



# Prior Recommendations

## Responses to Recommendations from the Most Recent Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Review

### College Recommendations

The responses to College recommendations include not only those from the 2009 Institutional Effectiveness review, but all recommendations to the College from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) since June 30, 2009. The College responses are organized by year and by recommendation.

In 2009 the Commission also made a number of recommendations to the District that were applicable to all four Colleges, including College of Alameda. The District recommendations are grouped into categories and responses provided accordingly.

### Summary of ACCJC Actions and College of Alameda Responses since the last Self Study:

#### 2009

College of Alameda submitted its Comprehensive Self Study Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in early spring 2009. A ten-member accreditation team visited the Peralta Community College District (PCCD), College of Alameda (COA), and the other three Colleges, Laney College, Merritt College, and Berkeley City College, March 9-12, 2009, for the purpose of determining whether the institution continued to meet Accreditation Standards, to evaluate how well the College achieved its stated purpose, to provide recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, to follow up on recommendations made at the last comprehensive visit in 2003, and to submit recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges regarding accreditation status. This was the second comprehensive self study to be done in concert with the other three Colleges of the PCCD and the first done with the Standards adopted by ACCJC in the year 2002.[REF: [Self Study Report 2009](#)]

The accreditation team that visited College of Alameda in March 2009 made seven recommendations to the College, five College specific and two District level. The Commission issued its action letters in June 2009, accepting the report of the accreditation team, placing the College on warning and requiring that the College complete follow up reports in March 2010 and 2011. The follow up report of 2010 was to demonstrate resolution of the following recommendations: Recommendation 1, 2, 3, and 4 (College specific) and a status report on the progress of satisfying recommendations 5 and 7 (District level). The letter to the District contained five recommendations, three to be resolved by 2010 and two by 2011.[REF: [Team Evaluation Report](#) ; [ACCJC-District-and-College-Action-Letters-June-30-2009](#)]

The College recommendations were:

**Team Recommendation 1:** In order to meet the Standards and build upon the considerable progress made in developing a systematic, integrated District-wide planning process, the team recommends that the College move forward in implementing its own comprehensive and integrated strategic planning process that is tied to the College's mission, values, goals, and priorities and includes the evaluation and refinement of key processes to improve student learning and promote institutional effectiveness (Standards 1A.4, 1B.2, 1B.3, 1B.4, 1B.6, 1B.7, 2A.1.a, 2A.2.f, 2B.4, 2C.2, 3A.6, 3B.1.a, 3B.2.a, 3B.2.b, 3C.1.c, 3C.2, 3D.1, 3D.3, 4A.1, 4A.2, 4A.5, 4B.2, 4B.2.b).

**Team Recommendation 2:** In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that systems to support internal campus communication, as well as College-District communication, be improved to support the optimal functioning of the College in promoting student learning (Standards 1B.1, 1B.2, 1B.4, 1B.5, 1B.7, 2A.2.a, 2A.2.b, 2A.2.f, 2B.4, 2C.2, 3A.6, 3B.2.b, 3C.2, 3D.1.a, 3D.1.d, 3D.3, 4A.1, 4A.2, 4A.2.a, 4A.3, 4A.5, 4B.2, 4B.2.b, 4B.2.e, 4B.3, 4B.3.f).

**Team Recommendation 3:** In order to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline, the College must accelerate its progress in developing and assessing course-level and program-level student learning outcomes and using assessment data for improvement. Further, in order to meet the Standards, the College must also ensure compliance with its program review and unit planning processes and accelerate its progress toward creating a data-driven environment in which continuous assessment is used as vehicle for institutional improvement (Standards 2A.1, 2A.1.a, 2A.1.c, 2A.2.a, 2A.2.b, 2A.2.e, 2A.2.f, 2B.4).

**Team Recommendation 4:** In order to meet the Standard, and consistent with the recommendation of the 2003 visiting team, the team recommends that the College devote the time and resources needed to complete regular, systematic evaluations for classified professionals, full-time contract faculty, and part-time faculty (Standard 3A.2).

**Team Recommendation 5:** In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College advance and refine the implementation of the District-wide computer information system (Standards 3C.1.a, 3C.1.c, 3C.1.d, 4B.3.b).

**Team Recommendation 6:** In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College develop, implement, and integrate the College budget development

processes with the new District resource allocation model (Standards 3D.2.a, 3D.2.b, 3D.2.d, and 3D.2.g).

#### District

**Team Recommendation 7: The team recommends that the District take immediate corrective action to implement all necessary system modifications to achieve access to a fully integrated computer information management system, including modules for student, financial aid, human resources, and finance. All corrective action and system testing should be completed within two years and the governing board should receive regular implementation progress reports until project completion (Standards 3D.1.a, 3D.1.b, and 3D.2.a).**

The following five recommendations were made to the District (two of them overlap with #5 and #7 for the College).

**Recommendation: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College advance and refine the implementation of the District-wide computer information system. (Standards 3C.1.a, 3C.1.c, 3C.1.d, IV. B. 3.6) (This was the same as College of Alameda's #5)**

#### Recommendation: Management systems

**The team recommends that the District immediately resolve the functional issues associated with the implementation of the District-wide adopted software management systems for student, human resources, and financial aid administration (Standards III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d, and IV. B. 3.b) (This was not the same but overlapped the College's #7 recommendation. In 2010 ACCJC re-titled this recommendation 2009 Team Recommendation 2).**

#### Recommendation: Financial resources and Technology

**The team recommends that the District take immediate corrective action to implement all appropriate controls and necessary MIS system modifications to achieve access to a fully integrated computer information management system, including modules for student, financial aid, human resources, and finance, in order to assure financial integrity and accountability. All corrective action and system testing should be completed within two years and the governing board should receive regular implementation progress reports until project completion (Standards II.D.1.a., III.D.1.b., and III.D.2.a.) . In 2010 ACCJC re-titled this recommendation 2009 Team Recommendation 3.**

**Recommendation: Board and District Administration (Berkeley City, Laney, and Merritt Colleges)**

**The team recommends that the District assess the overall effectiveness of its service to the Colleges and provide clear delineation of functional responsibilities and develop clear processes for decision-making (Standard IV.B.1, IV.B. 3a,b,c,f,g . In 2010 ACCJC retitled this recommendation 2009 Team Recommendation 1.**

**Recommendation: (Laney College only, #7) Governance and consultation. The team recommends that all College leadership groups participating in District governance strive to clarify and strengthen the individual and collective understanding and adherence to appropriate consultation practices and defined decision-making processes and authority in order to meet the Standard (IV.B.1.d,e)**

In November, 2009, in response to the 2009 Annual Fiscal Report filed by the District on behalf of College of Alameda and the other three Peralta Colleges, the ACCJC requested the Peralta Community College District to provide a Special Report which responded to twenty-nine audit findings in the District's 2007-2008 and prior independent audit reports from Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co, LLP (VTD) ( Recommendation 2), as well as to the OPEB (Other Post Employment Benefits) liabilities (Recommendation 1). Thus two recommendations to the District, as well as to Laney and Merritt Colleges, were added to the recommendations that were to be addressed in March 2010.[REF: [ACCJC-Request-for-Special-Report-on-Audit-Findings-November-18-2009.pdf](#)]

**2010**

The March 15, 2010 follow-up reports for College of Alameda and those of the other three Peralta Colleges were filed, responding to the District level recommendations as well as the College-specific recommendations. College of Alameda's report addressed six of seven recommendations (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7). Team recommendation 6 was omitted from the 2009 letter, because it involved the same requirement as Recommendation 1. Two of the College's recommendations concerned District operations (Team Recommendations 5 and 7).

The Special Report, addressing the November 2009 visit to the District was filed with ACCJC on April 1, 2010. On April 12, 2010, the ACCJC visiting team completed a College of Alameda site visit and a District site visit to the Peralta Community College District office. [REF: [COA Accreditation Followup Report FINAL March 15 10.doc](#); [Special-report4-01-10](#)]

In its June letter the ACCJC placed College of Alameda and the other three Colleges on probation status, requesting that the recommendations made to College of Alameda and the other three Colleges pertaining to District practices be addressed directly by the District office in an October 15, 2010 report to ACCJC and that the report for College of Alameda

specifically speak to the resolution of Recommendation 1. As a result of the Special visit, the Commission made two reporting requirements, nine recommendations, and continued the 2009 recommendations.[REF: [Accreditation Response June 30 2010](#)]

College of Alameda filed a October 15, 2010 Follow-Up Report to address the single College recommendation due at that time as directed in the June 30, 2010 Commission letter, as well as District recommendations 5 and 7. The report addressed Team Recommendation 1 related to implementing a comprehensive and integrated strategic planning process. [REF: [COA Final Follow Up Report October 15 2010](#)]

*The* Peralta District filed its report by the October 15, 2010 deadline, and a site visit took place November 4, 2010. The January 31, 2011 letter to the Peralta Chancellor notified the District that College of Alameda and the other three Colleges were retained on probation status pending another report to be filed by the District office on March 15, 2011.[REF: [ACCJC-101510-FollowUp-Report-FINAL.pdf](#); [January-2011-Commission-Letter-and-Follow-up-Visit-Report-ACCJC-letter-2-14-11](#)]

## 2011

A two member accreditation team visited College of Alameda on April 12, 2011 for the purpose of conducting a follow-up visit concerning Recommendation 1, cited in the Commission's June 30, 2010 action letter. In that letter the Commission went on to explain that the team would also verify the continued positive progress noted by the April 2010 visit on Recommendations, 2,3,4 and specifically Recommendations 5,and 7.

In its June 30, 2011 letter, the Commission removed College of Alameda from Probationary status. No additional recommendations or follow-up requests were made related to the 2009 Team Recommendations. However, the ACCJC acted to place College of Alameda on Warning status for five new recommendations related to Peralta District issues. The five new recommendations explicitly replaced and superseded all earlier District recommendations. The Peralta District was required to file a Follow-Up Report due March 15, 2012, on the five recommendations. In addition, College of Alameda was required to add to its March 15, 2012 midterm report: "regarding Commission Recommendation 5, College of Alameda must evaluate the impact of recent and future financial decisions on the College's ability to sustain programs and services." [REF: [Follow-up-report-documentation-April-1-2011](#); [-Peralta-CCD-Follow-Up-Report-May-20-2011-ACCJC](#); [AACJC-Action-Letter-June-30-2011](#); [ACCJC-Removal-from-Probation\\_College-of-Alameda](#)]

The College met all Standards.

## 2012

College of Alameda administrators, faculty, staff, and students worked with District administration to address the June 30, 2011 Commission Recommendation 5 pertaining to the impact of financial decision-making on College programs and services. College-wide work on the 2009 Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, and the College action plans had been ongoing since June 2009.

After consideration of the follow up report submitted by the District office, the follow-up visit to the District office, and the COA Midterm report of March 12, 2012 [REF: [COA Follow Up Report](#)] the Commission continued the College on warning because of lack of complete progress on Commission Recommendation 2 (audit findings), Commission Recommendation 3 (financial stability), Commission Recommendation 4 (evaluation of Board policies) and Commission Recommendation 5 (fiscal capacity) and required a follow-up report by March 15, 2013. [REF: [Follow-up-report-and-documentation-March-15-2012](#); [ACCJC-Follow-Up-Report-to-PCCD-May-2012](#); [ACCJC-Peralta-Action-Letter-July-2-2012](#)]

## 2013

As a result of the follow-up report of March 15, 2013 and the follow up visit by the Accreditation team on April 1, the Commission reinstated College of Alameda's full accreditation in a letter in June 2013. [REF: [ACCJC-letter-2-5-13](#); [Peralta-4-1-13-Special-Report-to-ACCJC-Final](#); [Final-CoA-Follow-Up-Report 3-15-13](#); [College-of-Alameda-Follow-Up-Visit-Team-Report-April-2013](#); [ACCJC-letter7-3-13-College-of-Alameda-Removed-from-Warning](#)]

---

## RESPONSE TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMISSION ACTION LETTERS

### Recommendation 1:

**In order to meet the Standards and build upon the considerable progress made in developing a systematic, integrated District-wide planning process, the team recommends that the College move forward in implementing its own comprehensive and integrated strategic planning process that is tied to the College's mission, values, goals, and priorities and includes the evaluation and refinement of key processes to improve student learning and promote institutional effectiveness (Standards 1A.4, 1B.2, 1B.3, 1B.4, 1B.6, 1B.7, 2A.1.a, 2A.2.f, 2B.4, 2C.2, 3A.6, 3B.1.a, 3B.2.a, 3B.2.b, 3C.1.c, 3C.2, 3D.1, 3D.3, 4A.1, 4A.2, 4A.5, 4B.2, 4B.2.b).**

The accreditation team report of March 2009 found that, while considerable progress had been made in the planning process since the 2003 visit, the College still did not meet the Standards. The accreditation team visit of March 2010 found that COA had satisfactorily resolved the above issue, but the Commission directed the College to do a follow-up report in October 2010.

The College's report in October 2010 included a completed delineated planning and budget integration cycle, with the months in which actions should be taken clearly outlined. The

Commission, in its letter to the College in January 2011, required that the issue be reported in the March 2011 follow-up report.

In June 2011, after the March visit and report, the Commission agreed that the College had met the Standard. The 2012 Midterm report summarized the history and actions by the College in continuing to implement an integrated strategic planning process tied to the College's mission, values, goals and priorities.

