October 10. This draft will incorporate input the steering committee provided on September 12.

7. On the October 19 flex day, at the direction of the chancellor, the entire district is invited to come together to review progress made to date on integrated strategic planning and there will be opportunity for participants to provide input on the draft strategic plan. MIG will use this input to further develop the strategic plan framework.

**District Office Integration Activities**

Concurrent to the strategic planning process, a number of activities are in place that reflect the District’s efforts to engage the colleges and to integrate the needs and concerns of each in decision making, such as the following:

1. The chancellor holds monthly meetings with a variety of groups to seek their input and direction:
   - Group of Advising Faculty (GAF);
   - Chancellor’s Policy Advising Committee (CPAC);
   - President’s Meeting (each college president); and
   - Executive Cabinet (presidents and District office department heads).

The agenda for all meetings includes the opportunity for participants to share ideas and concerns and to solicit discussion and advice in an open and free-flowing dialogue.

2. The chancellor and/or the director of finance and budget convene meetings to ensure integration of ideas and needs throughout the budget process, including the following:
   - Budget Advisory Committee, comprised of representatives from each college; and
   - Monthly meetings the director of finance and budget holds with the colleges’ business managers.
   - Budget Allocation Task Force

3. The Council on Instruction, Planning, and Development (CIPD) has been in existence for over thirty years. Each college has a curriculum committee per Ed Code and Board Policy Guidelines that is the direct responsibility of the College
Academic Senates. The CIPD with representatives from each college and staff from the District, coordinates the curriculum on a District-wide basis, provides the information to the Board for final adoption and submits paperwork to the State Chancellor’s Office. This committee has the current reputation of being a model District-wide committee that provides leadership and guidance and helps to facilitate college decisions. It is facilitated by the Vice Chancellor of Education.

4. The colleges/District began work in spring of 2005 to create a Peralta Community College District Facilities Advisory Planning Committee. This group is to be based on the model used by the Council of Instruction, Planning and Development (CIPD). The facilities advisory group has met twice and is in the process of designing their guidelines, purpose, identifying areas of responsibility, membership, and processes. The committee is chaired by President Odell Johnson of Laney College with four voting members from each college. It is staffed by personnel from the District facilities office. This committee is designed to be a coordinating body of all the facilities projects and would make recommendations to the Chancellor for the trustees committee on facilities. There was an agreement at a meeting held September 20, 2005, that the criteria for projects would be the same criteria as is used at the State Chancellor’s Office and the College’s Educational Master Plan.

5. The District marketing department convenes monthly meetings with the public information officers from each college to develop coordinated marketing efforts, participation in community events, and general community outreach.

6. The information technology department has created a steering committee for the implementation of the new PeopleSoft system. This group meets at least two times a month (more often as needed) to help guide the migration to the new system, which will impact all the technology needs of the colleges, including finance, student services, business management, and so forth. Further, a “Fit-Gap” Team comprised of faculty and classified staff has been established to address the “fit” and the “gaps” in the PeopleSoft student administration system.

7. District Matriculation Committee

Every department of the District office undertakes a range of integration activities and a report from each appears in the section of this report under “Documentation.”

Board of Trustees’ Strategic Planning
The Board of Trustees embraced the spirit of recommendation #1 by convening three board planning sessions since October 2005:

- March 4 & 5, 2005;
- June 24 & 25, 2005; and
- July 26, 2005.

At the special retreats, board members had the opportunity to engage in a dialogue about the benefits of strategic planning and to express their thoughts about what the District’s
plan should include. The first planning meeting, which a member of the board and staff facilitated in March, laid the groundwork for a second planning session in June.

At the June retreat, which the consultant facilitated, trustees identified 12 strategic planning areas:

1. Integrated strategic plan;
2. Student success;
3. Increased enrollment;
4. Student support services;
5. Fiscal stability and sustainability;
6. Accountability systems;
7. Access;
8. Quality Programs;
9. Physical facilities and infrastructure;
10. Partnerships;
11. Board development; and
12. District image and identity.

(The strategic planning steering committee added a 13th strategic planning area, Human Resource Development, which the Board accepted on July 26, 2005.)

Members of the Trustees agreed that "Tonight's meeting was designed to take a first look in order for the District's service centers to have a set of action plans and priorities that would form the District integrated strategic plan and this would guide future budgeting decisions and priorities."

The consultant transmitted these 13 planning areas to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee for consideration when developing the District-wide integrated plan.

