Follow-Up Visit Report

LANEY COLLEGE

900 Fallon Street
Oakland, CA 94607

This Report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Laney College on November 7 and November 8, 2016

Submitted to:
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Submitted by:
Dr. John Weispfenning, Chancellor, Coast Community College District
Dr. Erik Cooper, Dean, Sierra College
Dr. Kevin Bontenbal, Librarian, Cuesta College
Dr. Sherrie Guerrero, Executive Liaison, Chaffey College

NOTE: this page shall be added to the report noted below, immediately behind the cover page, and shall become part of the final report associated with the review.

DATE: February 3, 2017

INSTITUTION: Laney College
                  9000 Fallon Street
                  Oakland, CA 94607

TEAM REPORT: External Evaluation Team Follow-Up Report (Team Report)

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited Laney College November 7-8, 2016.

SUBJECT: Commission Revisions to the Team Report

The Team Report provides details of the team's findings with regard to the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies, and should be read carefully and used to understand the team's findings. Upon a review of the Follow-Up Report and evidentiary materials submitted by Laney College and the Team Report, the following changes or corrections are noted for the Team Report:

1. The Commission considers the Standards cited in District Recommendations 5 and 6 to be met once the staffing plan has been fully realized and the College/District functional responsibilities have been followed. This will require additional time to document, but the College and District have resolved the deficiencies noted in these recommendations.

DATE: November 8, 2016

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Dr. John Weispfenning, Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Laney College, November 7, 2016

Introduction:

An evaluation team visit was conducted to Laney College in March 2015. At its meeting of June 3-5, 2015, the Commission acted to issue Warning and require the College to submit a Follow-Up Report in October 2016 followed by a visit of an external evaluation team. The evaluation team, Dr. John Weispfenning, Dr. Erik Cooper, Dr. Kevin Bontenbal, and Dr. Sherrie Guerrero, conducted the site visit to Laney College on November 7, 2016. The purpose of the visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the College was accurate through the examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution has addressed the recommendations made by the evaluation team, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission Policies (together Commission's Standards).

In general, the team found that the college had prepared carefully for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon earlier with the team chair and by assembling appropriate documents for the use of the team. Over the course of the day, the team met with the President of the College, the Vice President of Instruction, the Director of Business & Administrative Services, Faculty Senate President, Classified Senate President, Student Government President, Deans of Instruction, Deans of Student Services, Dean of Research and Planning, Curriculum Committee Chairs, Learning Assessment Chairs, Accreditation Leads, Department Chairs, College Council members, Institutional Effectiveness Committee members, Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Team members, faculty, and classified staff. The team also held an Open Forum to provide the campus community the opportunity to give information.

The work of the evaluation team at Laney College was supplemented by the visit of a larger external evaluation team to the Offices of the Peralta Community College District on November 8, 2016. Laney College is one of four colleges in the Peralta Community College District. The other colleges are College of Alameda, Berkeley City College, and Merritt College. The 2015 external evaluation reports of the Peralta colleges included eight District Recommendations and one Commission Concern that were common to the four colleges. The District evaluation team, Dr. John Weispfenning, Dr. Glenn Roquemore, Dr. Linda Rose, Ms. Renee Martinez, Dr. Arleen Satele, Dr. Aeron Zentner, Dr. Erik Cooper, Mr. Edralin Maduli, Dr. Linda Lopez Chaparro, and Dr. Sherrie Guerrero, conducted the site visit to the Peralta Community College District Office.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations:

College Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning and Evaluation
In order to meet the Standard, the College should clearly define, document, communicate, and evaluate the structures, roles, responsibilities, and processes used to integrate human, facilities, and fiscal planning in support of student learning and achievement (I.B.6, I.B.7, II.B.3.a, II.B.4, III.B.2.b, III.D.4, IV.A.5).

College Recommendation 2: Program Learning Outcomes and Assessment
In order to meet the Standard, the College must:
- Identify and publish program learning outcomes
- Ensure official SLOs align with SLOs on course syllabi
- Regularly assess course and program student learning outcomes; publish results of program level assessment
- Use assessment results to take actions that may result in improvement and evaluate the results of these actions

(II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.i; ER 10)

District Recommendation 1
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District follow the 2014 audit recommendations and develop an action plan to fund its Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liabilities, including the associated debt service (III.D.1.c, III.D.3.c).

District Recommendation 2
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District resolve the ongoing deficiencies identified in the 2013 and 2014 external audit findings (III.D.2.b, III.D.3.h).

Commission Concern 1
Regarding District Recommendations 1 and 2, the Commission carefully reviewed the team report and the District's external audit and found that the District must provide the documented, long-term planning necessary for the continued financial stability of the District. This must include attention to obligations coming due in the future such as the postemployment health care benefits, the annual line of credit repayment, and the appropriate resolution to audit findings from 2013 and 2014 which impact the District both at the operating fund level and the entity-wide financial statement level (III.D.1.c, III.D.2.b, III.D.3.c, III.D.3.h).