### **Overview, History, & Current Practices**

In response to this recommendation, College of Alameda began the process of updating and revising its Integrated Planning and Budget (IPB) model (from 2008) and finalized the current version on December 06, 2009. Since that date, the College has adhered to the process depicted in the model and has repeatedly referred to the model when a question of process surfaced in committee and shared governance work, or in strategic planning events and general College related discussions. The College updated the IPB model during the fall 2014. [REF: Planning Handbook 2009; Planning Handbook 2014]

During fall 2009 to spring 2010, the goal of the subcommittee for Recommendation 1 was to integrate a systematic and comprehensive College strategic and operational planning model to align with the District-wide planning and budgeting plan, while honoring processes that were familiar to faculty and staff at College of Alameda. The processes were in place at the time of implementing the IPB but were not formalized in writing. The strategic portion of the College of Alameda IBP model depicts a full cycle review.

At the beginning of every year, each meeting of managers, the College Council, and Academic Senate reviews the College's mission and goals by a defined set of data. These data sets include but are not limited to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO's), and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); College-wide reports such as the Student Equity Plan, Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan; and national and state reports such as Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), and Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), as well as College and District strategic goals. Using the College goals and the data sets previously referenced, measurable action priorities for each of the College's goals are constructed.

The action priorities are assessed and are evaluated each year for the extent to which they have been achieved. Each year new priorities may be added; however, preceding priorities will remain until completed. Each committee uses the Planning Summary Matrix as an assessment scorecard and rubric consisting of quantitative and qualitative data. The operational portion of the COA IPB model shows that the College committees review the identified institutional outcomes and action priorities, then forward their summaries of these priorities to instructional and student services areas to integrate into their Unit Plans or Annual Program Updates (APU's), as they are referred to currently (instead of the former Unit Plans).

The College Council members and coordinating bodies, such as the Department Chairs and Student Service Council, are informed of these strategic priorities and are charged with

addressing the priorities, where pertinent, in their program reviews, APU's, and in committee inquiries and reports. Once the APU's are completed, the respective action plans are developed and finalized; all budget requests associated with the action plans are compiled into a comprehensive budgetary request matrix. The Department Chairs assist with prioritizing and ranking the budget requests included in the matrix, ensuring a faculty-driven process. This ranked matrix is next submitted to the College management team for review and any further refinement using a numeric rating spreadsheet, which is simultaneously forwarded to the Budget Committee, Academic Senate and College Council for review. The ranking or priority assigned to the requests may change by joint consultation with the reviewing bodies.

The top-ranked budgetary requests are submitted to the College President who may make changes or to seek further justifications. The requests accepted by the President are sent to the respective District-wide Planning and Budget Integration committees (e.g., District Education, District Technology, and District Facilities) for integration into the District-wide planning and budget integration model (PBIM).

The purpose of these District committees is to review requests for resource sharing and to negotiate and make more effective District-wide decisions on courses, programs, purchasing, and personnel. Any disputes regarding funding and allocations that persist after review by the respective District Education, Technology, and Facilities Committees, are forwarded to the District Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) for disposition. Final recommendations are then forwarded to the Chancellor, who consults with the Chancellor's Cabinet.

It is the College's ongoing commitment to meet or exceed all Accreditation Standards, and to continue to actively use the COA Strategic Integrated Planning & Budget Model to guarantee an open and transparent shared governance process of making recommendations and decisions on the College's resource allocation and action priorities. As previously stated, this model received full approval from all shared governance committees in December 2009. College of Alameda's Strategic Integrated Planning and Budget Model is a tool that was activated and used during all subsequent academic years, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014. The integrated budget planning process was re-affirmed in fall 2014.

The College meets the Standard.

### **Recommendation 2:**

**In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that systems to support internal campus communication, as well as College-District communication, be improved to support the optimal functioning of the College in promoting student learning (Standards 1B.1, 1B.2, 1B.4, 1B.5, 1B.7, 2A.2.a, 2A.2.b, 2A.2.f, 2B.4, 2C.2, 3A.6, 3B.2.b, 3C.2, 3D.1.a, 3D.1.d, 3D.3, 4A.1, 4A.2, 4A.2.a, 4A.3, 4A.5, 4B.2, 4B.2.b, 4B.2.e, 4B.3, 4B.3.f).**

The 1999, 2003, and 2009 evaluations and team reports all noted the need for improved communication at the College as well as between the College and District. The 1999 and 2003 team evaluations also stressed accuracy of information for students as part of the need

for better internal communication processes. During the six years prior to the 2009 Self Study Report, the College struggled with changing from an institution in which communication was informal, to one that included formal systems.

As a result of the ACCJC visit in 2009, and subsequent ACCJC team visits until the present, the College has made considerable progress in accomplishing improved formal communication systems.

Recommendation 2 was addressed extensively in the College follow-up report of March 2010 and the team report confirmed that. In May 2011 the follow up team noted:

The follow-up team that visited College of Alameda in April 2010 commended the College for exceeding the relevant Standards of accreditation. It was evident that the practices put into place more than a year ago are still in place and are being reviewed and modified to make any improvements in the process. In particular, the planning agendas for SLOs, accreditation, planning, resource allocation, and campus newsletters and the College website are excellent. The distribution of agendas and minutes of the College Council are commendable.

The action letter from AACJC in June 2011 accepted the report on Recommendation 2.

The midterm report 2012 summarized the actions to date since the 2009 recommendation and included communication in the planning agenda, as the College acknowledges that communication is an on-going process and that there must be College built-in processes that support intentional, clear, and transparent communication.

As the 2012 Midterm Report noted:

At the core of Recommendation 2 is the need for the College to develop “systems to support internal campus communication,” as well as improve “College-District communication” that supports optimal engagement and functioning of the College in promoting academic excellence and student learning. The need for improved communication reaches across several Standards and represents a systemic problem that can jeopardize the fostering of collaboration amongst campus constituency groups and negatively affect the success of our students. Therefore, the College addressed this recommendation in 2009 by reviewing specific themes that emerged from evaluating the Standards identified in the recommendation references. The findings from the five themes that bubbled up as a result of a thorough evaluation are outlined below and continue to inform positive changes in the College’s ongoing effort to reduce conversational barriers between constituencies, and increase collaborative inquiry that best supports student success and overall institutional health. Additionally, under the leadership of the new president hired in spring 2011, the College continues to clarify its focus and practice of becoming a Learning College, and of aligning its diverse constituencies by means of a simplified strategic initiative: the College’s ABC’s:

1. Academic Excellence
2. Budgetary Competence
3. Community Collaboration

The five themes identified in the 2010 follow up report were extracted from the Standards cited in the 2009 Recommendation 2 regarding “communication”. If these five themes were supported by College systems, then this Standard would be fully met.

1. **Ongoing collegial and self-reflective dialogue about improvement of student learning and institutional processes:**

Through shared governance committees with standardized minutes, posted online, under College *Governance* on the College’s website and available in the College Library for review by the campus community

2. **Communication of Institutional Goals and Institutional Effectiveness:**

Annual Program Updates (APU’s) integrate and give evidence that directly supports the College’s institutional goals and learning outcomes. All APU’s for every program are completed per the College’s Planning and Budget Integration Timeline and are fully vetted using the College of Alameda Strategic Integrated Planning and Budget Model. As described in the previous section, Recommendation I, review of all APU’s requires a rigorous and documented process that involves all College constituencies wherein budgetary priorities are ranked and recommended for funding. Thus, deliberate goal-setting mechanisms have been implemented to periodically evaluate College action plans based on ongoing data gathered through assessment findings.

3. **Planning process is broad-based, opportunities for input offered, resource allocation, improved institutional effectiveness:**

The planning process and annual program updates provide a formal and accountable method for individual members of the faculty and staff to forward requests that align with the mission, vision, and values of the College. Committees are also encouraged to submit action plans. For example, Colleagues Leading Action on Student Success or CLASS Committee (formerly Student Success Initiative/Basic Skills Initiative [SSI/BSI]), established in 2009 by the VPI and VPSS, employ the philosophical promotion of learning communities as well as the fiscal support of such academic strategies that are aimed at improving student enrollment, retention and success in the basic skills areas of the College. CLASS is an example of a committee that provides for communication across the instructional and student services “divide”. As stated in the 2012 Midterm report,

Overall, the attitude of the faculty and staff is positive in its belief that College planning processes such as APU’s and committees like CLASS promote rich and purposeful dialogue, a recognized and necessary broad-based practice at College of Alameda that continues to become all the more critical in this time of increasingly limited resources. Nonetheless, the College is proud of these deeply institutionalized practices of communication, planning, and budgeting that continue to be used to inform positive change and improvement at every level of the institution

The assessment vehicles noted in the 2009 Accreditation Self-Study, Standard 1-B page 12, have evolved into the following that are documented, evaluated and disseminated in an ongoing basis:

- Departmental assessments: Program Learning Outcomes and Annual Program Updates, which include overall enrollments, FTES, FTEF,
- The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), which measures institutional Learning Outcomes and benchmarks, most recently administered in 2014.
- The Equity Plan, which measures improvements in student course success and persistence, basic skills success and persistence, degree and certificate attainment, and transfer by students' age, gender, race/ethnicity, and disability.
- The Accountability Report for Community Colleges (ARCC), used in many different reports such as the Equity Plan and Fact Book, and supplements/supports other data collection.
- Multicultural and data on student diversity, student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, student success data, productivity used for measuring discipline progress in assessing whether learning is happening, and similar such data are being included as points of measurement and comparison to best inform decision making on planning and budgetary requests and prioritization.
- The COA Fact Book, initiated in June 2008 and updated in fall 2009, and on the website since then, provides formative and summative data on student enrollment and demographics.
- The "President's Newsletter" provides timely communication and information about staff development opportunities,
- Standing committee decision making, community events, faculty, staff and student accomplishments, and other such campus related news via electronic communication, hard copy publication, and through special forums.

In 2012 the website was migrated to an open source website powered by Wordpress that is the same as the software used by the other Colleges and the District office. Members of each department have the access to upload minutes of meetings so that the information is always up-to-date.

4. **Ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies:** College of Alameda understands the importance of ongoing planning and evaluation and has created an integrated planning process that involves participation of all departments, programs, faculty and staff. The annual Integrated Planning and Budget Timeline indicates the process of ongoing and systematic planning and is published on the College website and documented in minutes, agendas and completed unit plans.

Beginning in fall 2009, all departments and programs completed their respective unit plans which include programmatic recommendations, course additions, budget planning and action plans. Data was provided by the campus or District researcher to assist in evaluating course,

program, and institutional effectiveness. According to the timeline, once unit plans are completed and reviewed by divisions, the management team reviews them and then they are sent to the Budget Committee for validation of the process and further discussion. This allows for effective use of budget resources once planning is completed. This Integrated Planning and Budget process is cyclical and occurs systematically every year. This process is also being documented in the IPB Handbook and is being addressed in Recommendation 1 above.

The College provides for a systematic and regular review of its student support services and instructional unit plans based on the Integrated Planning and Budget Cycle. Programs complete annual unit plans which are then reviewed by the Department Chairs and the Student Services Council. The completed unit plans can be viewed on the College website. Action plans and budget requests are prioritized and then forwarded to the management team and then to the Budget Committee for review.

Evaluation of instructional and student support services contributes to the achievement of student learning outcomes by utilizing results to improve services. Information from the evaluation of SLOs and program assessment is incorporated into College documents like the Educational Master Plan, College Fact Book, and Matriculation Plan, and are also published on the website. The Peralta Office of Institutional Research generates, analyzes and disseminates data for institutional planning and program evaluation to the College. The College is then responsible for evaluating and analyzing the data for their individual programs and services as part of ongoing assessment.

Library and other learning support services such as the Learning Resources Center are evaluated through faculty, staff, and student input in the form of informal and formal methods of assessment including student surveys, class evaluations, and faculty/staff interviews. This information is used to develop the unit plans as well as program reviews. This summative information obtained through evaluations is incorporated into the Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan which is shared with the College constituency groups through forums, meetings and postings on the web.

This process has proven successful but needs to be constantly reinforced and is a key functional component to improved intra-campus communication.

##### **5. College-District Communication.**

In spring 2009, the Chancellor convened a Chancellor's Working Group (CWG) to seriously address the effectiveness of the current District planning and decision-making committees. The CWG was to determine if a more effective structure and process could be formulated with the goal to facilitate campus and District-wide communication. The Chancellor's Working Group (CWG) was comprised of four representatives from the Peralta Federation of Teachers, four representatives from the District Academic Senate, two classified staff representatives, one College president, one vice president of instruction and two administrators from the District office, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the District's General Counsel, who assumed the role of District strategic planning manager. The Chancellor attended meetings at key points in the process. A presentation on

the proposal from the CWG was presented on Staff Development Day, August 18, 2009, and the kick-off planning retreat was held on August 28, 2009 in Jack London Square.

The CWG process for arriving at an agreed upon “work product” was intense, at times confrontational, yet in the end constructive. The Chancellor asked the CWG to study the issues and recommend options for improving the functioning of the District-wide advisory and decision-making process. The Chancellor requested that the CWG recommend improvement to:

- Streamline the process for developing recommendations on planning and budgeting;
- Ensure effective shared governance participation and discussion; and
- Deliver thoughtful, data-driven recommendations.