MIG proposed that the original 13 planning directions be reformulated into seven strategic directions. In September, 2005, the steering committee accepted the seven strategic directions. The current seven strategic directions are as follows:

- Enhancing access and student success;
- Developing our human resources;
- Creating effective learning environments;
- Leveraging information technology;
- Enhancing resources and budget process;
- Enhancing awareness and visibility; and
- Improving the effectiveness of district-wide communication, coordination, and collaboration.

The strategic planning process will continue through 2006 and beyond. During this period, not only will strategic initiatives be continually refined, but also the processes and procedures of the District office will be adjusted and reshaped to meet more effectively the specific needs of the colleges. Further, MIG will assist the steering committee in developing criteria to evaluate progress made on the strategic plan. The budget process,
as one example, has the goal of being as transparent as possible. The Chancellor’s budget advisory committee is a major component of this “reshaping” of how the district develops the budget, and led by the vice chancellor for finance, the budget allocation model committee, many of whose members also serve on the budget advisory committee, will continue to refine the budget process will be refined as the planning process continues.

Overall, the members of the Strategic Planning Steering committee, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees are committed to pursuing strategic planning as the foundation of change throughout the District. The core goal of full integration of the activities of the District office with the needs and missions of each college is well underway. The steering committee and the college constituencies are equally committed to the long-term development and implementation of strategic initiatives.

Analysis of Results Achieved to Date

- There have been approximately 40 meetings concerning strategic planning between January and October 2005 with the steering committee and/or each college community. The schedule of meetings is in our documentation file;
- The District retained a planning consultant who has the experience and expertise to provide excellent support for the planning process;
- Meetings are planned through December 2006 and it is anticipated that a final strategic plan will be in place by May 2006 and full implementation will begin in fall 2006;
- The District is developing a shared mission, vision, and values statement in conjunction with the four colleges;
- The District has renamed departments of the District office as “service centers,” and they each identified steps and integrated activities undertaken during 2005 that involved and included the colleges in their work. Departments reporting include the following:
  - Educational Services;
  - General Services;
  - Finance and Budget;
  - Human Resources;
  - International Affairs;
  - Marketing, Public Relations and Communications; and
  - Information Technology;
- At least two, and in some cases, three District planning meetings have occurred at each college;
- The District has prepared planning binders that include all planning materials, notes, and background information for each member of the steering committee; and
- Issues have been identified as the core of the strategic plan.
- The curriculum area through CIPD has been operating for several years and is viewed as a model for other District-wide committees.
- The new District facilities advisory committee based upon CIPD is just beginning, and has the interest of college /District support
The area that still needs additional work is in finance. Although several meetings have occurred in relation to finance and the budget, the college communities still do not feel that the district has institutionalized any clear budget model. Complicating the work in this area has been the transition from a legacy system to the PeopleSoft system; consequently, staff members from all colleges and the district have focused on making a smooth transition to the new system. However, both the chancellor and the board of trustees have restated the commitment to expand the budget process and to make it transparent. Further, efforts will be taken to formulate a district wide information technology committee which will be charged with creating a district wide information technology plan.

College Response

College of Alameda’s formal planning and governance structure is centered on the College Council, which is comprised of representatives of all constituencies, administration, faculty, classified and students, as well as the chairs of the standing committees of the college. The College Council deliberates and makes decisions by consensus, except in those areas in which it relies primarily on the Academic Senate, such as curriculum. The College Council meets monthly.

On February 17, 2005 the President formally notified the Peralta Board of Trustees of the decision of the Accreditation commission. The College Council discussed the Accreditation team’s November 8, 2004 report on February 23, 2005. The College Council continued to guide its representatives on the District wide Strategic Planning Committee at each of its meetings during the spring 2005 semester. In addition the college President held all-college forums throughout the spring semester to inform the college community of activities of the District wide Strategic Planning committee.

While participating on a District wide level as a part of the District wide Strategic Planning Committee, College of Alameda continues to be engaged in its own strategic planning processes through its formal governance structure and through planning committees that report regularly to the College Council.

In fall 2003, as part of its accreditation self-study, College of Alameda revised its mission, values, vision, and goals and objectives for improvement and identified student success as its first priority. During the past two years the college has engaged in a number of initiatives designed to foster student success and greater institutional effectiveness:

- Shortly after the fall 2003 semester began the college began planning for its first student success initiative, the Early College High School Initiative, funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Aimed at underachieving students from traditionally underrepresented populations, the ECHS model allows students to

---

1 College of Alameda Standing committees 2005-2006
2 Letter from President Cervantes to the Board of Trustees
3 Minutes of the College Council, January-April 2005
4 Agendas, College Forums, Spring 2005
5 Mission, Values, Vision, and Goals and Objectives for Improvement
achieve a high school degree and two years of college credit through an accelerated program of study. In fall 2004 the first class of the new high school, the Alameda Science and Technology Institute, began.