District Recommendation 3
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that District General Services (DGS) work with college personnel to implement a plan to address total cost of ownership for new facilities and equipment, including undertaking critical deferred maintenance and preventive maintenance needs at the college in order to assure safe and sufficient physical resources for students, faculty and staff (III.B.1, III.B.1.a, III.B.2.a).

District Recommendation 4
In order to meet the Standards, the District should clearly identify the structures, roles, responsibilities and document the processes used to integrate human, facilities, technology planning, and fiscal planning in support of student learning and achievement and regularly

evaluate the process in order to fairly allocate resources to support the planning priorities (III.A.6, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.4, IV.B.3.g).

District Recommendation 5
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the district ensure retention of key leadership positions and that adequate staffing capacity is available to address the needs of the colleges in three critical areas reflected in the accreditation standards: institutional effectiveness and leadership, institutional research, and financial accountability and management (III.A.2, III.A.6).

District Recommendation 6
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the district clearly delineate and communicate the operational responsibilities and functions of the district from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice; and regularly assesses and evaluates district role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals (IV.B.3).

District Recommendation 7
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends the Governing Board adhere to its appropriate role. The Board must allow the chancellor to take full responsibility and authority for the areas assigned to District oversight (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.j).

District Recommendation 8
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District systematically evaluate the equitable distribution of resources and the sufficiency and effectiveness of district-provided services in supporting effective operations of the colleges (IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.h).

In addition to the preceding recommendations, the 2015 visit team made a third College Recommendation:

College Recommendation 3: Substantive Change
In order to comply with the ACCJC Distance Education Policy, for all programs, certificates or degrees where 50 percent or more of the requirements are approved for delivery via distance learning, Laney College must submit a substantive change proposal (II.A.1.b, II.A.2.d, II.B.1, II.B.2.a, II.C.1, ACCJC Policy on Distance Education).

The College satisfied College Recommendation 3 prior to the November 2016 visit and was not evaluated by the 2016 external evaluation team.

With regard to Commission Concern 1, the College did not include a separate response to the Concern in its Follow-Up Report. The evaluation team's Findings and Evidence and Conclusion presented in this Report were drawn from information included in the responses to District Recommendations 1 and 2.

Team Analysis of College Responses to the 2010 Evaluation Team Recommendations

College Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning and Evaluation
In order to meet the Standard, the College should clearly define, document, communicate, and evaluate the structures, roles, responsibilities, and processes used to integrate human, facilities, and fiscal planning in support of student learning and achievement (I.B.6, I.B.7, II.B.3.a, II.B.4, III.B.2.b, III.D.4, IV.A.5).

Findings and Evidence:

The College has undergone a number of changes to address the need for integrated planning. After evaluating its old organizational structures and processes for resource allocation, the College has formalized a new, refined organizational and decision making structure, which incorporates an enhanced Program Review process into an expanded budget cycle and planning process. The new processes, as well as the roles of faculty, staff, and administrators, are well documented in the supporting literature. The College is currently in the middle of its first cycle of the new process. The College provided evidence that the process has been used to support technology requests in support of student learning, but after reviewing the provided documentation and meeting with College representatives, the College has not yet fully used the new processes to allocate resources for staffing or facilities.

While the College has made progress towards addressing the Recommendation, with the limited time between receipt of the Recommendation and the follow-up visit, the College has not completed a full cycle of its new processes or evaluated their effectiveness. While pertinent individuals, such as the Dean of Research & Planning and members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, have a clear understanding of how progress in achieving College goals should be measured and how the College might choose to evaluate the effectiveness of the planning and decision making structures and processes, there is no clearly stated timeline defined for reviewing goals and evaluating processes and responsible parties are not named. Interviews with College personnel indicate an awareness of these deficiencies and the College has a place for the schedule as part of its Integrated Planning and Resource Allocation Model.

Conclusion:

After reviewing the provided documentation and meeting with faculty, classified staff, and administrators, it is clear the College has made substantial progress in documenting and developing the planning process and implementing the prioritization and resource allocation model. However, without completing a full cycle of the refined Planning and Resource Allocation cycle, the College has not had an opportunity to evaluate those new processes and structures. Given the available time, the college has made progress and, based on recent success in evaluating and modifying the old planning and resource allocation cycle, is on the right track. However, the College must complete the planned evaluation of its planning and resource allocation structures and processes.

The College is in the process of addressing the recommendation and correcting the deficiencies, but it has not yet achieved compliance with the Commission's Standards.

College Recommendation 2: Program Learning Outcomes and Assessment
In order to meet the Standard, the College must:
- Identify and publish program learning outcomes
- Ensure official SLOs align with SLOs on course syllabi
- Regularly assess course and program student learning outcomes; publish results of program level assessment
- Use assessment results to take actions that may result in improvement and evaluate the results of these actions

(II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.i; ER 10)

Findings and Evidence:

The College has done a tremendous amount of work in shifting the campus culture around student learning outcomes (SLOs) and assessment to one with greater understanding of the value of assessment and its role in improving student learning and intuitional effectiveness. With assistance from the college's Assessment Coordinators, all programs have identified program outcomes (PLOs), which are published in the college catalog and posted on the Learning Assessment Webpage and in CurricUNET Meta.