Early on in the process, the CWG established the following guiding principles:

1. Educational planning and needs (including services) should be the foundation of all decision-making.
2. College planning should be the primary source for determining shared governance recommendations. The role of the District-wide committees and processes is to provide uniform data, assure consistency, and to encourage and promote coordination. Colleges are the primary source because they are closest to student needs and have educational expertise.
3. There needs to be a clear flow of communication between committees so that the development of recommendations is transparent and logical.
4. The Planning and Budget Council (PBC) has authority to make a recommendation to the Chancellor and to make recommendations on initiatives proposed by the Chancellor. As per existing policies and procedures, the Chancellor and Board provide a response to advisory and constituency bodies if the recommendations are not adopted and are substantively modified.
5. All constituencies have the right to make recommendations directly to the Chancellor and Board.
6. The intent is to have a clear path from recommendations to consideration in the decision-making cycle.
7. All decisions and minutes shall be documented and publicized widely, using all available means.

This ensures effective communication to Colleges and constituencies.

It was agreed that this District-level process would be implemented in fall 2009 for the 2009-2010 academic year. At the end of the academic year, the process was reviewed and evaluated, and improvements put forward for review and adoption. Upon review during Academic Year 2010-2011, it was determined that the aforementioned Chancellor’s Work Group had indeed completed its task by setting firmly in place the parameters by which the newly developed Planning and Budget Integration committees on Facilities, Education, and

Technology would, and have, continued to operate. The increase in effectiveness of the PBIM ultimately eliminated the necessity for the Chancellor's Work Group wherein the Work Group was disbanded. The Chancellor's Work Group served its purpose by helping to establish principles by which the PBIM would operate, and also provided valuable insight to the development of the overall PBIM. The emergence of a better system from an existing system of communication between the District and Colleges is a positive sign that all constituencies continue to find new and better means for engaging in productive dialogue that results in improved processes for planning, budgetary allocation, services, and student success.

The District-level process or the Planning and Budget Integration Model (PBIM) and committee structure is comprised of the District Technology Committee, the District Education Committee, and the District Facilities Committee. In addition, there is a higher level District Planning and Budget Council which makes recommendations directly to the Chancellor. Each of these four committees includes the appropriate District office Vice Chancellor, a College President, as well as appropriate administrators, faculty, and staff. The goal is to move to more highly supported action meetings with key decision-making milestones, rather than the more frequent discussion-oriented sessions. Through this process the committees and their membership have the ability to actively address District services issues by using well-designed, Standardized, meeting agendas to discern what should be centralized or de-centralized services, equitable budgetary allocations, Standardized academic rigor, meaningful assessment and findings, and impartial attention to facilities and new buildings.

This process acknowledges College planning as the foundation of the PBI committees, recognizing that the Colleges, not the District, are closest to the educational needs of the students. As the first element of the PBI, the Colleges perform Standard program reviews, prepare annual program updates, and develop annual educational and resource plans, requests, priorities, and rankings. During periodic master planning and annual institutional planning, the Colleges develop plans addressing instructional and student services programs; staffing priorities; fiscal priorities; IT and equipment; facilities; and marketing. It is agreed that the planning of the four Colleges must drive District planning, which then drives the provision of District services and budgetary allocations. Most faculty, staff, administrators, and involved students agree that the PBIM is one of the best planning and budgeting integration models the Peralta Community College District has implemented and are in agreement that this model shall continue as an organic and dynamic system open to change and improvement as time and results dictate.

The role of the Education Committee, Technology Committee, and Facilities Committee is to support the Colleges in coordinating their efforts and resolving issues. These committees also provide subject matter expertise in their respective areas by including College representatives with relevant knowledge, responsibility, and experience. These committees are responsible for communicating with their counterpart committees at the Colleges (with intentional cross-membership); thereby, ensuring dialogue and transparency regarding action items at all levels, both horizontally and vertically.

These three committees are charged with developing District-wide recommendations that best serve students and the community using evidence-based processes and criteria.

Therefore, the committees work toward consensus solutions that are based on the results of these processes and a “shared agreement” decision model. Any unresolved issues are sent to the higher-level Planning and Budget Council.

After the August 28, 2009 “Summit,” these PBI committees continued to meet nine (9) times during the regular academic year of each subsequent academic year and conduct a self-evaluation to review what worked, what did not work, and what needs improvement. Each new academic year, a planning summit is held wherein each PBI committee addresses their charge, their operating principles, and develops their desired outcomes and milestones, for the year, including reviewing their proposed evaluation instrument.

The overarching Planning and Budget Council is charged with making final PBI related recommendations to the Chancellor. The committee also receives draft policy initiatives and considerations from the Chancellor and makes recommendations on said policies prior to any significant action taken by the Chancellor.

The Planning and Budget Council (PBC) is responsible for providing oversight on the implementation of the District Strategic Plan. The PBC ensures accountability for follow-through on recommendations. The PBC tracks their recommendations and determines which of two results occurs: (1) the recommendation is implemented including any modifications, or (2) the recommendation is not implemented and provides the reasons for not implementing. The PBC also ensures accountability for follow-through on process steps, assuring that constituencies, Colleges, District service centers, committees, etc., perform the agreed upon steps in the process.

While each of the four committees has a chair (the appropriate Vice Chancellor) and a faculty co-chair (and a classified co-chair for the Technology Committee), these four committees also have a meeting facilitator, recorder, and note-taker.

The facilitator works with the chair and co-chair to design the meeting agenda and discussion/decision tools. During the meeting the facilitator’s role is to support an effective and timely level of discussion (e.g., promote an appropriate balance of discussion and decision-making). The recorder keeps a record of the main points of the discussion on a flip chart or wall chart. This enables the group to track progress during the discussion. The note-taker has the important responsibility of documenting key decisions, points of agreement and follow-up steps and will be a classified staff support person. Further the note-takers use an agreed upon template for recording the meeting’s motions, action items, general minutes, and attendees. This includes the following in column format: Agenda Item; Discussion; Follow-Up Action; and Decision (shared agreement/resolved or unresolved?). All materials from the meetings, including agendas, minutes, and back-up documents are posted on a District Web site. [REF: [PBIM-Overview-2014](#)]

**College Action Plan:** Each year the College has engaged in renewing the processes that support decision making and disseminating information to all College constituencies. The communication tools have been used to sharpen the focus on the processes that are used to support decision making that is based on the institutional goals of the College as well as alignment with those of the District.

The College Catalog represents a step forward in the communication of the College mission, institutional learning outcomes (ILO’s), values, vision, and the President’s ABC’s strategic

initiative. The catalog provides clarification as to how these components relate to the College's Educational Master Plan and what the College has determined as the most critical learning outcomes for each student who engages in some aspect of learning at College of Alameda. The College's catalog is a deliberate step away from the dry reiteration of history that is simply a do-over from catalog to catalog of years past. The College takes pride in its innovative approach to a more relevant and engaging College catalog that is expected to go live as an interactive, online, experience for students and all COA website users in the future.

The College Council, as the central planning body of the College, has a clear sense of purpose. Prior to 2009, fewer than ten people attended College Council meetings. Since then the meetings have been well attended and the membership understands the decision making accountability of the body.

Other College standing committees report a similar response from their constituencies, that is, a renewed sense of focus on institutional change and the effectiveness of the institution in responding to the dramatic changes. A page on the College website entitled, "College Governance," assists committees in viewing updated and archived committee minutes and associated documents. Once again, a standardized minute taking format continues to make writing and reading minutes, motions, and action items a more productive and easier endeavor.

The College meets the Standard.

### **Recommendation 3:**

**In order to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline, the College must accelerate its progress in developing and assessing course-level and program-level student learning outcomes and using assessment data for improvement. Further, in order to meet the Standards, the College must also ensure compliance with its program review and unit planning processes and accelerate its progress toward creating a data-driven environment in which continuous assessment is used as a vehicle for institutional improvement (Standards 2A.1, 2A.1.a, 2A.1.c, 2A.2.a, 2A.2.b, 2A.2.e, 2A.2.f, 2B.4).**

As the 2009 Team Evaluation report indicated:

The College of Alameda partially meets this Standard. Although appropriate structures have been put in place for the development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels, implementation has been slow and uneven among disciplines. Although much dialogue has taken place, it has focused more on the development of the structures and processes than on movement toward creating a College culture of review and data analysis.

Currently at the development phase for student learning outcomes, the College needs to focus its energies quickly on consistent and accelerated implementation if it is to achieve proficiency by 2012. Similarly, the College has successfully created program review and unit planning structures and processes that are appropriately linked to its Educational Master Plan and the District strategic planning process, but the focus needs to move from development,

implementation, and evaluation of structures to College-wide compliance and meaningful dialogue on assessment and its relationship to institutional improvement. (page 38)

The visiting team in 2010 noted that the College had made significant progress and was confident that the deadline for 2012 would be met.[REF: Team Evaluation Report]

The College's mid-term report in 2012 confirmed that the levels of SLOs and proficiency would be met by the close of the academic year 2012. In the ensuing three years since the recommendation in 2009 the College had implemented a faculty driven Institutional Effectiveness Committee with the responsibility of assisting all faculty and staff in working with TaskStream. Most importantly widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment had made the Student Learning Outcome development process a living reality rather than a checklist operation. During this time the leadership of the College fully aligned College resources in training administrator and faculty leadership. [REF: [COA Midterm Report March 15, 2012](#)]

The College meets the Standard.

#### **Recommendation 4:**

**In order to meet the Standard, and consistent with the recommendation of the 2003 visiting team, the team recommends that the College devote the time and resources needed to complete regular, systematic evaluations for classified professionals, full-time contract faculty, and part-time faculty (Standard 3A.2).**

The 2003 visiting team recommended, consistent with the recommendation of the 1999 team, that the College dedicate the time and resources to complete a backlog of management, classified, faculty evaluations. The 2009 visiting team found that the College still had not completed evaluations for classified professionals and part-time faculty.

In the 2012 midterm report the College noted that the College implemented an aggressive plan to complete all delinquent evaluations for classified professionals prior to the end of the fall semester 2009 and reached its goal by fall 2010. The College and District confirmed the need for timely and ongoing evaluations for contract and part-time faculty. In an effort to facilitate this process, a side letter ratifying a Part Time Preference Pool Agreement was agreed upon and included as Article 30-H in the Peralta Faculty Teacher's Handbook. As a result of this agreement and the implementation of more efficient practices within the College, significant progress has been made since 2009 and all part-time faculty, full-time faculty, staff, and administrator evaluations are current and up to date. [REF:

All part-time faculty are evaluated every three years; thus, the managers have developed a three year cycle matrix in the form of a spreadsheet that documents the evaluatee, evaluator, evaluation dates, ranking, and whether each of the required documents were completed. College managers worked with the Peralta Federation of Teachers to assure implementation of this revolving schedule was agreeable to all involved. This agreement clearly defines a process of observation and evaluation of adjunct faculty, as well as criteria, that results in the placement of adjunct faculty in a "preferential pool" if they meet all conditions. Additionally, the District has provided a \$60 stipend for adjunct faculty who participate on an evaluation

committee. The following outlines the process the College has taken regarding part-time evaluations:

1. A list of all full-time and part-time faculty is maintained monthly for accuracy.
2. A determination is made on who would be evaluated; following the contract guidelines:
  - a. 1/6 of the part-timers in each department must be evaluated each semester.
  - b. Anyone in their first year at Peralta (11-12) is evaluated first; after that, the most senior part-timer(s) get evaluated first.
3. A comprehensive spreadsheet was developed by College managers in 2010 to completely and accurately document all aspects of the faculty evaluation process and outcomes.
4. Starting from 2009, the main role of the Department Chair continues to be to maintain vigilance and keep the process on track with support and guidance from the deans and vice presidents. The timeliness and thoroughness of evaluating contract and part-time faculty continues to be a priority for the College. All full and part-time faculty evaluations are current and documented in a 3-year cycle format of evaluation.

All classified professional evaluations are on track and meeting proper dates of completion in alignment with their original hire dates, and following a once per year evaluation cycle. In advance of the month in which the evaluations are due, the Human Resources department at the District office sends a list of the classified professionals to the managers who supervise them.

The College continues to recognize the critical role adjunct faculty play in providing quality education to our students and insuring the smooth operations of the institution; therefore administrators developed evaluation teams with target dates for completion of evaluations. In spring 2009, a side letter was adopted which streamlined this process but required the Department Chairs, not the Deans, to assign faculty evaluators. Working with the Department Chairs has resulted in substantial progress wherein the College is now in full compliance with this Recommendation and requirement.

The College meets the Standard.

#### **Recommendation 5:**

**In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College advance and refine the implementation of the District-wide computer information system (Standards 3C.1.a, 3C.1.c, 3C.1.d, 4.B.3.b).**

The 2010 visiting team deferred recommendation on the College's satisfactory action on this recommendation as this had become a District level recommendation. A special team

was sent to the District to evaluate this recommendation. The Evaluation team report of the visit on April 12, 2011 stated:

The evidence provided by the District and the Colleges demonstrates an urgency to resolving this issue. The interviews with College staff affirm that the information provided by the Management System is reliable, timely, user friendly and accurate. The planning is coordinated with the users in mind. The information is understandable, easy to access, and therefore it is trusted by the Colleges and District staff. The progress that has been made is significant according to staff and they have enhanced the student functions to provide greater access.

[REF:[COA Follow Up Report May 20 2011](#)]

The College meets the Standard.