- In fall 2004 the planning units revised their Educational Master Plan in light of the revised mission, values, vision and goals and objectives for improvement\(^6\).

- Also in fall 2004 the college was selected as one of two colleges in California to be awarded a Title III Planning Grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The Title III team engaged in an intensive year-long planning process, reviewing data and recommendations from the college’s other planning initiatives and gathering input from all of the college’s constituencies to identify areas of institutional strength and weakness. Areas under discussion for a Title III Comprehensive Development grant include the need for a pre-collegiate program, developing discipline-specific information competency models, and providing faculty with intensive training in student learning outcomes, learning communities, and service learning.

- During 2004-2005 select members of College of Alameda’s Budget committee participated on the district wide Budget allocation Task Force, the committee had the task of looking at models for possible reallocation of funds for the Peralta Community College district.

- During 2004-2005 the college’s Enrollment Management Committee developed the Student Equity Plan, a state mandated planning and policy document, to provide a systematic response to equity requirements. The newly-revised plan, adopted by the Academic Senate in March 2005, focuses on strategies to increase equity in five key areas: access, retention (course completion), ESL and Basic Skills class completion, degree/certificate completion, and transfer to four-year colleges\(^7\).

- In May 2005 COA was invited by the Center for Urban Education (CUE) at the University of Southern California to be one of ten community colleges to participate in a new project, *Equity for All: Institutional Responsibility for Student Success*. *Equity for All* is a partnership between CUE, the Lumina Foundation, and the Chancellor’s Office for California Community Colleges. The purpose of the project is to close the equity gap in postsecondary educational outcomes among minority and low-income students. Over the next year, the *Equity for All* team will engage in rigorous analysis of educational outcomes data that will be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and gender. Based on the analysis of existing data, the team will then create benchmarks and indicators for four areas: academic pathways, retention, transfer readiness, and excellence in achievement\(^8\).

---

\(^6\) Educational Master Plan, 2004-2019  
\(^7\) Student Equity Plan, March 2005  
\(^8\) Equity for all Invitation letter
In May 2005 as a result of needs for curriculum revision identified by the college Curriculum committee, the office of Instruction in coordination with the Academic Senate, organized all faculty into eight clusters, which are meeting to revise curriculum and integrate Student Learning Outcomes.9

In May 2005 the Student Services Division piloted an integrated budget planning document that will be considered and adopted by all planning units for the 2006-2007-budget year.10

This summer COA held an Enrollment Forum for faculty to discuss ongoing issues with enrollment and retention. One of the key recommendations to emerge from this forum was the need to integrate study skills within all content area courses.

In August 2005 a team of COA administrators and faculty attended the Dale Tillery Institute at UC Berkeley, which centered on the theme of Equity Challenges and Solutions. The team members identified three main equity challenges to address at COA. The college has selected one of these priorities to further develop and address student needs leading to student success.

On Professional Day in August 2005 the college renewed its process of reviewing and revising its mission, values, and vision11. During the current academic year the college will adopt the revised mission values and vision and develop new goals and objectives for improvement that will use student learning outcomes as the foundation for institutional outcomes. Two teams of faculty, the English as a Second Language and the automotive faculty attended an intensive workshop on Student Learning Outcomes taught by consultant Ruth Stiehl from Portland State College.

In August 2005, COA was approached by Cabrillo College in Santa Cruz to replicate the Digital Bridge Academy, funded by the James Irvine Foundation. The Digital Bridge Academy focuses on recruiting and engaging high-risk students and preparing students for college and careers. This fall the college will continue discussions to see how the two models might be linked and, together, form a menu of college preparatory programs for educationally disadvantaged students.

On September 8, 2005, COA administrators, staff, faculty and students participated in a Town Hall meeting facilitated by MIG, the planning consultant firm.

COA is in the process of evaluating and restructuring the Learning Resources Center (LRC), which was created originally through a Title III grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The Learning Resources Center Coordinator is currently visiting other community colleges in the Bay Area to investigate their

---

9 Cluster document, April 2005
10 Student Services Integrated Planning grid, May 2005
11 Agenda, College Professional Day, August 17, 2005
developmental education programs and learning centers. The current Title III planning team is also discussing possible upgrades to the LRC and the library, both located in the L building.