In ensuring that SLOs listed on official course outlines of record (CORs) are aligned with SLOs on course syllabi, the Assessment Coordinators generated a list of all course SLOs that was shared with faculty. Faculty then included the SLOs on their syllabi. Team members viewed a number of courses to verify alignment. For ongoing accountability, this list will continue to be updated and shared with faculty, and the Deans' offices are responsible for ensuring that the SLOs on course syllabi remain aligned with SLOs on CORs.

Ongoing assessment of SLOs and PLOs is integrated in the College's curriculum and program review processes. The College has established a consistent policy for the approval of SLOs and PLOs, including a requirement that all faculty map SLOs to PLOs and/or Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) in order to offer new or updated courses and programs. Assessment results data is currently stored in Taskstream, and on alternative spreadsheets for faculty not familiar with Taskstream, until the college fully implements the Assessment Module within its CurricUNET Meta system by Spring 2017. Departments report on the analysis of these assessments in their program review, as well as describe at least three changes/improvements that have been made in the past three years as a result of these assessments. PLOs assessment results are also made available on the Learning Assessment Webpage and in Taskstream. The college is continuing to have discussions about how best to report to its constituencies the assessment results for learning outcomes and plans to make these results available in CurricUNET Meta's Assessment Module, once fully implemented.

The College uses assessment results to make improvements and is continuing to strengthen the link between learning outcomes assessment and institutional decisions and resource allocation.

Many examples of curriculum and instructional improvements have been identified and implemented, and justification for resource requests is connected to learning outcomes assessment. To ensure the progress it has made is ongoing and sustained, the evaluation team encourages the College to continue clearly documenting systematic, consistent, and ongoing processes for assessing course and program learning outcomes, including publishing the results of these assessments.

Conclusion:
The College has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Commission's Standards.

Team Analysis of Responses to the 2015 Evaluation Team District Recommendations

District Recommendation 1
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District follow the 2014 audit recommendations and develop an action plan to fund its Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liabilities, including the associated debt service (III.D.1.c, III.D.3.c).

Findings and Evidence:

The external audit report dated June 30, 2015, shows that the 2014 audit recommendation was partially implemented. It is anticipated that the 2016 audit should resolve this deficiency. However, at the time the external evaluation team visited the District, the audit results were not available and are not expected until December 2016.

However, the District has developed both a short term and long term action plan to mitigate the impact of the OPEB debt service on District finances.

Short term actions include the following:
- The District's B2 tranche was restructured by converting $38,450,000 of Convertible Auction Rate Securities to variable rate bonds with a Letter of Credit from Barclay's Bank on August 5, 2016.
- The District may use this approach with subsequent tranches, the next one maturing in 2020.

The following long term plan was approved by the Board of Trustees on April 29, 2016
- Develop a 10-year cash flow analysis of all District funds to fund the OPEB bond debt and the District's pre-2004 retirees.
- Create an irrevocable trust for the District's post-2004 retirees.
- Commit annually 5 percent of general fund revenues, specifically the State Apportionment Computational Revenue, to OPEB bond debt service and the establishment and maintenance of an irrevocable trust.
- Strategically refund OPEB bonds and/or swaps as required by subsequent tranches.

- Reduce the District's overall OPEB liability.
- Update the District's Substantive Plan on an ongoing basis per GASB 43/45.

The team was able to validate these actions through review of all the evidence presented as well as interviews with District staff. Of particular note, the pending 2016 external audit would validate the planned actions.

Conclusion:

The District has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Commission's Standards.

District Recommendation 2
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District resolve the ongoing deficiencies identified in the 2013 and 2014 external audit findings (III.D.2.b, III.D.3.h).

Findings and Evidence:

The team reviewed evidence demonstrating the District has resolved the ongoing deficiencies identified in the 2013 and 2014 external audit. The team was able to confirm the resolution of these ongoing deficiencies through its review of the Annual Financial Reports dated June 30, 2014, and June 30, 2015, and interviews with District staff.

The June 30, 2014, external audit showed 10 of the 14 deficiencies from the 2013 external audit were resolved. The 2015 external audit showed 3 more deficiencies resolved. The one outstanding deficiency carried into 2015 was partially completed (2013-006 & 2014-002: Reporting – Common Origination and Disbursement).

The June 30, 2015, external audit showed 10 of the 12 deficiencies from the 2014 external audit were resolved, while 2 deficiencies showed partial implementation (2014-002: Reporting Common Origination and Disbursement & 2014-001: District Financial Condition).

Evidence demonstrates that the district significantly reduced the number of external audit findings.