### **Recommendation 6:**

**In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College develop, implement, and integrate the College budget development processes with the new District resource allocation model (Standards 3D.2.a, 3D.2.b, 3D.2.d, 3.D.2.g).**

Recommendation #6 which was part of the final team report was eliminated from the commission's letter in June 2009. Recommendation #6 focused on the College's integrated budget development process. This recommendation appears to have been folded into Recommendation 1. The College's 2012 midterm report addressed Recommendation 6 by reiterating the actions the College took to respond to Recommendation 1.

### **District Recommendation**

#### **Recommendation 7:**

**The team recommends that the District take immediate corrective action to implement all necessary system modifications to achieve access to a fully integrated computer information management system, including modules for student, financial aid, human resources, and finance. All corrective action and system testing should be completed within two years and the governing board should receive regular implementation progress reports until project completion (Standards 3D.1.a, 3D.1.b, and 3D.2.a).**

The evidence reviewed by the team and through interviews with the College President and faculty leaders demonstrated that the changes at the District have resulted in positive outcomes for College of Alameda. These positive outcomes have greatly assisted the College's integrated planning process, curriculum review and SLO process, student financial aid, and educational planning, as well as up to date financial information on College budgets.

The College meets the Standard.

## District Recommendations

The responses to District recommendations include not only those from the 2009 Institutional Self-Study Report, but all District recommendations from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) since June 30, 2009. Given the number of District recommendations, the recommendations are grouped into categories and responses provided accordingly.

### Board and District Administration

#### 2009 District Recommendation 1: Board and District Administration

**The team recommends that the District assess the overall effectiveness of its service to the College(s) and provide clear delineation of functional responsibilities and develop clear processes for decision making. (Standard IV.B.1, IV.B.3.a,b,c,f,g).**

#### Response:

Central to addressing this recommendation was the implementation in Fall 2009 of the Planning and Budgeting Integration Model (PBIM) and the District-level committee structure comprised of the District Technology Committee, the District Facilities Committee, the District Education Committee, and the higher level Planning and Budgeting Council which reports directly to the Chancellor. Each of these four committees includes the appropriate District office Vice Chancellor or Associate Vice Chancellor; appropriate District and College administrators; faculty; and staff from the four Colleges and District office service centers. What was noted in 2009, and has proven to be true, is that these committees and their membership are able to actively address District services and through well-designed meeting agendas are able to focus on collaboration between the District office service centers and the Colleges to provide a greater focus on those “services” which are centralized. This structure has provided much clarity regarding District versus College functional responsibilities and provides a clear process for decision making with all final decisions being made by the Chancellor. It should be noted that the Chancellor consults with the Chancellor’s Cabinet, formerly the Strategic Management Team, which is comprised of the four College presidents and lead District administrators.

As noted previously when this process was implemented five years ago, it was agreed that College planning is the foundation of the Planning and Budgeting Integration (PBI) process since the Colleges are closest and most responsible for the educational needs of the students and it is the Colleges that are charged with ensuring student success. The first element of the PBI requires the Colleges to conduct program reviews every three years, to provide an annual program update, and to develop annual educational and resource planning priorities. These

efforts are in alignment with the five District strategic planning goals and the annual institutional objectives/outcomes. The Colleges integrate the results of their “subject matter” committees into College planning, e.g. technology committees, curriculum committees, facilities committees, etc. During the annual institutional planning process, the Colleges develop plans addressing: instructional and student services programs; staffing priorities; fiscal priorities; IT and equipment; facilities; and marketing. The planning of the four Colleges must drive District planning which then drives the provision of District services or those services which are centralized.

The role of the Education Committee, Technology Committee, and Facilities Committee is to support the Colleges in coordinating their efforts and resolving issues. These committees also provide subject matter expertise in their respective areas by including College and District representatives with relevant knowledge, responsibility, and experience. These committees are responsible for communicating with their counter-part committees at the Colleges (including possible cross-membership).

As stated when this process began in 2009, these District committees are charged with developing District-wide recommendations that best serve students and the community by using evidence-based processes and criteria. Further, the overarching Planning and Budgeting Council is charged with making recommendations to the Chancellor. The Council often receives draft policy initiatives from the Chancellor in his effort to seek input and recommendations before the Chancellor takes any significant action.

The Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) is responsible for providing oversight on the implementation of strategic planning and annual institutional objectives/outcomes. In fact, each of the four committees is required to set annual objectives aligned with the strategic planning goals. The Planning and Budgeting Council also insures accountability.

The PBI process begins each year with an all-day off-site Summit wherein all committee members gather and hear from the Chancellor regarding the key issues that need to be addressed during the year. Opportunity is provided for the committees to begin to set their annual objectives and to review the previous year’s objectives. The Summit has proven to be a key reminder of the need for District office service centers and the Colleges to work collaboratively, transparently, and accountably – which addresses functional responsibility and decision making.

It is clear that the PBI process provides clarity about decision making and addresses functional responsibilities. One can access committee agendas, committee minutes, committee documents, the results of the annual assessment of the PBI process, and other key materials at the following web site: <http://web.peralta.edu/pbi/>

In addition to the PBIM process, the Chancellor’s Cabinet (prior to July 2012 called the Strategic Management Team) meets weekly. The Chancellor’s Cabinet is comprised of the Chancellor; the four Vice Chancellors (Educational Services, Finance and Administration, Human Resources and Employee Relations, and General Services); the Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Services; General Counsel, the Director of Public Information, Communication and Media; and the four College Presidents. (It should be noted that at the time this response was written the position of Deputy Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer was posted for hire and once

hired this individual would be involved in the Chancellor's Cabinet, as well as the PBI process.) The Cabinet also has added to the clarification about functional responsibilities and processes for decision making. The Chancellor's Cabinet reviews the work and actions of the PBI Committees and addresses topics which may be sent to the PBI Committees for input/feedback. It goes without saying that the ongoing weekly interaction among these Cabinet members facilitates open dialogue regarding all aspects of District planning and District operations.

It should also be noted that during the process of updating Board Policies and District Administrative Procedures, two administrative procedures relevant to this recommendation were approved. AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor's Staff details the roles and responsibilities of District managers who report directly to the Chancellor. AP 3250 Institutional Planning details decision making through the District committee process.

The District has continued to address this recommendation regarding clear a clear delineation of functional responsibilities and having clear processes for decision making. The District/Colleges meet the Standards associated with this recommendation.

\*\*\*

**(2010) Recommendation 2: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends the District evaluate the reporting structure with regard to the inspector general so that the position is properly placed in the hierarchy of the District organization. (Standard IV.B.1.j).**

**(2010) Recommendation 7: In order to meet the Standard, the visiting team recommends a change in the reporting relation of the Inspector General from the Board of Trustees to the**

**Chancellor. (Standard IV.B.1.j)**

**Response:**

As reported in October 15, 2010 Follow-Up Report, at the July 19, 2010 Board meeting it was unanimously agreed that the Inspector General position would report directly to the Chancellor. On January 5, 2011, the individual serving in this position resigned from the District. At that point in time the position was discontinued.

This recommendation is fully resolved and the associated Accreditation Standards are met.

\*\*\*

**(2010) Recommendation 3:** In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends the District clarify the role of the board members with respect to the work of the District managers. This would include a review of reporting structures, methods for board inquiries, distinction between board policy setting and oversight, and management, leadership, and operational responsibilities for the District. (Standards IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.j)

**(2010) Recommendation 4:** In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the District provide ongoing and annual training for board and management on roles and functions as it relates to District policy and operations. (Standard IV.B.1.f)

**(2010) Recommendation 5:** In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the District engage in ongoing discussion about the role of the board and how it serves its trustee role for the good of the District. The role of the board should be reviewed regularly with each board member. (Standard IV.B.1, IV.B.1.j)

**(January 2011) Recommendation 1:** The team recommends that the 2010 Recommendation 5 be revised to include the following language: The Team additionally recommends that the Board of Trustees continue to redefine the appropriate roles of the Board and its relationship to the Chancellor. The Board of Trustees should also refine and change the roles and charges of the Board Committees so that they also reflect an appropriate role for the Board. (Standard IV.B.1, 3)

**(2010) Recommendation 8:** In order to meet the Standard, the visiting team recommends a regular review of board roles to assure that the board is relying on the Chancellor to carry out the policy set by the board. (Standard IV.B.1.j)

**(2010) Recommendation 9:** The team recommends the Board of Trustees and District adhere to their appropriate roles. The District must serve the Colleges as liaison between the Colleges and the Board of Trustees while assuring that the College presidents can operate their institutions effectively. Meanwhile, the Board must not interfere with the operations of the four Colleges of the District and allow the Chancellor to take full responsibility and authority for the areas assigned to District oversight. (Standards IV.B.3.a-g)

### **Response**

2010 Recommendations #3, #4, #5, #8, and #9 and 2011 Recommendation #1 addressed the roles and responsibilities of a community College Board of Trustees. The recommendations

stressed the need for the Board to focus on its role as a policy making body and that the Board act in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws; that the Board has a means for board development; that the board hires the Chancellor and delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference; and that all other personnel, especially the College Presidents, report to the Chancellor and not to the board. Further, it was stated that Board Committees, which existed at that time, needed to stay within the scope of work of a Board of Trustees and not become involved in the operations of the District service centers and the Colleges.

In 2010, the members of the Board of Trustees engaged in intensive training provided by the Community College League of California (CCLC). The training focused on the roles and responsibilities of the Board and on ACCJC Standard IV. B. Of the seven current elected Board members, six went through this training. As a result of the training, the Board adopted the CCLC document, “Board and CEO Rules: Different Jobs, Different Tasks (2000).” The Board was clear in stating that the Board has authority only to hire and evaluate the Chancellor, and that it assigns the Chancellor responsibility for the operation of the District and the hiring and evaluation of all administrators.

As the Board updated board policies, per an ACCJC recommendation, there were four specific policies adopted in 2011 and one in 2012 that demonstrated the Board’s knowledge of their function, purpose, role, and responsibilities. In so doing, the Board demonstrated compliance with accreditation Standard IV.B and full resolution of any previous deficiencies.

Board Policy 2200: Board Duties and Responsibilities references accreditation Standard IV.B.1 and California Education Code section 70902 and in so doing the policies delineate the responsibilities of the Board, especially that the Board “respect(s) the authority of the Chancellor by providing policy, direction, and guidance only to the Chancellor who is responsible for the management of the District and its employees, and delegate(s) the authority to the Chancellor to issue regulations, and directives to the employees of the District.”

The Board had eliminated the Board committees that had existed and when revising and updating Board policies and adopted a policy on the Board’s ability to meet as a Committee of the Whole (BP 2220) to “gather information, hear from the public, and provide a forum to discuss pertinent issues that may ultimately come before the Board for further discussion and action.”

The Board adopted a very detailed policy regarding Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor (BP 2430) and a very clear policy on Board Education (BP 2740).

On November 12, 2013, the Board held a Special Workshop which continued to demonstrate the Board’s ability to work within their official role and to work directly with the Chancellor and to delegate full responsibility to the Chancellor. The agenda for the Special Workshop covered Strategic Planning, Board/Chancellor Relations, the Chancellor’s Goals, and the Board’s Goals and Professional Development.

The minutes from this meeting provide insight into how the Board continues to meet and even exceed accreditation Standard IV.B. The Board spoke about “the open lines of communication they have had with the Chancellor and even thanked the Chancellor for bringing leadership and a sense of calmness to the District leadership” and that they looked

“forward to continuing to move in a positive direction.” The Chancellor stated that he “appreciates board members calling (him) before board meetings with any questions they have about the board agenda which streamlines board meetings and (fosters) open communication.”

At this November 12, 2103 meeting the Board addressed the fact that “accreditation is fundamental to how we operate.” In keeping with Accreditation Standards, board members noted that the focus must be on best practices in the areas of institutional integrity, teaching and learning processes, student support systems, resources, and governance. A trustee alerted his fellow trustees to read through the ACCJC “Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards.” This focus on accreditation demonstrated how far the board has come in their willingness and commitment to meeting and even exceeding Standards in effort to provide for the good of the community and to ensure student success.

In terms of Board Development, at this November 12, 2013 meeting, the Board addressed the “number of workshops and conferences that board members can attend to achieve trustee excellence.” The newest member of the board, who currently is vice president of the board, “spoke about the Board’s interest in the Excellence in Trusteeship Program presented by the Community College League of California (CCLC). She felt (that) this program was important for the Board to be involved in... (since) it has a direct relationship in their role as trustees.” To date each of the seven elected board members has been very active in the CCLC Excellence in Trusteeship Program.

At this same meeting, the Board began its annual self-evaluation.

As noted, the board continues to take seriously the accreditation Standards and those Standards which address the role of the board of trustees. The board continues to demonstrate that these previous recommendation continue to be resolved and the accreditation Standards are met.

\*\*\*

**(2010) Recommendation 6: In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends the board consider regular review of the code of ethics to assure thorough understanding and application of its intent. (Standard IV.B.1,e; IV.B.1.h)**

### Response

In addressing this recommendation in 2010, the Board conducted a review of the code of ethics, conflict of interest code, and reviewed pertinent ACCJC accreditation Standards, California Government Code, and California Education Code. In September 2010, the Board agreed that within the annual Board self-evaluation they would evaluate themselves in keeping with the code of ethics.

During the updating of board policies and administrative procedures, the code of ethics and conflict of interest were reviewed and significantly updated. BP 2715 Code of Ethics and

Standards of Practice was finalized by the Board at the end of 2012 and AP 2710 Conflict of Interest Disclosure also was approved. At the beginning of 2013, the Board finalized BP 2710 Conflict of Interest and AP 2712 Conflict of Interest Code. All four went through a first and second reading at a Board meeting and it was clear that the Board took these quite seriously.

