

The Peralta Colleges

Berkeley City College ♦ College of Alameda ♦ Laney College ♦ Merritt College

Charting Our Course for the Future:
Peralta's District-Wide Plan for Educational
Excellence

July 8, 2008

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1
II. District Wide Educational Planning Context..... 6
III. Shared Priorities and Processes..... 9
IV. Culture of Evidence and Accountability..... 44

Appendices

- Internal Environmental Scan
- External Environmental Scan
- Long Range Enrollment Projections
- Committee for Strategic Educational Planning Summary Report
- Accelerated Program Review Handbook
- District Wide Discipline Planning Handbook

Please contact the Educational Services Department for appendices.

Acronyms and Terminology

Key acronyms and terms used in this plan are defined below. The term “career-technical education” is used in place of the term “vocational education” to be consistent with current usage in state and federal legislation and programs.

Acronyms	
DWEMP	District Wide Educational Master Plan
DWEMPC	District Wide Educational Master Plan Committee
CSEP	Committee for Strategic Educational Planning
CTE	Career Technical Education
Terms	
Foundation Skills Education	Skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, as well as learning skills and study skills which are necessary for students to success in college-level work. (The Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges, July 2007)
Career-Technical Education	Career Technical Education (CTE) courses and programs are those educational options that offer specific occupational and technical skills related to identified industry clusters.

District Wide Educational Master Planning Committee 2007-2008

Chair: Gary Yee, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services. Facilitation: Paul Downs

	<i>Berkeley City College</i>	<i>College of Alameda</i>	<i>Laney College</i>	<i>Merritt College</i>
<i>Academic Senate President</i>	Joseph Bielanski	Carlotta Campbell	Shirley Coaston	Tom Branca
<i>At-Large Faculty</i>	Fabian Banga	Bob Grill	Cheli Fossum	David Morales
<i>Vice President, Instruction</i>	Debbie Budd	Jannett Jackson	Elnora Webb	Linda Berry
<i>Vice President, Student Services</i>	Mario Rivas	Kerry Compton	James Bracy	Josue Hoyos

The Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees unanimously accepted the *District Wide Educational Master Plan* on July 8, 2008.

I. Introduction

The *District-Wide Educational Master Plan* is an overall framework for the evolution and development of the Peralta Community College District. Drawing on environmental scan reports, program reviews, and unit plans, the plan sets overarching directions for meeting the needs of students and the community through a coordinated approach across the four colleges and district service centers.

The *District Wide EMP* is an umbrella statement of direction for the four *College Educational Master Plans*, which provide more detailed goals and strategies that are unique to each college's needs. The *District Wide EMP* presents the common long-range planning assumptions for the colleges and describes the processes and procedures by which the four colleges will work together. The college master plans and the *District Wide EMP* were developed collaboratively to create an integrated planning framework linking program review, educational planning and resource allocation. The integrated planning approach achieves one of the major goals of the *District Wide Strategic Plan* and fulfills the major district-level accreditation recommendation.

The Peralta District has a strong history of collaborative planning. Starting with the major realignment of career-technical programs in the 1980's, the colleges and district-wide offices have maintained processes that bring the colleges together regularly to plan for the future. This *District-Wide Education Master Plan* builds on this foundation and sets goals that are intended to strengthen the district's collaborative processes for charting overall educational directions.

Plan Purpose

The purpose of the plan is to present a shared educational "road map" for the Colleges and district service centers for the next 15 years. This shared district-wide road map is made up of the agreed-upon educational principles, goals, and integrated planning and budgeting processes that provide both a clear future direction and a set of adaptive mechanisms to ensure the plan is a living document. The district wide plan documents the common planning criteria, methodologies, and agreements that bring consistency to and provide a context for the four *College Educational Master Plans*.

The district-wide plan's road map is composed of several specific elements:

1. **Educational Program Framework:** The set overarching program themes that provide a shared focus for the colleges, and the unique areas of career-technical focus for each college.
2. **Integrated Instructional and Student Service Strategies:** The educational strategies for instruction and student services to meet current and anticipated needs of students.
3. **Shared Decision-Making Criteria and Processes:** Document the processes shared across the colleges on a district-wide basis that will enable the colleges and district as a whole to remain flexible and adaptive to change
4. **Long-Range Growth Assumptions:** A set of integrated enrollment growth projections and assumptions regarding distance learning, education centers, non-state funded education, and enrollment management to achieve the enrollment goals.