Audit Deficiencies

1) 2013-006 & 2014-002: Reporting – Common Origination and Disbursement (COD)

Audit Findings: The outstanding deficiency from 2013 and 2014 is the proper reporting of disbursement within the 30-day requirement. According to the 2015 audit report (2015-003), the auditors noted "The District did implement a new process during 2015 spring semester, thereby addressing the issue, several instances of noncompliance were noted during the fall semester." The new process included a cross-functional team, consisting of Finance, Financial Aid, and IT,

that developed a file transfer submittal process to ensure compliance with Federal requirements. Instructions and training have been disseminated to the colleges and the District's Financial Aid Policy and Procedures Manual has been updated to reflect this new process.

Current status: Partially implemented. In spring 2015, there were no audit findings. It is anticipated that the 2016 audit should validate the resolution of these deficiencies. However, at the time the external evaluation team visited the District, the audit results were not available and are not expected until December 2016.

   2) 2014 – 001: District Financial Condition

Audit Findings: The District is required to maintain operational and budgetary financial stability both at the fund level and the entity-wide level. The District's total OPEB bond obligation is $218 million. While the District has $215 million in investments related to the OPEB obligation, these investments are not in an irrevocable trust. The District's self-insurance fund has a deficit balance of $1.6 million.

Current status: Partially implemented. According to the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, an irrevocable trust has been created and the self-insurance fund has a positive ending balance estimated at $468,000 in June 2015. Pending the receipt of the 2016 external audit, this outstanding deficiency should be resolved. However, at the time the external evaluation team visited the District, the audit results were not available and are not expected until December 2016.

For continuous improvement and implementation, under the leadership of the current Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, who was hired in August 2015, the Office of Finance and Administration has reorganized its structure to include two new positions: a senior accountant and a payroll manager. Each of these positions will provide additional support and guidance to the colleges, as well as to provide for enhanced internal controls through monitoring. Given the work of the Audit Resolution Work Team and other collaborative District efforts, the District has reduced completely the number of findings.

Conclusion:

The District has resolved all ongoing deficiencies identified in the 2013 and 2014 external audits, and the non-recurrent audit functions that are considered key to its operational efficiency, fiscal integrity, and educational services delivery capacity have been addressed. The District also is continuing to evaluate other business processes (e.g., debt issuance/management and purchasing/contracting processes), thereby ensuring a model for continued improvement. There is ongoing discussion and evaluation within the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC).

The District has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Commission's Standards.

Commission Concern 1

Regarding District Recommendations 1 and 2, the Commission carefully reviewed the team report and the District's external audit and found that the District must provide the documented, long-term planning necessary for the continued financial stability of the District. This must include attention to obligations coming due in the future such as the postemployment health care benefits, the annual line of credit repayment, and the appropriate resolution to audit findings from 2013 and 2014 which impact the District both at the operating fund level and the entity-wide financial statement level (III.D.1.c, III.D.2.b, III.D.3.c, III.D.3.h).

Findings and Evidence:

The District did not include a separate response to Commission Concern 1 in its Follow-Up Report. The Findings and Evidence, and Conclusion presented here were drawn from information included in the responses to District Recommendations 1 and 2.

The District asserts that it has developed a long-term plan to continually fund its Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liabilities, including its associated debt service. The District also states that they have taken short-term actions to mitigate the impacts of the OPEB debt service on District finances.

The District has made significant progress in addressing District Recommendations 1 and 2. Specifically, the District conducted a special board retreat to address the recommendation on OPEB Liability on July 12, 2016. The presentation to the Board, delivered in the workshop, contained evidence of short- and long-term planning as required in Commission Concern 1.

Short-term actions include the following:
- The District's B2 tranche was restructured by converting $38,450,000 of Convertible Auction Rate Securities to variable rate bonds with a Letter of Credit from Barclay's Bank on August 5, 2016.
- The District may use this approach with subsequent tranches, the next one maturing in 2020.

The Board of Trustees approved the following long-term plan on April 29, 2016:
- Develop a 10-year cash flow analysis of all District funds to fund the OPEB bond debt and the District's pre-2004 retirees.
- Create an irrevocable trust for the District's post-2004 retirees.
- Commit annually 5 percent of general fund revenues, specifically the State Apportionment Computational Revenue, to OPEB bond debt service and the establishment and maintenance of an irrevocable trust.
- Strategically refund OPEB bonds and/or swaps as required by subsequent tranches.
- Reduce the District's overall OPEB liability.
- Update District's Substantive Plan, on ongoing bases, per GASB 43/45.

The audit findings from 2013 and 2014 impact the District at the operating fund level and the entity-wide financial statement level. The June 30, 2014, external audit showed 10 of the 14 deficiencies from the 2013 external audit were resolved. The 2015 external audit showed 3 more

deficiencies resolved. The only outstanding deficiency was carried from 2014 into 2015 as partially completed.

The June 30, 2015, external audit showed 8 of the 10 deficiencies from the 2014 external audit were resolved. One deficiency shows partial implementation. The other deficiency was unresolved in the 2015 external audit. The 2016 preliminary audit report would validate the resolution of these deficiencies. However, at the time the external evaluation team visited the District, the audit results were not available and are not expected until December 2016.