This recommendation continues to be resolved and the associated Accreditation Standards are met.

\*\*\*

**(January 2011) Recommendation 4:** *The team recommends that the District continue to address all recommendations from 2009, 2010 and the current visit (November 2010). Although the District has invested substantial effort to address all recommendations, it is incumbent to the District to ensure that these efforts continue and are institutionalized within the District.*

### **Response**

This recommendation has been appropriately placed in each section of the District Recommendations where there are recommendations from 2009 and 2010. The responses in each area continue to show that the Peralta Community College District continues to address all recommendations, including those from 2009 and 2010, as the District assists the Colleges in meeting and exceeding the accreditation Standards.

\*\*\*

**(January 2011) Recommendation 3:** **The team recommends that the Board of Trustees develop and implement a plan to review all Board policies so that the policies reflect only policy language and that the operational processes for these policies be reflected in a system of administrative regulations (procedures). (Standard IV.B.1.e, IV.B.3)**

**(June 2011) Commission Recommendation 4:** **While evidence identifies progress, the District has not achieved compliance with Standard IV.B and Eligibility Requirement #3. Specifically, the District has not completed the evaluation of Board policies to the end of maintaining policies that are appropriate to policy governance and excluding policies that inappropriately reflect administrative operations. Therefore, in order to meet Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the District must evaluate all Board policies and implement actions to resolve deficiencies.**

**(2012) Commission Recommendation 4:**

[In the June 2011 action letter, ACCJC stated the following:]

**While evidence identifies progress, the District has not achieved compliance with Standard IV.B and Eligibility Requirement #3. Specifically, the District has not completed the evaluation of Board policies to the end of maintaining policies that are appropriate to policy governance and excluding policies that inappropriately reflect administrative operations. Therefore, in order to meet Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the District must evaluate all Board policies and implement actions to resolve deficiencies.**

[In the July 2, 2012 letter, ACCJC updated the recommendation:]

**The District has revised a significant number of its Board Policies. This project needs to be completed so that all policies are reviewed and revised as necessary by March 15, 2013.**

**Response:**

As reported in the March 15, 2013 Follow-Up Reports filed by the four Colleges, the District has reviewed and revised all Governing Board policies and District administrative procedures. The District, under the leadership of the Governing Board and the Chancellor, adopted a comprehensive approach to policy and procedure review through the utilization of the Community College League of California (CCLC) framework for policies and procedures. This approach involved renumbering and transitioning the existing District Board Policy Manual to the CCLC framework, eliminating any unnecessary policies and procedures, as well as adopting some new policies and procedures. It should be noted that 68 of the 72 California Community College Districts use the CCLC approach to Board policies and District administrative procedures.

Since the submission of the March 15, 2013 Follow-Up Report and the review by an ACCJC Evaluation Team in April 2013, the Peralta Community College District continues to use the CCLC approach to updating and revising board policies and District administrative procedures. With Update #22 (June 2013), the District revised/updated four policies and ten administrative procedures. With Update #23 (October 2013), the District revise/updated seven policies and six administrative procedures. Additional administrative procedures have been updated given the many procedural changes in keeping with California Community Colleges Student Success and Support Act. At the time this response was being written, the District had engaged in reviewing and updating the specific policies and procedures associated with CCLC Update #24 (April 2014). It is anticipated that there will be an Update #25 (October 2014), which the District will work with.

This recommendation continues to be resolved; there is an ongoing process now for reviewing and updating board policies and District administrative procedures; the Standards continue to be met.

\*\*\*

## Technology

### 2009 District Recommendation 2: Management Systems

**The team recommends that the District immediately resolve the functional issues associated with the implementation of the District-wide adopted software management systems for student, human resources, and financial administration. (Standards III.C.1.a, III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d, and IV.B.3.b)**

**(January 2011) Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the District continue to address all recommendations from 2009, 2010 and the current visit (November 2010). Although the District has invested substantial effort to address all recommendations, it is incumbent to the District to ensure that these efforts continue and are institutionalized within the District.**

### Response

This Management Systems recommendation initially was addressed in the College Follow-Up Reports submitted March 15, 2010 (and the number assigned to the recommendation differed in the College letters) and was further addressed in the District Follow-Up Report submitted October 15, 2010. This clearly was a District-level recommendation since the District Office of Information Technology was and is responsible for the management of the enterprise management system, PeopleSoft.

The PeopleSoft system was purchased in 2004/2005 and while various financial modules were implemented in 2005, the student administration system and other non-finance modules were implemented in November 2007 (it went “live” in April 2008). Because of the experience in implementing various financial modules, the District hired RWD Technologies to provide a change management strategy to assist in the move from the legacy system to PeopleSoft. RWD provided a successful approach and provided a method to address problems experienced by front-end users as the transition was made. As noted in 2010, the move from a “data storage” system to a “process control” system created a major shift for end users.

However, when RWD Technologies services were discontinued, their process was not maintained/ continued in an effective manner and there was frustration and complaints, since it was not always clear as to who was in charge. RWD had used a clear project governance system, defined leadership roles and expectations, structured leadership to own projects across the Colleges, and provided clear reporting on project status. And so to address this accreditation recommendation, a decision was made to implement a structure in keeping with the RWD process and to communicate this widely throughout the District as a means to addressing functional issues and implementation of additional non-financial modules.

The PeopleSoft Resolution Team (PRT) was established and is currently chaired by the Director of Enterprise Services. The PRT is the coordinating body that identifies critical implementation functions and the PRT members are kept up-to-date on the implementation of new PeopleSoft modules. The PRT meets monthly and are thus provided monthly updates and an opportunity for monthly input to the Director of Enterprise Services. The PRT's essential charge is to identify and prioritize the ongoing and new functionality issues or needs, monitor the resolution of identified issues, and receive status reports from the Office of Information Technology. Within the current Planning Budgeting Integration (PBI) Model, the PRT provides regular status reports to the District Technology Committee.

There is a PeopleSoft Resolution Team web site: <http://web.peralta.edu/prt/> On the front page of the web site it notes that "The PeopleSoft Resolution Team offers an institutional forum to facilitate discussion and deliberations related to the District's PeopleSoft database and associated applications. An expression of participatory management practices, the PRT's administrative procedures are outlined below (PRT Administrative Procedures). The team also serves as a repository for all of the projects and issues handled by numerous functionality teams whose documents appear in the navigation on the left."

There also is a Footprints ticket method now for submitting online requests needing Tech Support, <http://helpdesk-dit/footprints/customer.html> As noted on this web page, one can submit, edit, and check on the status of each tech support request. Also, the Help Desk puts out a weekly report on completed projects which are posted on the web page.

Increased staffing available to assist with PeopleSoft modules and PeopleSoft issues has been important. There is a Director of Enterprise Services; two Application Software Analysts; two Senior Application Software Analysts; one Senior PeopleSoft Database Administrator; one Enterprise Resource Planning Project Manager; and five analysts in specific areas who review specific PeopleSoft modules (Research, Student Finance, Curriculum, Financial Aid, and Admissions & Records).

During 2013-2014 academic year there was a specific emphasis of moving from the financial aid module in the legacy system to the financial aid module in the PeopleSoft system. The project was assisted by a consultant. There was active involvement of appropriate financial aid staff. The PeopleSoft financial aid module was implemented successfully and ongoing review and training will be provided.

The issues related to this 2009 recommendation remain resolved and the Standards are met.

\*\*\*

## Human Resources

**(2010) Recommendations 1: In order to meet Standards at all times, all personnel selection actions must adhere to the established policies and procedures. (Standard III.A.1.a)**

**(January 2011) Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the District continue to address all recommendations from 2009, 2010 and the current visit (November 2010). Although the District has invested substantial effort to address all recommendations, it is incumbent to the District to ensure that these efforts continue and are institutionalized within the District.**

**Response:**

This 2010 recommendation came as a result of the creation of the Inspector General position, which reported to the Board (and has since been eliminated), and the creation of the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources position which caused confusion among constituencies as to the process in creating a new position. As noted by the visiting team, “Direct operational control of the District should be handled by the Chancellor rather than by members of the Board acting individually as though they speak for the entire board.”

As reported in the October 15, 2010 Follow-Up Report, in July 2010 the interim Chancellor was extremely clear with the Board that he and he alone reported to the Board, that the Board had a limited role in personnel selection, and that Board training (which happened) would be essential to help the board better understand their role and responsibilities. The current Chancellor and the Board have an effective working relationship and the Chancellor is the only employee who reports to the Board.

With the review and updating of board policies and District administrative procedures all personnel or Human Resources policies and procedures were updated. These board policies and District administrative procedures are being adhered to. Those pertinent to this 2010 recommendation include the following:

Board Policy 7120 Recruitment and Hiring

Board Policy 7210 Academic Employees

Board Policy 7230 Classified Employees

Board Policy 7240 Confidential Employees

Board Policy 7250 Academic Administrators

Board Policy 7260 Classified Managers

Administrative Procedure 7121 Faculty Hiring

Administrative Procedure 7123 Hiring Procedures for Regular Academic Administrators and  
Classified Managers

Administrative Procedure 7125 Hiring Acting and Interim Academic and Non-Academic  
Administrators

This recommendation remains resolved and the Accreditation Standards are met.

\*\*\*

**Financial Resources****2009 District Recommendation 3: Financial Resources and Technology**

**The team recommends that the District take immediate corrective action to implement all appropriate controls and necessary MIS system modifications to achieve access to a fully integrated computer information management system, including modules for students, financial aid, human resources, and finance, in order to assure financial integrity and accountability. All corrective action and system testing should be completed within two years and the governing board should receive regular implementation progress reports until project completion. (Standards III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, and III.D.2a).**

**(January 2011) Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the District continue to address all recommendations from 2009, 2010 and the current visit (November 2010). Although the District has invested substantial effort to address all recommendations, it is incumbent to the District to ensure that these efforts continue and are institutionalized within the District.**

**Response:**

This recommendation was last responded to in the April 1, 2011 District Follow-Up Report and the April 2011 Visiting Team noted that hiring a Director of Enterprise Services to manage the PeopleSoft system was key to resolving this recommendation. This position has been sustained and as noted by the April 2011 Visiting Team, the Director of Enterprise Services focused on the issues identified by the 2009 Visiting Team. The Commission viewed this recommendation as having been fully resolved.

The District continues to upgrade and support the modules within PeopleSoft to allow for accurate and timely financial reporting. During the last fiscal year, the human resources and student finance module were upgraded and the Student Financial Aid Module was implemented. The full implementation of the Student Financial Aid module was completed in August 2014 and this module has been welcomed by students and those who work in the Office of Financial Aid at the District and at the four Colleges. Another improvement to the PeopleSoft system is the use of the electronic personnel action request since it provides for position control and electronic oversight of the financial transactions associated with the requested position. The Electronic Content Management feature is being implemented and is important to the work of Accounts Payable. Trust and agency funds have been moved from

the Legacy system to the PeopleSoft system, which provides a better method of oversight and management of these funds.

The Colleges have the ability to access and run all of their financial information, as all of the College Business Managers have the capacity to run their financial statements at any time during the fiscal year. The College Business Managers have access to the General Ledger to allow for inquiry and report processing as needed. The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the College Business Managers, and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology meet on the first Thursday of every month for ongoing assessment of the PeopleSoft financial management functions providing for an ongoing discussion of how to improve the system and continue the dialogue regarding effective electronic budget management. These monthly meetings will be important as the District moves to upgrade the financial management modules to PeopleSoft version 9.0 during the 2014-2015 academic year. It should be noted that this upgrade is a priority in the District Information Technology Strategy plan.

This recommendation remains resolved and the associated Accreditation Standards continue to be met.

\*\*\*

**(January 2011) Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the District continue to monitor its progress toward meeting the issues listed in the Corrective Action Matrix. In particular, the District needs to plan to address the OPEB bond and to be evaluated on keeping to its 2010-2011 budget. (Standard III.D.1,2,3)**

**(June 2011) Commission Recommendation 1: The District has identified several options to address the OPEB liability without stating which option it intends to pursue. In accordance with Standard III.D.1, b and c, and Eligibility Requirement #17, the District needs to identify the amount of obligation that currently exists as a result of the activities related to the OPEB loss and establish a plan and timeline that reflects how the District will pay off any liability that may have resulted from the OPEB bonds.**

**(Special Report 2013) The District shall provide a report that clearly states the District's plan for funding its OPEB obligations, including an assessment of the OPEB bonds and the increasing debt service required (Accreditation Standard III.D.3.c)**

**Response:**

Two previous District recommendations required that the Peralta Community College District address OPEB obligations and the liabilities associated with the District OPEB

bonds. Further, in 2013 the Peralta Community College District was required to file a special financial report that provided the District's plan for funding its OPEB obligations.

The special financial report which was filed with ACCJC on April 1, 2013 (<http://web.peralta.edu/accreditation/files/2010/03/Peralta-4-1-13-Special-Report-to-ACCJC-Final.pdf>) provided details from the OPEB Substantive Plan (December 2012; updated September 2014) (<http://web.peralta.edu/trustees/files/2011/08/Substantive-Plan-SR.pdf>). Both documents should be referenced for full detail that was previously provided to demonstrate and continues to demonstrate that the District has been addressing and continues to address OPEB obligations and liabilities and the District OPEB Bonds. The OPEB Substantive Plan fully addresses the issues that were cited by ACCJC. The District has a Retirement Board ( <http://web.peralta.edu/trustees/board-committees/retirement-board/> ) which meets regularly to provide oversight of OPEB bonds and planning and to review investment portfolio updates.