Plan Development Process

The concepts presented in the plan reflect the contributions and agreements of faculty, staff, students and administrators who participated in several planning processes over the period from September 2006 to June 2008. The plan reflects an iterative process of district-wide planning discussions integrated with college-based discussions.

Initial Planning Foundation: Strategic Planning Steering Committee

District-wide collaborative planning was a major theme of *District-Wide Strategic Plan*, published in June 2006. The plan was the result of the work of a 40-member Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) representing the four colleges, faculty, staff, administrators and students. The work of the SPSC was responsive to college stakeholder input received at town hall meetings at each college, flex day activities and college councils. The SPSC also responded to the accreditation recommendation that the colleges and district office establish an integrated strategic planning process to address educational and resource planning across the colleges and district functions.

Process Guidance: Strategic Management Team and District-Wide Educational Master Planning Committee

In Fall 2006, the Strategic Management Team (SMT) – composed of the college presidents, the vice chancellors, and the chancellor – responded to the SPSC's recommendation in the Strategic Plan that there be an integrated educational master planning effort. The SMT reviewed and approved an educational planning process developed by the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services.

The District-Wide Educational Master Planning Committee (DWEMPC) provided the primary venue for integrating the various strands of educational master planning. The committee membership was based on a standard composition from each college: the Vice Presidents of Student Service and Instruction, the Academic Senate President, and an at-large faculty member. The Vice Chancellor of Educational Services chaired the committee with support from an external consultant.

Faculty and Dean Input Via Program Review

The educational planning process started formally with two parallel efforts in the spring of 2007. The first element was the refinement and implementation of a shared approach for program review. This involved faculty throughout the district: Laney and Berkeley city College completed program review in an accelerated mode for all disciplines, while College of Alameda and Merritt College completed more extensive program review for specific disciplines. (All colleges and disciplines undertook a consistent level of review by completing unit plans for all disciplines.) The program reviews were primarily source documents for college level planning.

Academic Senate Presidents and Vice Presidents of Instruction—the Committee for Strategic Educational Planning

The second track was the development by an ad-hoc committee of a complementary process for assessing instructional programs on a college-wide basis using consistent criteria of quality, relevance, and productivity. The Committee for Strategic Educational Planning (CSEP) met from

February 28, 2007 to May 22, 2007. CSEP members included the Academic Senate Presidents from each college, the Vice President of Instruction for each college, and Dr. Margaret Haig, then Vice Chancellor for Educational Services. The criteria developed by CSEP were integrated with program review in the Unit Planning process, where all disciplines reviewed the criteria in conjunction with the data collected during the program review.

Student Services Planning

Student services issues were integrated into planning discussions throughout the process, especially in the development of the student cohort model. The original strategic planning steering committee had significant student services representation, as did the district wide educational master planning committee. In addition, the matriculation committee provided leadership. There is standing practice of using consistent policies and procedures for student services throughout the district.

Faculty Input at August 2007 Flex Day

At the August 2007 Flex Day, the Vice Presidents of Instruction presented the results of the CSEP process and, with College Deans, led faculty groups in discussing district-wide issues for each discipline (for example, all Math faculty met together, all librarians met together).

Unit and College Planning in Academic Year 2007/2008

In Fall 2007, each instructional discipline completed a unit plan. Based on a consistent district wide template, faculty and deans examined program review data, the CSEP criteria, and college planning material. The instructional unit plans present future program and goals and the resource and equipment needed to support student success. Each college then reviewed and aggregated the unit plans into a College Educational Master Plans, using information from a series of internal and external environmental scan assessments prepared by an external consultant.

College Educational Master Planning Committee Convention March 2008

Representatives from all four college educational master-planning committees convened at Merritt College to discuss issues and options related to collaborative planning. The session allowed participants to share ideas across the colleges and identify factors needed to support effective coordinated planning.

District Wide Plan Integration: Spring 2008

The District-Wide Educational Master Plan represents the recommendation of DWEMPC to synthesize the inputs and discussions that constituted the planning process. DWEMPC's goal was to develop a plan that responded as directly as possible to student and community needs as reflected in the planning studies and decision-making tools, for example, the environmental scans and CSEP process. Also, DWEMPC's role was to suggest an approach that would work for the colleges collectively as a whole, taking a district wide perspective.

Plan Organization

The plan is organized into six sections.

- I. Introduction
- II. District-Wide Educational Planning Context
- III. Shared Priorities and Processes
- IV. Culture of Evidence and Accountability

Strategic Plan Summary

The District Wide Strategic Plan was developed through discussions of a 40-person steering committee representing faculty, classified staff, students and administrators. This section summarizes the key concepts of the plan, which are the foundation for educational planning.