Pending the receipt of the 2016 external audit, these outstanding deficiencies should be resolved.

Conclusion:

The District has fully addressed Commission Concern 1, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Commission's Standards.

District Recommendation 3
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that District General Services (DGS) work with college personnel to implement a plan to address total cost of ownership for new facilities and equipment, including undertaking critical deferred maintenance and preventive maintenance needs at the college in order to assure safe and sufficient physical resources for students, faculty and staff (III.B.1, III.B.1.a, III.B.2.a).

Findings and Evidence:

The team reviewed evidence describing how the District General Services (DGS) works with college personnel to implement a plan to address total cost of ownership for new facilities and equipment, including undertaking critical deferred maintenance and preventive maintenance needs at the Colleges in order to assure safe and sufficient physical resources for students, faculty and staff.

An action plan was created to develop the District's Total Cost of Ownership (TCO). The plan was completed by the Department of General Services (DGS) and the Districtwide Facilities Committee (DFC) and presented at the District's August summit meeting 2015. At that time, the plan included the following elements:

1. A list of new and modernization facilities projects, to include funding resources.
2. An action plan for addressing equipment needs (and technology acquisition) and critical deferred maintenance needs.
3. An action plan for addressing preventive maintenance needs: the District is responsible for 98 buildings throughout the District, including the District Administrative Center (DAC) with a total area of 1,596,887 gross square feet.

Meeting minutes from October 2015 document the TCO District Team Committee was formed to examine the TCO needs of all four colleges and continue to revise the existing TCO Plan (alternatively referred to as Guidelines). This committee began its work by meeting with each

college to address the TCO elements that are college-specific and the resources needed to achieve college objectives. A list of capital projects and scheduled and deferred maintenance projects was then generated. After reviewing minutes, initial meetings were held at the four colleges for input. Furthermore, a town hall meeting was held at Berkeley City College to encourage additional dialogue pertaining to new facilities for TCO planning.

In November 2015, DGS presented a revised TCO plan to the District's Planning and Budgeting Council to establish and document institutionally agreed upon, systematic procedures for evaluating facilities and maintenance needs at all four colleges. The TCO included a financial projection to help identify direct and indirect costs of facility and equipment needs, to include the total economic value of the physical property investment, scheduled and deferred maintenance needs of the colleges, staffing, training, safety, modernization, maintenance, and costs of technology acquisition and replacement.

Evidence indicates significant progress in addressing deferred maintenance projects across the colleges. There were 1,270 work orders in August 2015. One year later, in August 2016, there were 105 outstanding work orders. To address safety needs, the District has distributed 250 digital radios districtwide to bridge communication between law enforcement officers and District constituents.

As the District continues to evaluate the TCO guidelines, in May 2016 there was a revision to include IT. It was determined that the cost of acquiring technology and equipment was key to the network infrastructure across the colleges. Implementation includes each college developing a list of priority technology requests that is vetted though the college shared governance process and submitted to the District Technology Committee (DTC) and PBC. For fiscal 2016-2017, the District IT unit was allocated $1.8 million which is approximately 1.4% of the District's total adopted budget.

For continuous quality improvement, evidence shows that the District conducted a Facility Conditions Assessment study (FCA), in collaboration with the California Community Colleges, in 2013. This assessment is included within the colleges' 5-year capital outlay plans. The District's Facilities Assessment Index (FCI) was completed in September 2016 and will help to determine ongoing facilities and maintenance planning. The TCO Guidelines call for the establishment of an in-house Task Force to monitor the implementation of the FCA study recommendations.

For implementation and evaluation, the District has continually utilized the TCO guidelines in requesting proposals for new buildings, proposing additional staffing levels, safety issues, IT requirements, deferred maintenance and equipment. The District has utilized Survey Monkey and recently compared a 2015 satisfaction survey with one from 2013. One of the outcomes is the revised work order system, which led to a significant reduction in work orders. From interviews with DGS, they began in May 2016 to have the district facilities director, manager and staff go to each college's Facility Committee to have regular dialogue regarding outstanding college needs and services, and to provide updates about District-related facility activities.

Conclusion:

The District constructed a DGS Action Plan for creating new TCO Guidelines in collaboration with the colleges. The District continues to make progress in addressing and satisfying deferred maintenance needs at the colleges, "in order to assure safe and sufficient physical resources" for all members of the District community. The reorganization of DGS has revitalized leadership presence and efficiency. Four new assistant chief engineers were hired by October 2016, to address facilities and maintenance needs at each college.   Beginning in summer 2016, the Chancellor's C-Direct featured DGS reports that detailed progress on deferred maintenance. These reports have improved communication Districtwide as TCO objectives are implemented.

The District has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Commission's Standards.