- In September the college submitted a proposal to the James Irvine foundation for Transformative Learning Connections, a Student Support Partnership Integrating Resources & Education (SSPIRE) Initiative. Specifically, COA is seeking support to develop and launch a new program, Transformative Learning Connections (TLC), a strategic intervention aimed at boosting college success rates for young at-risk COA students during their first year of study.

The above demonstrates that the college is engaged in systematic integrated planning, guided by research, to continue and improve programs and services to mitigate the effects of diminishing resources and greater challenges by its community.

**List of Documents**

1. Letter from Presidents to Planning Committee February 8, 2005;
2. Planning process;
3. Roster of steering committee;
4. List of planning meetings;
5. Shared mission, vision, and values statements;
6. Reports by department of integrated actions during past year;
7. Diagram of planning process;
8. Minutes of board of trustee retreats;
9. Strategic initiatives;
10. Minutes from CIPD;
11. Approved curriculum for 2004/05 sent to trustee;
12. Draft of Guidelines for the District Wide Facilities Advisory Committee; and
13. Agendas and Minutes from Peralta Community College District Facilities Advisory Planning Committee.
Recommendation Two:

The team recommends that the Peralta Community College District provide a detailed and concrete plan that clearly identifies the steps, timelines and measurable actions that are being undertaken by the District to provide funding for the long-term liability posed by healthcare benefits. (Standard 9C.1)

Progress to Date:
District Response as of September 30, 2005:

The District office has developed a planned approach to reducing the unfunded liability of the District with both short- and long-term actions as follows:

1. Engaged an actuarial study that resulted in a reduction of the liability from $150,000,000 to $115,000,000;
2. Negotiated a reduction in the costs of medical benefits by changing medical carriers and by requiring a medical co-pay;
3. Designed a plan to issue up to $250 million in medical benefits bonds to fund and pay for ongoing medical benefits for both current and retired employees. The necessary steps to accomplish this are as follows:
   - Enlist an actuary to quantify the District’s current and future OPEB (other post employment benefits) liability;
   - Establish dedicated OPEB trust and improve matching between OPEB assets and liability profile;
   - Have board of trustees adopt an OPEB investment policy;
   - Contract with ACERA or any institutional governmental asset manager to invest OPEB trust;
   - Validate obligation by filing a petition in California Superior Court. This gives the District the legal standing to issue the bonds;
   - Issue taxable OPEB bonds to fund the District’s OPEB obligation; and
   - Structure OPEB bonds such that debt service plus normal cost is less than the projected pay-as-you-go liability.

The District retained the actuarial firm of Bartel & Associates LLC on July 22, 2005. The Peralta Board of Trustees, on July 26, 2005, passed a resolution authorizing the District to issue up to $250 million in OPEB bonds. On August 12, 2005, the District filed in Superior Court a petition for bond validation. The chancellor; chairman of the board finance & audit committee; and the District’s chief financial officer interviewed four investment banking firms in New York on September 8 and 9. The District will be selecting an investment firm during the next month to market and sell the bonds. The District expects the transaction to close in January 2006.

The board of trustees is also in the process of revising its investment policy. Once this is completed, the District will have a new investment policy in place that will then be utilized to guide the investment of the proceeds from the bond sales.
Analysis of Results Achieved to Date

- The District as a result of negotiations with the unions changed and implemented union contracts in July 2004. These contracts require a medical co-pay which has been implemented and is operational; District medical benefits end at age 65 for all employees hired after July 1, 2004; and 10 years is now required for vesting of all employees hired after July 1, 2004. Previously the requirement for vesting of academic employees was five years.
- Blue Cross was replaced September 2004 with Interplan, a network of physicians, and Core Source as administrator of services. This action reduced administrative costs of our medical benefit program and also allows the District to qualify for rebates which also defray District costs; and
- On September 8 and 9, 2005 the chancellor, assistant vice chancellor for finance and budget, President of the Peralta Federation of Teachers (PFT) and chair of the board’s committee on audit and finance traveled to New York to interview perspective investment firms.

College Response

College of Alameda acknowledges the importance of decisive action on this recommendation on the part of the District office in moving from the pay-as-you-go strategy to full disclosure by 2006-07, per the new GASB standards.