Mission/Vision

The mission/vision statement describes the shared future the District is committed to creating.

We are a collaborative community of colleges. Together, we provide educational leadership for the East Bay, delivering programs and services that sustainably enhance the region's human, economic, environmental, and social development. We empower our students to achieve their highest aspirations. We develop leaders who create opportunities and transform lives. Together with our partners, we provide our diverse students and communities with equitable access to the educational resources, experiences, and life-long opportunities to meet and exceed their goals.

Values

The Strategic Plan includes the values that represent the core commitments and beliefs that will guide our actions and our efforts to realize the vision of the *Strategic Plan*. There are three overarching values.

Students and Our Communities

The colleges and service centers are committed fundamentally to the success of students and flourishing of the surrounding communities. This includes commitment to ensuring equity of access, services and outcomes. The institution values and celebrates the strengths of our diverse students, communities, and colleagues. Values: Student Success and Equity; Diversity.

Excellence and Innovation

Peralta promotes the highest level of quality in all programs and services. The colleges and service centers support creative approaches to meet the changing demographic, economic and educational needs of our communities. We effectively manage resources. We engage in model environmental sustainability practices. Values: Excellence; Innovation; Financial Health; Environmental Sustainability.

Communication and Collaboration

The colleges and service centers use a consultative decision-making process based on trust, communication and critical thinking. We support one another's integrity, strength and ability. We promote the development of all employees. We seek first to understand, then be understood. We treat one another with care and respect. Values: Collaboration; Trust; Employee Development; Communication; and Respect.

Principles

The Strategic Plan includes a set of principles to provide guidance for planning, decision-making, and institutional processes.

- Educational Needs are Primary
- Planning Drives Resources
- Shared Governance
- Diversity and Shared Strengths
- Organizational Development
- Collaboration
- Future Orientation
- Environmental Sustainability
- The Service Center Role
- Community and Individual Empowerment

Strategic Goals

The Strategic Plan includes a set of outcome-based goals, each of which includes a set of implementation strategies.

- A Advance Student Access, Equity, and Success
Actively engage our communities to empower and challenge all current and potential students to succeed.
- B Engage Our Communities and Partners
Actively engage and partner with the community on an ongoing basis to identify and address critical needs.
- C Build Programs of Distinction
Create a cohesive program of unique, high-quality educational programs and services.
- D Create a Culture of Innovation and Collaboration
Implement best practices in communication, management, and human resource development.
- E Develop Resources to Advance and Sustain our Mission
Ensure that resources are used wisely to leverage resources for student and community success in a context of long-term environmental sustainability.

II. District Wide Educational Planning Context

The District Wide Master Plan responds to the challenges and opportunities identified in scans of the district's internal and external environments conducted in 2007.

External Scan

The study documents important shifts in demographics, economics and community needs:

- **MODERATE AREA GROWTH CONTINUES**, shifting to the northern part of district: suggesting the possibility of new district off-campus community centers in that area as well as others.
- **MORE DIVERSE POPULATIONS**, foreign immigrants are 1/2 of area growth: suggesting the need for continued, robust ESL programs, possibly with a non-credit component.
- **AN AGING POPULATION, WITH LOWER NUMBERS OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES**: suggests earlier PCCD intervention into K-12 to sustain transfer credit programs and marketing to new 55+ niches, through non-credit, community and contract education.
- **HIGHER HIGH SCHOOL DROP-OUT RATES, BUT ALSO HIGHER INTEREST AND PREPARATION OF GRADS**: suggests the need for urgent K-12 early intervention with academic and career counseling as well as instruction.
- **STUDENTS ARE CHANGING**, becoming more IT/Media conversant, but with less time for study, greater need for study and time management skills, and more diverse learning styles (as they become more culturally diverse): suggesting more work on basic skills and staff development oriented to student needs and learning styles - proactive and in "communities" or groups - with more technology and in facilities with flexible rooms and other learning areas.
- **PCCD HAS A MAJOR ROLE IN AREA DEVELOPMENT**, responding to area labor market needs, training for emerging sectors, and marketing to area niches with low college-going rates.
- **PCCD CAN TRAIN FOR MOST AREA JOBS**, including transfer programs for managers, accountants, teachers, software engineers; and workforce preparation of RNs, 1st Line Supervisors, carpenters, green technologists, logistics (supply-chain and distribution managers, truckers), teacher aids, customer service reps, home health aids, wholesalers, and other career skills high area demand.