Beginning in fiscal year 2011, the District made substantial and critical changes on how it valued and funded its OPEB liabilities and debt. In order to manage and reduce liabilities, the District: successfully negotiated with collective bargaining units to place maximums or caps on District paid health benefit plans, implemented a OPEB charge that brought new revenue into the OPEB trust, changed the investment policy statement such that it matches the targeted rate of return with the OPEB liability, and restructured the program oversight to one that provides more transparency and accountability. As a direct result of these accomplishments the actuarial value of the OPEB liabilities had decreased \$39 million by April 2013, trust assets had increased by \$50 million and related debt service had been held to approximately 5% of the Unrestricted General Fund. It was determined that over time all debt service would be funded out of trust assets that are in excess of the actuarial liabilities. The current actuarial determined liability is \$174,703,920 million compared to trust assets of \$218,549,849 million. A new actuarial study will begin in November 2014 and will be completed by March 2015. Over time as the difference between the liabilities and trust assets widens, the assets in excess of the liabilities will be used to fund partially or fully the related debt service. As the evidence to date suggests, the District's plans have been successful and over the next 25 years are projected to fully fund all associated liabilities. Please refer to Standard III.D.1.c. and III.D.1d. for additional information.

This recommendation remains resolved and the associated accreditation Standards continue to be met.

\*\*\*

**(Special Report, November 2009)** The District was required to file a report by March 15, 2010 requiring responses to specific audit findings in the 2008 audit: OPEB liabilities, Oversight and Monitoring (2008-1), Financial Accounting System Procedures (2008-2), Information Systems (2008-3), Bursar's Office and Trust Fund Reporting Changes (2008-8), Accounts Payable/Purchasing Functions (2008-11), and Using Associated Student Body Fund to Account for General Fund Reserves (2008-18).

**(June 2011) Commission Recommendation 2:** In accordance with Standard III.D.2.a, c, and g and Eligibility Requirement #18, the District needs to resolve outstanding audit findings identified in the Department of Education letter dated May 20, 2011 referring to Audit Control Number (CAN) 09-2009-10795. That letter identifies the findings for each of the four Colleges as those findings relate to Department of Education areas of funded programs including Title IV and Financial Aid. Additionally, the District should resolve all audit findings in the Vavrinck, Trine, Day, & Co. LLP, Certified Public Accountants' audit reports for years 2008, 2009, and future audit reports issued after the date of this recommendation.

**(2012) Commission Recommendation 2:**

[In the June 2011 action letter, ACCJC stated the following:]

In accordance with Standard III.D.2.a, c, and g and Eligibility Requirement #18, the District needs to resolve outstanding audit findings identified in the Department of Education letter dated May 20, 2011 referring to Audit Control Number (CAN) 09-2009-10795. That letter identifies the findings for each of the four Colleges as those findings relate to Department of Education areas of funded programs including Title IV and Financial Aid. Additionally, the District should resolve all audit findings in the Vavrinek, Trine, Day, & Co. LLP, Certified Public Accountants' audit reports for years 2008, 2009, and future audit reports issued after the date of this recommendation.

[In the July 2, 2012 letter, ACCJC updated the recommendation:]

Although the District has resolved a significant number of the audit findings from prior audits, a number of audit findings remain unresolved. The remaining audit findings need to be resolved by March 15, 2013.

**(Special Report 2013)** The District shall provide excerpts from the 2011/12 audit report showing that the District has addressed the multiple 2010/11 audit findings, especially those that were repeated from prior years. If the report shows that the District has not resolved the persistent findings, the District should submit a plan that demonstrates how the findings will be resolved (Accreditation Standard III.D.3.c)

**Response:**

These recommendations address audit findings and the focus of the recommendations is the requirement that specific audit findings be resolved and that the District should have a plan for resolving audit findings.

In November 2009, the Peralta Community College District was required to submit a Special Report addressing seven specific audit findings: OPEB liabilities (which became a separate recommendations as noted above); District internal control structure (internal control system, oversight and monitoring, financial accounting system procedures, information systems, bursar's office and trust fund activity reporting changes, accounts payable/purchasing functions) and Associated Student Body Fund to Account for General Fund Revenues. All of these audit findings were from the June 30, 2008 independent audit report, some of which were repeated from the 2007 audit report. The Peralta Community College District filed the report with ACCJC on April 1, 2010. It was with this report that the Peralta Community College District began a Corrective Action Matrix approach to addressing audit findings. As the visiting team in November 2010 reported, "the matrix is a detailed plan which lists the corrective actions...for audit findings... The matrix lists the responsible party, due date, status, and related systematic integration." All of these audit findings have been resolved and continue to remain resolved.

The Peralta Community College District Office of Finance continues to use a Corrective Action Matrix (CAM) as a plan of action/method for addressing any and all audit findings. As noted by the November 2010 visiting team, for each audit finding the CAM lists the needed Corrective Action, the Responsible Point Person for resolving the audit finding, the expected due date for resolving the audit finding, a listing of the Status of the resolution of the audit finding (which is updated until resolved), and the Systematic/Source Integration.

A Commission recommendation in June 2011, which was repeated as a Commission Recommendation in June 2012, with the addition that all audit findings from prior audits had to be resolved by March 15, 2013, required that all audit findings to that date in time be resolved by March 15, 2013. Further, the Peralta Community College District was required to submit a Special Financial Report on April 1, 2013. The Special Financial Report essentially was similar in content to the June 2011/June 2012 Commission recommendations. The visiting team report dated April 2013 reported that "the number of audit findings has been reduced from 53 as of 6/30/2009 to 8 as of 6/30/12. Of those 8, only four are from the prior year. The remaining 49 finding have been cleared." The July 3, 2013 Commission action letter noted, "the Peralta Community College District has resolved most of the 53 audit findings and is well on the way to resolving the remaining few. The District has also developed and implemented a plan to fund the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Obligations." Of those eight (8) audit findings from June 30, 2012, five (5) were repeated in the June 30, 2013 findings: Time and Effort Reporting, Financial Reporting (one program), Equipment Management, Concurrent Enrollment, and CalWORKs Reporting. As of the time of the writing of this response, these five (5) have been resolved and the June 30, 2014 audit report will substantiate this conclusion.

Detail regarding independent audits and that "responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately" can be found in Standard III.D.2.a and Standard III.D.2.b of this Institutional Self-Evaluation. Independent audit reports can be found at the following website: <http://web.peralta.edu/business/finance-contacts/annual-financial-reports/>. The most current corrective action matrix (September 21, 2014) is available at this website: <http://web.peralta.edu/business/files/2014/09/PCCD-CAM-June-30->

[2013-to-September-21-2014.pdf](#) . At the time of the March 2015 site visit, the 2014 independent audit report will be available, as well as an updated Corrective Action Matrix.

These recommendations are resolved and the associated Accreditation Standards continue to be met.

\*\*\*

**(June 2011) Commission Recommendation 3: While evidence identifies progress, the District has not achieved compliance with Standard III.D and Eligibility Requirement #17. Specifically, the District has not achieved a long-term fiscal stability related to resolution of collective bargaining agreements on compensation and postretirement benefits. Therefore, in order to meet the Standards and the Eligibility Requirements, the District must assess its fiscal capacity and stability and implement actions to resolve the deficiencies.**

**(2012) Commission Recommendation 3:**

**[In the June 2011 action letter, ACCJC stated the following:]**

**While evidence identifies progress, the District has not achieved compliance with Standard III.D and Eligibility Requirement #17. Specifically, the District has not achieved a long-term fiscal stability related to resolution of collective bargaining agreements on compensation and post-retirement benefits. Therefore, in order to meet the Standards and the Eligibility Requirements, the District must assess its fiscal capacity and stability and implement actions to resolve the deficiencies.**

**[In the July 2, 2012 letter, ACCJC updated the recommendation:]**

**The District has secured modifications to the collective bargaining contracts resulting in a soft cap on retiree benefits. The District must demonstrate its ability to maintain its fiscal stability over the long term (beyond three years) and assess the impact of the new revenue achieved through the passage of the parcel tax.**

**Response:**

In the March 15, 2013 College Follow-Up Reports, the Peralta Community College District was able to report that the District had maintained fiscal accountability, stability, and solvency for fiscal years 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13. This now also is true for fiscal year 2013-14.

The 2013 reports emphasized various strategies that were key to fiscal stability and those continue to be foundational to ongoing fiscal stability.

- The District negotiated with all three collective bargaining units a variable rate cost cap on District paid medical and health care benefits.
- The District has in place a monthly financial reporting process through which monthly financial reports are disseminated and thus provide the District with the

- capability to continuously monitor and assess its fiscal capacity. In fact, since March 2013, each College has been able to run its own financial reports and monitor funds.
- The District implemented new Board policies and District Administrative Procedures that establish minimum Standards and accountability for budget preparation and funding.
  - The District has a revised District Budget Allocation Model (BAM) that was initially implemented in fiscal year 2012-2013 and continued to be reviewed and addressed in fiscal year 2013-14, and will be monitored again in 2014-15.
  - The District successfully had voter support to pass the Measure B- Parcel Tax which provides additional revenue for eight years-- \$7,682,155 (2012-13) and \$8,053,384 (2013-14) and for 2014-2015 \$8,055,785 has been budgeted.
  - The District continues to build a strong reserve which was at 12.36% at the beginning of fiscal year 2014-2015 and the District is doing so to offset the Parcel Tax when it expires. In 2012-2013, \$2.8 million was added and \$1.3 million in 2013-2014.

As can be seen, the District is taking the issue of fiscal accountability, stability, and solvency seriously and engaging in all possible methods to address this need.

This recommendation remains resolved and the associated Accreditation Standards continue to be met.

\*\*\*

### Actionable Improvement Plan

In College of Alameda’s 2009 Self Study, forty-seven improvement plans were identified by College faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Since then, all plans have been addressed. Ninety per cent of the plans were accomplished by building annual processes into the governance structure of the College. Other plans were completed or changed to meet changes in conditions during the six year interval.

ACTION PLAN COMPONENTS	COMPLETION/ APPROVAL DATES	ACTION
<b>STANDARD I A: MISSION</b>		
<p><b>IA: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability, and evidence- based practice:</b> The College, led by the College Council, will formally review the mission statement as part of the overall planning process at least once every six years.</p> <p>COA will revise the statements as needed, using evaluation tools such as learning outcomes, student success rates, and basic skills data. In addition, the College plans to incorporate new data analysis as it become available to reflect the changing</p>	<p>Every three years: 2011</p>	<p>April 27, 2011 Review of Mission/Vision and Approval of ILOs</p>

Accountability for completion: College Council (President)	2014	
<b>STANDARD I B: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS</b>		
<p><b>IB: Primacy of Teaching and Learning:</b> COA institutional identity needs clarification. At the direction of the President, the appropriate College body (i.e. College Council, Accreditation Committee) should initiate a focused discussion by relying on results of recent efforts on innovation and institutional identity by various committees and workshops including, but not limited to: the Student Success Initiative (SSI) and Basic Skills Committee (CLASS), Curriculum Committee, the Spring 2009 Skills Retreat. Suggestions for institutional identity include: civic engagement and service learning, sustainability or green curriculum, and an emphasis on basic skills. This process will then include increasing active outreach and dialogue with both the College and local communities to achieve a cohesive institutional identity with which the faculty would be willing to identify and to which students are drawn for a successful learning experience.</p>	2012	<p>Open Forums conducted 2010-2012</p> <p>Institutional Goals &amp; Action Priorities approved bi-annually 2010, 2012, 2014 (pending)</p> <p>Learning Reconsidered/Learning College theme adopted 2010.</p>
Accountability for completion: College Council (President)		
<p><b>IB: Communication:</b> Resolve crucial and ongoing problems related to the following: publication and communication of all planning documents; revisions of policies and procedures; and accessibility and usability of the new web service. To further maximize public notification and campus dialogue, reporting-back mechanism between managers, faculty, and staff, by way of committee and shared governance structure, should be consistently and promptly utilized.</p>	Annually, on-going	<p>President's Newsletters and e-mails</p> <p>Shared governance committee agendas &amp; minutes posted</p>

		<p>Open Forums</p> <p>College retreats</p> <p>New web platform adopted 2012</p> <p>Web Page Governance Link</p>
Accountability for completion: College Council (President)		