District Recommendation 4
In order to meet the Standards, the District should clearly identify the structures, roles, responsibilities and document the processes used to integrate human, facilities, technology planning, and fiscal planning in support of student learning and achievement and regularly evaluate the process in order to fairly allocate resources to support the planning priorities (III.A.6, III.B.2, III.C.2, III.D.4, IV.B.3.g).

Findings and Evidence:

To identify the structures, roles and responsibilities used to integrate human, facilities, technology, planning and fiscal planning in support of student learning and achievement, the District provided an overview of the integrated planning structure through its Planning and Budget Integration Model (PBIM). The PBIM guides the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) that oversees district-wide planning and is supported by subject matter committees that focus on education, facilities, and technology.

The role and responsibilities of PBC are outlined in the PBIM Handbook and include the following activities:
- Provide oversight to the District and colleges' Strategic and Educational Plans
- Recommend a coordinated, District-wide planning approach
- Recommend a prioritization of plans across subject areas and colleges
- Identify funding approaches to support priorities
- Review educational and resources priorities, Board policies and administrative procedures, and integrated planning and budgeting
- Review recommendations from the subject area committees and provide final recommendations to the chancellor
- Provide transparent two-way communication of directions and decisions

Following the annual planning calendar, the District begins the annual planning process during the District-wide planning summit in August, where data, evaluation, and outcome information is reviewed by leadership and constituent groups to provide direction and focus for the upcoming

year. The PBC activities are outlined in the annual calendar for planning, program review, and annual program updates.

The PBIM planning strategies utilize Program Review and other data to facilitate plans and resource requests that support decisions from the institutions. The prioritized requests are provided to Chancellor's Cabinet for prioritization and given to PBC for final review for recommendation to the chancellor. As outlined in the Program Review calendar, all sites conduct comprehensive or annual programmatic planning reports that render strategies and requests for resources. The evidence showed that all program review manuals were updated for the various programs and all reviews were conducted and completed in 2015-16.

Planning in the District is governed by District strategic goals and institutional objectives. This framework provides a foundational structure wherein District, college, and programmatic planning draws integration points and connections between plans to meet at a centralized vision. The District utilizes the Program Review process to conduct annual assessments across the different instructional and non-instructional programs at the colleges and district in support of evidence-informed decision-making. The review of Program Review documentation (i.e., templates and completed documents) found a direct linkage between programmatic initiatives, College goals, District goals, and institutional objectives.

The District provided four flowcharts related to the instructional resource, staff resource, technology, and facilities resource allocation. This was documented in a college-level prioritized summary of a report listing new resource needs (i.e. staffing, technology, facilities, and other). The college reports draw an alignment between the college goals and District strategic goals to support overall requests for resources. The resource prioritization employs a multifaceted approach to creating a ranking of resources and positions at the college-level. Through interviews, it was confirmed that prioritization is completed by the college presidents in Chancellor's Cabinet and distributed to PBC for approval and recommendation to the Chancellor. Documentation of discussion around the cabinet-level prioritization process was limited, and a final district-wide prioritization outcome was not evident. However, interviews affirmed a new resource allocation structure is being proposed District-wide to better streamline the structure of budget development and resource allocation.

The documentation and dissemination of information and minutes are made available publicly for review. Also, an emphasis on communication is structured around two-way communication between the colleges' Planning and Budget Committees, the subject matter committees and the PBC and between the Chancellor and Board. This information is reflected throughout the minutes from the associated committees.

The District outlined an assessment timeframe for the PBIM to occur during the spring term and utilizes the assessment results in the annual districtwide planning summit in August. The assessment process employs a PBC goal assessment matrix to assess the effectiveness and progress made on PBC goals. Additionally, an assessment survey of PBIM is conducted to yield quantitative and qualitative feedback and recommendations to support an evidence-informed evaluation for continuous improvement. This assessment strategy is tied directly to specific institutional objectives, which were discussed in the August 2016 planning summit.

Conclusion:

Through the review of the District response to the Recommendation, actions taken by the District, and the evidence provided, it is apparent that the District has developed and follows a structure, the roles, and the responsibilities presented in the Planning and Budget Integration Model (PBIM). Under this model, the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) and the subject matter committees oversee the prioritization of planning and resources.

In addition, the District follows an integrated and evidence-informed approach for planning the Program Review process. This approach has led to the documented prioritization of staffing, facilities, technology, and fiscal planning based on linkages to the College goals, institutional objectives and District strategic goals. While the evidence found prioritized documentation at the college-level, the results of the final resource prioritization were unavailable; however, the new prioritization model and process is anticipated to alleviate this challenge through subject matter committees' resource prioritization.

Finally, the review of documentation found consistency in assessment processes of the PBIM and that the findings are used to make timely modifications to the planning process.

The District has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Commission's Standards.

District Recommendation 5
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District ensure retention of key leadership positions and that adequate staffing capacity is available to address the needs of the colleges in three critical areas reflected in the accreditation standards: institutional effectiveness and leadership, institutional research, and financial accountability and management (III.A.2, III.A.6).