The change in union contracts incorporated the following: a co-pay program; the ending of District medical benefits at age 65 for those hired after July 1, 2004; and vesting time changed from five years up to ten years. All of these decisions have slowed the growth of liability. By far the most positive action taken is the proposal around the issuance of a medical benefits obligation bond. During Chancellor Harris’s tenure as Mayor of Oakland, the city successfully issued such bonds to deal with a similar situation. The hiring of Vice Chancellor of Finance Tom Smith on December 1, 2004, has added to the leadership in this investment/bond area. Also, the November 2004 election of Trustee Edward W. (Bill) Withrow, former Mayor of Alameda, has added to the expertise in this area.

List of Documents

- Resolution of the board of trustees authorizing issuance of bond;
- Superior Court petition for bond validation;
- Draft of board investment policy; and
- Union contracts.
Recommendation Four:

The team recommends that the Board of Trustees adhere to its appropriate functions and policy orientation, and rely upon the District Chancellor for recommendations affecting the organization of the District as well as the hiring, retention, and termination of all categories of District and college staff. The team further recommends that the Board of Trustees clearly identify and widely disseminate the roles and responsibilities assigned to the District administration and those assigned to the college administration so that the appropriate responsibility and authority and related accountability standards are established. (Standards 10A.3, 10A.4, 10C.1, 10C.2, 10C.3)

Progress to Date:

Since 2004, the board of trustees has continued to take steps to ensure that all members clearly understand its governance role. In May 2004, the vice chancellor for human resources conducted a special closed session in which micro-managing as it related to the District was defined and the role and responsibilities of the board was discussed.

On September 21 2004, the District held a candidate’s night for the eight candidates who were running for the four Board seats. All College Presidents and District Service Center personnel were in attendance to present and discuss with the potential new trustees what their roles and responsibilities were and what the District / Colleges roles were including the role accreditation has.

General Counsel Thuy Thi Nguyen, on March 3, 2005, as part of an overall special retreat on strategic planning, discussed with the board in closed session the board’s role and legal requirements placed on board members in the context of several pending and potential lawsuits.

The board of trustees also discussed its role in several board retreats held in 2005. At the March retreat, the board discussed strategic planning and the role of the board in moving planning forward. To that end, the board discussed the established goals of the board to ensure they provided clear direction to the college community. At the June 24-25, 2005 session, MIG consultants led the board through a discussion in which the board acknowledged that what is needed “is a concrete statement about the way in which the college plans drive the five District service centers.” The major part of the second day of the retreat focused on “the board’s role and responsibility in strategic planning and leadership of the District by focusing on policy issues and not micromanagement of the District and colleges.”

Analysis of Results Achieved to Date

1. Previously, the Board of Trustees approved “request to advertise” classified positions during open sessions of board meetings. Since July 12, 2005, the board no longer approves advertisement of classified positions. As long as there was a budget in place to fund classified positions, there was no reason for the board to be involved in approving
such requests. The board would ensure accountability from the institution through the budgetary process;

2. Previously, the board of trustees approved employment of classified employees in closed session and such appointments would thereafter be announced in open session. Since July 12, 2005, the board no longer approves the employment of classified employees in either open or closed session. Such authorization has been entirely delegated to the chancellor; and

3. The board policy review committee is committed to separating the board policy from administrative procedures, so that the board of trustees only develops and reviews board policies. Administrative procedures are delegated to the chancellor and his staff to develop and revise. Such delegation has already occurred as evidenced by the board’s approval of several board policies in chapter one of the Board Policy Manual on July 12, 2005. The board did not approve any administrative procedures at this board meeting. In addition to revisions and development of board policies relating to board meetings and board officers, the policy review committee developed and the board approved Board Policy 1.20, a new policy that delineates the board’s role in the chancellor selection.

**College Response**

The four new trustee members were elected in November 2004 to the Peralta Board. Since that time the board discussed the ACCJC recommendations at the December board orientation that David Viar conducted, at the March Board retreat, and at the June Board retreat. In all instances the board members have been supportive of the colleges.

**List of Documents**

- Goals of the policy review committee 2005;
- Board meeting agenda; timed agenda; board meeting minutes; and handout from Dr. Viar;
- The Brown Act pamphlet;
- Last board meeting agenda with “Request to Advertise”; first board meeting agenda without “Request to Advertise”; and meeting minutes;
- Last board meeting agenda with “Employment”; first board meeting agenda without “Employment” in closed session; and meeting minutes; and
- July 12, 2005 Board meeting agenda; July 12, 2005 Board meeting minutes; July 12, 2005 Board meeting materials; and Board Policy 1.20 (Chancellor Selection).