<p><b>IB: Shared Governance, Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Clarify governance structure, especially procedural approval of recommendations; insure focused dialogue in the policy/budgetary decision-making process and between the various recommending and decision- making bodies.</p>	<p>Academic year 2009-10</p>	<p>Web Page Governance Link</p> <p>Email distribution &amp; Posting of minutes</p> <p>Planning process adopted 2009</p> <p>Established Institutional Effectiveness Committee Spring 2010</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President); Academic Senate</p>		
<p><b>IB: Evidence-based practice:</b> Institutionalize a cycle of systematic measures that are tied to objectives with measurable outcomes that are reported annually and measured against baselines that are informed by research data.</p>	<p>Annual, on-going</p>	<p>2010 established Annual Program Updates (Unit Plans)</p> <p>Integrated Planning and Budget (IPB) model adopted December 06, 2009</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President)</p>		
<p><b>STANDARD II. A: INSTRUCTION</b></p>		
<p><b>IIA: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Student learning outcomes are a new practice at COA. In order for the outcomes to be of value to the institution, there needs to be clarity of process and consistency in practice. The following definitions, processes, and chains of accountability need to be determined regarding the development, application, analysis, and assessment of student learning outcomes that are interwoven with institutional outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibilities and accountability of instructors for course and programs outcomes;</li> <li>• Responsibilities and accountability of department chairs, department directors, and Deans for initiation and completion of outcomes;</li> <li>• Scope, responsibilities, and accountability of the SLOAC;</li> </ul> <p>Scope, responsibilities, and accountability of the Curriculum Committee (including updating of courses, vocational certificate programs and other programs).</p> <p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President), Academic Senate</p>	<p>2012</p>	<p>Major re- organization has taken place since spring 2010 when IEC was established</p> <p>Ongoing workshops for staff, faculty &amp; administrators have occurred so that the level of proficiency could be reached</p> <p>President's <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> adopted Sept 2010</p>

<p><b>IIA: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Although planning processes at COA have been initiated and practiced, further refinement of these processes are needed to reduce confusion and redundancy. Timely feedback with regard to these planning documents is essential. When written procedures are completed, they will be well- communicated, with training as appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written and clear procedures regarding the content of unit plans, integrated budget plans, and program reviews are critical. If the planning processes are completed as described, then during any cycle, &gt;80% of units will have unit plans, budget plans, and program reviews completed and done to specifications.</li> </ul>	<p>12/2010</p>	<p>Completed 5 years – of Integrated Planning &amp; Budget process Beginning FY2009-10</p> <p>Continuously improved unit plans now called Annual Program Updates</p> <p>Refined and completed Program Reviews</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President), Academic Senate</p>		
<p><b>IIA: Evidence-based practice:</b> To ensure quality practice, COA uses empirical evidence to evaluate, analyze, assess, and restructure learning modalities. Student learning outcomes are used for courses, programs, student service, and other departments and the institution. To effectively incorporate the research data, education and goal setting for faculty and staff must be available and attainable. Hallmarks of this program will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A commitment and investment from the institution in support of evidence-based practice</li> </ul>	<p>By 12/10, initial changes in educational content and institutional procedures based on evidence completed.</p>	<p>12/08, SLO coordinator identified</p> <p>5/09, educational workshops offered on writing, assessing, and analyzing SLOs.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLO workshops to assist faculty in writing and assessing SLOs.</li> <li>• All SLOs need to be completed and included in all syllabi.</li> <li>• Education and assistance with analyzing SLOs for course, program, and degrees</li> <li>• Rewriting and reworking course/program content to reflect improvements based on evidence</li> <li>• Sharing of findings in a holistic manner for disciplines, programs, departments, divisions, and the institution.</li> <li>• Substantive change based on outcome analyses (reports) and the impact of findings on general education requirements and College practices and procedures.</li> <li>• Integration of course and program SLOs, alignment with institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), and appropriate identification of assessment measures.</li> <li>• Complete comprehensive learning outcomes for General Education and develop an assessment for general education courses.</li> </ul>		<p>By 12/09, written guidelines concerning sharing of outcome findings will be available and will have been acted upon.</p> <p>been completed and syllabi are reviewed every new semester to assure SLO's are included and printed in every syllabus. This is required of all syllabi.</p> <p>All course and program level SLO's complete as of end of Spring 2011, 100%</p> <p>All assessment plans and findings 100% completion fall 2012</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Student Services</p>		
<p><b>IIA: Limited Resources:</b> College of Alameda will urge the District to purchase a software package, such as Schedule 25, to help in scheduling classes across the District.</p>	<p>Recommendations to CIPD and District Technology Committee made by 5/2009.</p>	<p>Since the identification of the outcome of this planning agenda item, the Business Intelligence tool has proved to be useful in terms of tracking the type of data needed to</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: Curriculum Committee and Vice President of Instruction</p>		
<p><b>IIA: Maintenance of Effort, Stability of Administration and Continuity of Practice:</b> The job placement of students in vocational programs should be tracked at the College and District level.</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>Ongoing process</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: Department chairs and Curriculum Committee; District Office of Institutional Research</p>	<p>On-going informal tracking at department/program level</p>	<p>District Office of Institutional Research data page has employment information</p>
<p><b>STANDARD IIB: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES</b></p>		

<p><b>IIB: Communication:</b> The Student Services Division has the following needs for improved communication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop communication methods and signage that are culturally sensitive and that serve all constituents, with attention to non-English languages.</li> <li>• Plan and develop a protocol so that information flows in a systemic and sustainable manner from unit plans, program reviews and evidenced-based practices to Student Services Council, to the BSI/SSI Committee, and to College Council, to form a basis for holistic planning within the department and the College and to contribute to institutional effectiveness.</li> <li>• Improve awareness of the College Catalog Supplement to assure accurate and consistent communication of information.</li> </ul>	<p>2010</p>	<p>College Catalog includes multiple languages to address the population we serve Student Services maintains an annual list of staff who speak languages other than English.</p> <p>Catalog supplements are posted on the College's website for ease of access</p> <p>Regular meetings of Student Services Council and A Building committee</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: VPSS with the Student Services Council</p>		
<p><b>IIB: Evidenced-based practice:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and maintain the use of accurate and well- planned research to augment and sustain evidence-based planning for programs and services, including budgeting for necessary research.</li> <li>• Collaborate with the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC) to continue developing and refining student learning outcomes.</li> </ul>	<p>2010</p>	<p>Research data provided by the District Office of Educational Services online via the Business Intelligence Tool (BI Tool) and is used to analyze and complete APU and program reviews. IEC was created as successor to SLOAC.</p>
<p>Initiator: Department Chairs and Coordinators Collaborator: SLOAC, District Office of Institutional Research Accountability for completion: VPSS</p>		
<p><b>IIB: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> The responsibility for development and review of the Catalog needs to be officially designated.</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>Catalog Committee established, and 2011-2013 and 2013-2014</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: VPI and Catalog committee</p>		

<p><b>IIB: Limited resources:</b> The Student Services Division finds a need for human and physical resources. These requests are delineated in the Educational Master Plan and unit plans. These requests should be filled as resources allow. Some examples of current requests are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FTE Articulation Officer</li> <li>• Counselors,</li> <li>• Financial Aid staff</li> <li>• General outreach position</li> </ul>	<p>An assessment will be made yearly, at the end of each spring semester.</p>	<p>Integrated Planning &amp; Budget District- wide review based upon input from College IPB process was developed approved and implemented, process of resource request assessment ongoing since 2009. Active reorganization has been on-going to respond to budget challenges. The move to the Welcome Center in 8/09 has streamlined student services.</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President)</p>		
<p><b>IIB: Better Integration of College and District Functions:</b> The new PASSPORT system needs to be responsive to the needs of the end-users. There should be an on-going cycle of evaluation and improvement.</p>	<p>An assessment will be made yearly, at the end of each spring semester.</p>	<p>Business Readiness Teams established in 2008, and are ongoing, as well as PBI District Tech Committee, to inform IT &amp; Passport needs</p>
<p>Initiator: VPSS Collaborator: Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Services, Department Chairs and Coordinators Accountability for completion: Student Services Council</p>		
<p><b>STANDARD IIC:</b></p>		
<p><b>IIC: LIBRARY: Maintenance of Effort, Stability of Administration and Continuity of Practice</b> District librarians will conduct selection and migration process for a new integrated Library system, necessitated by the recent announcement that development of the Horizon system will be discontinued after the 7.4.1 release.</p>	<p>Completed:2011</p>	<p>New District-wide Library system installed in 2011</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: District Financial Planning, Head Librarians Group</p>		
<p><b>IIC: LIBRARY: Maintenance of Effort, Stability of Administration and Continuity of Practice, Limited Resources:</b> <i>Memorandum of Understanding</i> with managers to recognize the need for stabilized minimum, or "maintenance of effort" budget each academic year,</p>	<p>2012, and first completed collections update cycle 2017</p>	<p>2010 - Funding stabilized through PCCD Foundation grants, Measure A bond funds and</p>
<p>including additional funding for intersession and summer sessions. This MOU should include stable, continued funding including grant development, for update of print and e-book and multimedia-collections within 10 year goal cycle beyond current Measure A bond funds.</p>		
<p>Accountability for completion: Head Librarian, VPI</p>		

<p><b>IIC: LIBRARY: Primacy of Teaching and Learning:</b> Plan for redesign and restructuring of reference services into reference/classroom area and instructional “smart classroom” lab for teaching information competency. Implementation of Audio-Visual Center Collections Project including Listening Viewing Center; expand library classroom and reference instruction (in-house and “infused librarian”).</p> <p>Accountability for completion: Head Librarian, VPI</p>	<p>Completed:2011</p>	<p>Smart Classrooms installed in the Library fall 2011. Other library instruction expansion planned for new Library.</p>
<p><b>IIC: LRC: Limited Resources:</b> Update and increase LRC specialized textbooks/reference materials; develop funding for more specific resources/workshops/programs, including online and 24/7 type tutoring assistance for all students.</p>	<p>Review annually, completed 2015</p>	<p>Ongoing, reserve collection augmented by faculty donation and PCCD Foundation grants</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: LRC Coordinators, VP Instruction</p>		
<p><b>IIC: LRC: Maintenance of Effort, Stability of Administration and Continuity of Practice</b> Work with administration, faculty, the IT department, as well as publishers of software to advise, update and improve software in all the labs.</p>	<p>An assessment will be made yearly, at the end of each spring semester.</p>	<p>Annual cycle of faculty and IT review and implementation of software upgrade is ongoing</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: LRC Coordinators, VP Instruction</p>		
<p><b>IIC: LRC: Primacy of Teaching and Learning, Communication:</b> Increase usage, and explore new ways of delivering LRC materials, print and digital, in of all academic labs in the LRC via greater faculty involvement and increased course linkage to the labs. Development in this area depends on available funding. This development would include development of the LRC website. Accountability for completion: LRC Coordinators, VP Instruction</p>	<p>An assessment will be made yearly, at the end of each spring semester.</p>	<p>Ongoing, annual assessment cycle is part of APUs  Expert faculty trained in Basic Skills assessment, andrological strategies are employed in LRC to aid student success</p>
<p><b>STANDARD IIIA: HUMAN RESOURCES</b></p>		
<p><b>IIIA: Primacy of Teaching and Learning:</b> In cooperation with the College Staff Development Committee, District Staff Development should ensure that professional opportunities are rigorously evaluated and assessed for appropriate application of academic Standards.</p>	<p>2014</p>	<p>Ongoing assessment and evaluation, which informs and results in future workshops and activities</p>

Accountability for completion: Academic Senate; Staff Development committee		
<b>IIIA: Limited Resources:</b> Additional permanent streams of funding should be developed for staff development. Models from other PCCD Colleges should be investigated.	2014	Staff development has been reorganized so that funds are spent, less on expensive conferences and more on group training
Accountability for completion: President, Academic Senate, Staff Development Committee		
<b>IIIA: Communication, Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> The Office of Human Resources will continue to provide ongoing training sessions in the area of recruitment and selection, continue to develop procedures, guidelines, and improve communication to help expedite the hiring process, and together with appropriate constituencies develop a master training calendar.	2012	Board Policies and Administrative Procedures currently being updated and systematically approved through District PBI process– anticipate completion by 2012
Accountability for completion: VPI, VPSS, College Council (President)		
<b>IIIA: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Existing procedures for classified evaluations should be clarified, consistently applied, and communicated effectively. Accountability should be determined for conducting and completing classified staff evaluations.	2010	Faculty process established in 2008/09, currency has been maintained. Administrative &
COA deans and vice presidents will document that a good- faith effort has been made to clarify the classified staff evaluation process; evaluation of classified staff will begin during the 2009-2010 academic year. Accountability for completion: Management team		Classified staff processes in place and currency has been maintained
<b>IIIA: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Due to various procedural and staffing issues, full-time tenured faculty are not evaluated on a regular basis. The College requests that all appropriate campus and District representatives necessary to the process join together with the District Human Resources Department to clarify and stabilize a process. A systematic evaluation process for full-time tenured faculty will be in place and utilized starting in the 2009-2010 academic year, and it will be sustained annually.	2010	Faculty process established in 2008/09 and is being maintained according to the bargaining unit agreement. Information about classified evaluations are provided to each manager on a monthly basis by District Human Resources

Accountability for completion: Management team (President)		
<b>STANDARD IIIB: PHYSICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>IIIB: Communication:</b> Incorporated within the institutional effectiveness plan is a reporting mechanism for all College committees to provide oral reports to the College Council and Academic Senate and where applicable, to the Classified Senate and ASCOA. Such reports (health, safety, expanding facilities needs) can emanate from evaluative studies, College planning documents, proposed survey criteria, and/or proposed plans for building renovations and acquisitions.	2010, then ongoing	Ongoing
Accountability for completion: President		
<b>IIIB: Evidence-based Practice:</b> The Safety and Facilities Committees, in collaboration with the Research and Planning Officer, and using College planning documents, risk management reports and surveys (e.g. revised Facilities Master Plan, PCC District Facilities Risk	Approved as a process, 2010, then ongoing	ongoing
Management Survey), and other appropriate sources, including faculty/staff proposals, should compile a list of safety and facilities issues affecting programs and services. These outcomes should be measurable and systematically evaluated annually by the Safety and Facilities committee members and shared with the College's aforementioned governing bodies and appropriate District departments.		
Accountability for completion: Facilities and Safety Committees Chair		
<b>STANDARD IIIC: TECHNOLOGY</b>		
<b>IIIC: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Continue to refine the College-wide process for requesting technology funding (state and private), recognizing the specialized needs of individual departments and programs by implementing a clear planning matrix for evaluating hardware and software needs including staffing ratios for on-campus and/or distance education/remote access functions and services.	2015	Since 2009-10 technology requests are Included in the APU process, includes resource requests for personnel, technology, equipment, and facilities; College is in its fourth iteration of the IPB process
Initiator: VPI Collaborator: Deans, Department Chairs and Coordinators, Information Technology (IT) Team Accountability for completion: Requesting Departments/Chairs		