Findings and Evidence:

The District has developed and enhanced existing planning processes to address the recruitment and retention of key leadership positions. In addition, the District has developed a 2016-2019 Staffing Plan to ensure that adequate staffing capacity is available to address the demands of institutional effectiveness and leadership, institutional research, financial accountability, and management. In July 2015, a new Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration was approved by the Board of Trustees and in July 2016, an interim Director of Institutional Research and Planning was also approved by the Board. At the time of this visit, the District was implementing the new Staffing Plan.

Beyond the planning that has been done, the District is in transition with the leadership of the colleges. Of the four colleges, three had interim presidents; two have searches underway at the time of the evaluation team's visit that are expected to be completed at the end of fall 2016. The

third college will initiate its search in spring 2017. In addition, there are still key leadership positions, identified by the District and the colleges, that remain without permanent staff.

Interviews with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services indicated that the Staffing Plan is integrated with the current planning model by being aligned with the District's four-year strategic planning process. It will be reviewed on an annual basis with a comprehensive review of the process every two years. Included in the Staffing Plan is a gap analysis that is intended to assist the planning process at each of the four colleges. A review of the plan indicates the development of a schedule for the review of staffing levels at each college using a formula to determine and assess the optimum staffing levels. Assumptions will be used in the process of hiring administrators, classified staff, and facilities support staff to address needs for custodial, grounds, and maintenance.

In "The New Peralta Way: An address to the Peralta Community College District Faculty and Staff," the chancellor provided an overview of priorities for the future of the District. In a memo dated March 1, 2016, the chancellor communicated his commitment to retain key leadership in the District. The memo was distributed to all employees in the District. The memo indicated that the Chancellor used the solicited responses he had received from District employees to develop the re-organization for the District in support of the colleges. The District's 2015-2016 Strategic Goals and Institutional Objectives identify the focus and intent of the Chancellor to strengthen accountability, innovation, and collaboration and to enhance District and college leadership to support student success.

Conclusion:

The District has developed an integrated Staffing Plan and has communicated a commitment to increase the retention of key leadership positions. While processes already existed to determine the number of faculty to be hired to meet state requirements, the evidence reviewed demonstrated the Staffing Plan will assist the District and the colleges in identifying the need for specific positions in the areas of College leadership, administration, and classified staffing.

The District has developed and is implementing processes that will enhance its ability to ensure adequate staffing. However, the existing vacancies in college leadership indicate the District must successfully complete those hires and the scheduled evaluation of the process that is integrated into the model in order to meet the Standards.

The District is in the process of addressing the recommendation and correcting the deficiencies, but it has not yet achieved compliance with the Commission's Standards.

District Recommendation 6
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the district clearly delineate and communicate the operational responsibilities and functions of the district from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice; and regularly assesses and evaluates District role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes

to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals (IV.B.3).

Findings and Evidence:

Growing out of its annual governance summit meeting, the District developed Unit Delineations of Functions for District Service Centers (DSC). The Unit Delineations of Functions are included in the DSC Program Reviews and are available online in interactive function charts. Additionally, the District created a District Functions Matrix, which apportions functions, based on the accreditation Standards, between the District and the colleges.

The District utilized a satisfaction survey to assess how well DSCs are meeting the needs of the colleges. One goal for the survey was to assess and evaluate District role delineation. However, none of the survey items addressed delineation of functions. Stakeholders from the colleges and the District provided feedback about the DSCs. Because the surveys were linked to the DSC Program Reviews, Program Review participants were also surveyed and the results were used to make recommendations for improving the Program Review process. Other outcomes included reorganizing District Offices, creating new positions at the District, and developing a Staffing Plan.

Conclusion:

The District has made progress in delineating and communicating its functions. The District's development of Unit Delineation of Functions and the District Functions Matrix has delineated and communicated operational responsibilities and functions of the district from the colleges. While its survey focused on DSCs, it did not address delineation or other decision-making structures and processes. As such, adherence to delineation was not documented, and evaluations of governance and decision-making structures and processes were not addressed.

The District is in the process of addressing the recommendation and correcting the deficiencies, but it has not yet achieved compliance with the Commission's Standards.

District Recommendation 7
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends the Governing Board adhere to its appropriate role. The Board must allow the chancellor to take full responsibility and authority for the areas assigned to district oversight (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.j).

Findings and Evidence:

The District hired a new Chancellor following the retirement of the previous Chancellor in Spring 2015. The selection of the new Chancellor was completed by July 1, 2015, with a contract that included provisions that allowed the Chancellor to assume more demonstrable responsibility for District oversight.

In August 2015, the Chancellor introduced the concept, "The New Peralta Way," to all Peralta Community College constituents. The is an initiative intended to improve "leadership through the strengthening of competence, passion, integrity, and intimacy—a leadership focused on enhancing student success." Following this address, a "Team Building" retreat was held in September 2015, in which the Trustees and the Chancellor developed formal goals, expected outcomes, and timelines. Both the Board and the Chancellor agreed to respective evaluations to review the progress toward these goals, outcomes, and timelines in Summer 2016.