<p><b>IIIC: Communication:</b> Better communication between all IT Team and all College constituencies about scheduling and coordinating services and programs that impact and require technology resources, especially setting delivery dates prior to term start dates.</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>Established Help Desk District Technology Committee</p> <p>Campus Technology Committee</p>
<p>Initiator: IT Team Collaborator: VPI, Requesting Departments Accountability for completion: VPI</p>		
<p><b>IIIC: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Technology Committee should be supported to help provide the College with consistent implementation and clarity on existing policies, and development of new IT related procedures and policies (e.g. Technology Life Cycle). Address concerns about the adequacy of staff and faculty training in District and College technology (software and systems). Adequate time for regular and emergency planning, prompt purchase and installation with awareness for vendor and District IT delays should also be addressed</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>Addressed through the PBI process that includes the District Technology Committee, PBI Council, etc, (Appendix III)</p>
<p>.</p>		
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President), Technology Committee IT Team</p>		
<p><b>IIIC: Communication:</b> Expedite planning and design of CCTI by developing funding, programs and workshops in teaching and learning (LRC) and information and educational technologies and competencies driven by faculty need and interest.</p>	<p>2012 (Depends on completion of Bldg. A)</p>	<p>Fall 2010 CCTI established in L215</p>
<p>Initiator: LRC, Distance Education Coordinators Collaborator: VPI, Academic Senate, IT Team Accountability for completion: VPI</p>		
<p><b>IIIC: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Designate a responsible body (staff or committee) to oversee the design and maintenance of the College's website. Establish responsibility for departmental/divisional webpages, either by following faculty recommendations of hiring a campus webmaster, or by providing other solutions so that this issue can be resolved, and the redesign and maintenance of the College's website can move forward.</p>	<p>Fall 2009</p>	<p>Web Committee established as a standing committee fall 2010</p> <p>As a result of College's Web Committee's work, a new and greatly improved College website to be populated and go-live by April 2012.</p>

Accountability for completion: College Council (President), Technology committee		
<b>STANDARD IIID: FINANCIAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>IIID: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> The College will continue with strategic planning to develop, establish, and update its priorities for College budget planning and spending. The process will be well communicated to all College constituents. The result of planning will include research data as a basis for decision making.	2010	President's Learning Reconsidered 9/2010 adopted by College Council Dept Chairs 10/4/2010  IPB Process & Planning Cycle 2009-10
Accountability for completion: Budget Advisory Committee, College Council(President)		
<b>IIID: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> It is recommended that budget forms such as the <i>College of Alameda Integrated Planning and Budgeting Process</i> template be	2009	IPB Process & Planning Cycle initiated in 2009
revised and simplified with input from all users. The process and forms will undergo the shared governance process for approval. Once adopted, the new form should be available online with clear instructions and training on its use.		2010 Review and refined resulting in establishment of the IEC Spring 2010.
Accountability for completion: College Council (President)		
<b>IIID: Evidence-based practice:</b> The College must engage in a process that integrates research findings into department planning documents (e.g. student success, student equity plan, matriculation plan, enrollment management plan, unit plans, integrated budget plan templates) so that practice reflects real data.	2010	APUs fourth year of implementation( three budget cycles) beginning FY 2009-10; IEC work ongoing, providing training workshops on evidence gathering.
Accountability for completion: VPSS, VPI, District Office of Institutional Research		
<b>IIID: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> The COA budgeting and funding processes should address issues of evaluation and prioritization of budget items. Other current financial documents (e.g. audit reports) should be made available when possible.	2009	2009-10 Unit Plans/APUs College wide prioritization of facilities, technology, personnel, and equipment; College Integrated Planning & Budget Model used to guide process.

Accountability for completion: President, Budget Advisory Committee Collaborator: Business and Administrative Services Manager		
<b>IIID: Communication, Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> In collaboration with the Business and Administrative Services Office, College constituents (e.g. department chairs and coordinators, classified staff, division deans) involved in budgetary and financial matters should continue to address the various issues and problems with the <i>PROMT</i> financial/accounting system. An evaluation procedure should be in place that allows users to reflect upon budget/finances-related paperwork and procedures so that the budgetary and financial work of the College can be more promptly completed.	2010	Ongoing, District has greatly improved PROMT database tool; District Business Readiness Teams; College Budget Committee conducts regular meetings, reviews current budgets, and assists in recommendations to the President on budget.
Accountability for completion: VPs, President Manager, District Office of Budget and Finance		
<b>STANDARD IVA: CAMPUS LEADERSHIP</b>		
<b>IVA: Communication:</b> Communication practice needs to span both traditional (print and oral) and contemporary (electronic communication, such as a listserv, blog, wiki or website) methods. Communication will then be accessible for all internal and external constituents, and institutional effectiveness will be enhanced. COA needs to develop a protocol so that information flows in a systemic and sustainable manner from and to all constituents, from and to all governance structures, and from and to all administrative bodies. New communication protocols will need to assess for effectiveness via an evaluation process.	2010	Web Page Governance Link President's Newsletters College Council Minutes Dept Chairs Meetings Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) Open Forums
Accountability for completion: College Council (President)		
<b>IVA: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> Clear, specific written policies that explain the method by which innovation is begun, realized, and maintained will be constructed.	2010	2008 BSI/SSI Innovations Grants 2012 Draft New Course Proposal CLASS committee established
Accountability for completion: College Council (President), Curriculum committee		
<b>IVA: Limited Resources:</b> In order to develop,	2009	2009 SLO

<p>implement, and assess new SLOs, as well as streamline the process for course development, TaskStream and CurricUNET application software packages will be purchase, utilized, and maintained.</p>		<p>Training Workshops: TaskStream Whitewater SLO/Assessment</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President);Curriculum committee Academic Senate</p>		
<p><b>IVA: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b> The College will identify the component parts of its governance structure (including all standing committees) that must have constitution/ bylaws. Bylaws will be written that specify the roles of its members and the mission of each committee; the bylaws will also provide for evaluation of the committee function. The result of these evaluations should be well communicated to the College community.</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>Ongoing College Standing Committee structure currently under review/revision to reduce overlapping missions &amp; to streamline &amp; improve overall effectiveness</p> <p>Milestones: 2009 Staff Dev. Committee approved bylaws 2011 with Academic Senate revising its Bylaws/ Constitution</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President); Academic Senate</p>		
<p><b>IVA: Maintenance of Effort, Stability of Administration and Continuity of Practice:</b> To improve student participation in the shared governance process, the College could offer course credit to students for College governance participation through a leadership class.</p>	<p>2009 and on-going</p>	<p>Curriculum developed to enhance student leadership and development</p> <p>Management level position of Director established 2012</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President); curriculum committee</p>		
<p><b>STANDARD IVB: BOARD, PRESIDENT, DISTRICT SERVICE CENTERS</b></p>		
<p><b>IVB: Communication:</b> It is recommended that the President ensure that important information that might affect the College community be communicated directly from the president’s office, widely, utilizing multiple media, and in a timely manner.</p>	<p>2009 and on-going</p>	<p>2006 COA Today Newsletter, replaced by President’s Newsletter 2010</p> <p>Email Communication “FROM the</p>

<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President)</p>		<p>PRESIDENT” 2010 established.</p>
<p><b>IVB: Limited Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify existing or new sources of revenue to support the adequate staffing of administrative, faculty, and staff positions as identified in the COA Integrated Planning and Budgeting College-wide Priorities (unranked) 2007-2008 as recommended by the College Budget Advisory Committee-April 23, 2007 and College Council.</li> <li>It is recommended that the College utilize appropriate planning and assessment to identify or advocate for the funding of priorities that will assist the College in achieving its institutional goals.</li> <li>It is recommended that the District continue to develop and implement the Strategic Management Plan to effectively use resources in a fair manner to assist College of Alameda in achieving its institutional goals.</li> </ul>	<p>2010 and on-going</p>	<p>Established in 2009, improved 2010, and on-going annually: IPB Process, Prioritizing of Resources based on Annual Program Updates/Unit Plans (APUs); major grants, e.g., SSPIRE, ATLAS, augmented College funds; budget allocation model established at District level.</p>
<p>Accountability for completion: College Council (President)</p>		
<p><b>IVB: Evidence based practice:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that the institution continue to develop and utilize research data in determining strategic allocation of resources.</li> <li>It is recommended that a review be performed to determine the best way to improve purchasing- related services to the College, and that the Chancellor and Board expedite the suggested solutions.</li> <li>It is recommended that evaluations be performed on District service units to determine what improvements could be implemented to advance customer service to the College(s), and that the</li> </ul>	<p>2012</p>	<p>Ongoing continuous process of assessment of instruction and College services begun 2008 via Program Reviews &amp; APUs</p> <p>2011 District Service Areas developed SLO’s</p> <p>PBI District level has improved communication and delineation of roles.</p>
<p>results be clearly and broadly disseminated to the College community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop mechanisms for regular formal evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision- making structures.</li> </ul>		<p>Significant improvements in communication with District finance and purchasing.</p>

College Council (President)		
<p><b>IVB: Processes that provide clarity, consistency, transparency and accountability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended that District and College strategic planning procedures and processes be clarified, simplified, and communicated comprehensively to the College community.</li> <li>• It is recommended that the institution develop a clear process to systematically evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts, and review institutional effectiveness as it relates to the College mission and plans for improvements.</li> </ul>	2009/10 and on-going	<p>2009/10 District &amp; College IPB Committees established and on-going</p> <p>Use of TaskStream as a means for storing and aligning the College's Mission, Vision, and ILO's with Service Areas and course and program level SLO's, assessment plans, collected evidence, resulting in changes &amp; improvements made via assessment findings; this ongoing evaluation results in increased College-wide efficiency, effectiveness, and greater communication— all of which increases student success.</p>
College Council (President)		

**Evidence (in chronological order)**

**2009**

College of Alameda [Self Study Report 2009](#)

[Team Evaluation Report](#) ;

[ACCJC-District-and-College-Action-Letters-June-30-2009](#)]

[ACCJC-Request-for-Special-Report-on-Audit-Findings-November-18-2009.pdf](#)

**2010**

[Special-report4-01-10](#)

[COA Accreditation Followup Report FINAL March 15 10](#)

[Accreditation Response June 30 2010](#)

[COA Final Follow Up Report October 15 2010](#)

[ACCJC-101510-FollowUp-Report-FINAL.pdf](#);

## 2011

[January-2011-Commission-Letter-and-Follow-up-Visit-Report-ACCJC-letter-2-14-11](#)

[COA Follow Up Report May 20 2011](#)

[Follow-up-report-and-documentation-March-15-2012](#); [ACCJC-Follow-Up-Report-to-PCCD-May-2012](#); [ACCJC-Peralta-Action-Letter-July-2-2012](#)

[Follow-up-report-documentation-April-1-2011](#);

[-Peralta-CCD-Follow-Up-Report-May-20-2011-ACCJC](#);

[AACJC-Action-Letter-June-30-2011](#);

[ACCJC-Removal-from-Probation College-of-Alameda](#)

## 2012

[COA Follow Up Report](#)

[Follow-up-report-and-documentation-March-15-2012](#);

[ACCJC-Follow-Up-Report-to-PCCD-May-2012](#);

[ACCJC-Peralta-Action-Letter-July-2-2012](#)

## 2013

[ACCJC-letter-2-5-13](#);

[Peralta-4-1-13-Special-Report-to-ACCJC-Final](#);

[Final-CoA-Follow-Up-Report 3-15-13](#);

[College-of-Alameda-Follow-Up-Visit-Team-Report-April-2013](#);

[ACCJC-letter7-3-13-College-of-Alameda-Removed-from-Warning](#);

[PBIM-Overview-2014](#)

## Board Policies

[BP 2710 Conflict of Interest](#)

[BP 2715 Code of Ethics and Standards](#)

[BP 7120 Recruitment and Hiring](#)

[BP 7210 Academic Employees](#)

[BP 7230 Classified Employees](#)

[BP 7240 Confidential Employees](#)

[BP 7250 Academic Administrators](#)

[BP 7260 Classified Managers](#)

### **Administrative Procedures**

[AP 2712 Conflict of Interest Code](#)

[AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor's Staff](#)

[AP 2710 Conflict of Interest Disclosure](#)

[AP 7121 Faculty Hiring](#)

[AP 7123 Hiring Procedures for Regular Academic Administrators and](#)

[Classified Managers](#)

[AP 7125 Hiring Acting and Interim Academic and Non-Academic](#)

[Administrators](#)

### **Audit Reports**

<http://web.peralta.edu/business/finance-contacts/annual-financial-reports/> .

<http://web.peralta.edu/business/files/2014/09/PCCD-CAM-June-30-2013-to-September-21-2014.pdf>