On December 8, 2015, the Board and the Chancellor adopted goals that included policies about the quality of the program integrity of institutional actions and the effectiveness of student learning programs and services. To increase communication, the Chancellor writes a weekly report named the C-Gram message to keep the Board apprised on District activities and minimize unwelcome surprises. In addition, prior to each scheduled board meeting, the Chancellor, the Board President and Vice President, Legal Counsel, and Chief of Staff meet to go over the Board agenda so all are aware of the issues. Additionally, Board members are apprised of the Chancellor's weekly agenda, which provides them opportunities to stay informed, as well as have input and participation in relevant activities. Also, the Chief of Staff keeps the Chancellor aware of ongoing concerns, important issues, and outstanding items to be addressed by the Chancellor. The team validated that these types of communication are being well received by the Board of Trustees.

In order to address the frustration of community constituents' concerns for perceived lack of action on the part of college administrations and in order to minimize the need for constituents to appeal directly to Board members, the Chancellor has pledged that "all public issues will be satisfactorily addressed." In addition, Trustees have committed to refer all individuals to the Chancellor's Office for their public concerns.

Beginning fall 2016, the District publishes a calendar to ensure all Board Policies are scheduled for review on a rotating basis. A posted schedule states Board Policy series 1000, 2000, and 3000 are under review in fall 2016. District Cabinet minutes dated September 12, 2016, verified this activity is in process.

Conclusion:

The District has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Commission's Standards.

District Recommendation 8
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the District systematically evaluate the equitable distribution of resources and the sufficiency and effectiveness of district-provided services in supporting effective operations of the colleges (IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.3.h).

Findings and Evidence:

The District has taken a number of actions to ensure the equitable distribution of resources to the colleges. This included both the re-evaluation by shared governance groups of the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) and the Program Review processes. Additionally, the District initiated the development of a Human Resources staffing plan, a review of the District's technology services, and improvements to the District's responses for routine maintenance, preventive maintenance, and deferred maintenance requests.

The evaluation team reviewed evidence and interviewed personnel involved in the district planning and resource allocation processes. Interviews with individuals at the colleges provided additional insight into the processes.

The BAM has been reviewed and significant changes have been proposed with a goal of making it more equitable. As noted in the District's Follow-Up Report, the five proposals addressed:

- Removing full-time salary and benefit costs from the colleges' allocations
- Maintaining decentralized allocations of fixed costs and basing future allocations on prior year actuals
- Making no changes with respect to resource allocations and capped courses
- Allocating the appropriate level of custodians based on industry best practices
- Forming a separate task force to review and assess service levels, efficacy, and reasonableness of costs associated with District services

At the time of the visit, it had not been determined whether or not the recommended changes would be adopted by the District; however, the discussions were calendared for specific committees during the fall semester.

Those interviewed conveyed a confidence in the processes used for determining the prioritization of faculty positions. The requests emerge from Program Review, are prioritized at the college, and then collaboratively prioritized at the District. However, a similar process does not exist for the prioritization of classified positions. The District initiated a task force to review and develop a process for the prioritization of classified positions.

With respect to technology resources, there has been robust discussion within the District Technology Committee and IT staff regarding the clarification of the District's role in providing services (e.g., providing the infrastructure) and the colleges' roles in planning technology (e.g., instructional technology needs). Meetings with IT staff indicated efforts were underway to improve the understanding of IT complexities and increase transparency in IT discussions. First, a new IT Steering Group will help sort requests for technology projects and resources working in conjunction with the District Technology Committee. A flowchart has been developed that demonstrated the proposed processes to be used in evaluating whether or not District IT can provide the requested service. Additionally, IT staff have proposed to the District Technology Committee a project management approach to technology needs which includes the following steps:

- Initialization and planning
- Analysis and design

- Develop, configure, and execute
- Test, train, and monitor
- Deploy, optimize, closeout

This project approach helps to demonstrate to IT users the complexity involved in some IT requests and the time needed to fully implement the request. Although not finalized, the discussions between the IT Staff and the District Technology Committee are providing a vehicle for the evaluation of IT services.

The District does have shared governance structures in place to evaluate the equitable distribution of resources and the sufficiency and effectiveness of District-provided services. Though many individuals stated that they could use more resources, they did acknowledge that structures were in place to provide discussion and the appropriate involvement of constituent groups in those discussions. Although the District has attempted to obtain feedback on District Services through surveys and informal discussions, no systematic, regular process exists for this.

Conclusion:

The District has the shared governance structures in place to provide feedback on the quality and efficacy of District Services. Although no formal, systemic evaluation process exists, the District is close to having that developed. District Offices now complete program review, and a new task force will specifically develop that formal process. Additionally, though those interviewed express the need for additional resources, all acknowledged that the District's shared governance structure provided a vehicle for the appropriate involvement of constituent groups.

The District has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Standards.