Internal Scan

- **LACK OF CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY TOOLS**. Faculty focus groups suggests a general lack of technology tools in PCCD classrooms - too few projections systems, smartboards, and computers - all needed to support current styles of teaching. Moreover, all faculty and students should have computer access. About six of every 10 community college students enroll with computer access; the others do not and need help with it.

- **OPPORTUNITY TO DIVERSIFY DELIVERY.** PCCD delivers its instruction in four relatively small colleges and virtually all by classroom-based credit classes, little online or in the non-credit mode. PCCD's community service and contract education also are minimal, far smaller than typical community colleges in California.
- **ONGOING FUNDAMENTAL SKILLS CHALLENGES.** Fewer (than average) students from PCCD feeders reach high school graduation, but when they do they are more interested and prepared than is usual. Still, four of every five who are assessed on entry lack college-level skills. Moreover, today's students even while more literate in IT skills, seem to have fewer study skills and less time for study. Despite this, PCCD college students' success in basic skills courses is at the average of community colleges, and higher than average in effectively moving on to higher-skilled classes. The instructional challenge at PCCD colleges is made all the more difficult by the high proportion of students who come with post-collegiate skills – one in every five has a baccalaureate, producing a wide range of learning capabilities – and the many learning styles that result from a culturally-diverse enrollment.
- **POSITIVE TRANSFER:** The PCCD colleges' performance in transferring students is average or above (compared to other colleges) as measured by the expected rates – half of PCCD students who intend to transfer, prepare and do so within six years of starting. More PCCD transfers stay in California than is typical, and not surprisingly, many more go to U.C. Berkeley.
- **CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION:** Overall, PCCD colleges' workforce preparation programs tend to be undersized relative to the area's job training needs, especially for teachers (and aids), RNs, engineers, carpenters, green and bio technologists, customer service reps, 1st line supervisors, logistics workers, machinists, home health aids and the like. PCCD's role in workforce preparation should be (1) as a "major strategic player" in the area's economic development, (2) to respond to area labor market needs, largely replacements for vacancies in existing jobs, and (3) as the enrollment manager and marketer of programs to potential student niches.
- PCCD's fiscal health arguably is better than it has been for decades what with an adequate reserve, recent passage of two capital bond measures, and the OPEB bond solution to the district's unfunded retiree health benefits.
- **HEAVY RELIANCE ON STATE FUNDING.** That said, the need to fund its priorities becomes problematic with the emerging State budget situation and PCCD's heavy reliance on State revenue. The deficit, fiscal emergency and proposed suspension of Proposition 98 argue for greater PCCD "extramural" funding – contract, community education, partnerships, and other cost-recovery pricing of instruction.
- **MIXED SPENDING PATTERNS.** Peralta spends less per student than would be expected with its small colleges and their diseconomies of scale – less for instruction because of relatively high faculty productivity, heavy use of tenured overloads and part-time faculty, lower faculty salary payments, and specialization – at just one college – of potentially high cost programs. Student support services and administrative costs per student at PCCD are about average, while (from another perspective) classified salaries, employee benefits and operating expenses and equipment are above average cost.
- **LONG RANGE BUDGET MODEL.** PCCD's expenditure patterns and future funding uncertainties suggest the need for PCCD to begin a cost and benchmarking study to examine

fixed and variable costs, implement a budget allocation model to fairly and effectively distribute appropriations across the colleges, and develop a long-range (five-year) budget simulation model.

Existing District Wide Processes and Successes

There have been many examples of district wide collaboration for the benefit of students and the community. A few examples are presented below:

- Peralta ESL Advisory Committee
- Librarians coordination meetings
- Student Services coordination meetings
- Distance Learning task force
- Alignment of curricula in some departments
- Committee for Strategic Educational Planning (CSEP)
- District Wide Educational Master Planning Committee
- Strategic Management Team
- Facilitation Corps

III. Shared Priorities and Processes

This chapter presents the long-range assumptions and district-wide priorities of the District Wide EMP. The long-range assumptions indicate the overarching approaches the colleges will implement to respond to the needs presented in the environmental scan. The priorities list the plan's specific recommendations and process proposals, organized according to specific educational issues.

This chapter is presented in two sections. The first describes long-range assumptions and the second presents the educational master planning priorities and associated strategies. The graphic on the following page shows that the assumptions and priorities support the Peralta vision.

Long-Range Assumptions: The long-range assumptions present the overall growth strategy and path of the *District Wide Educational Master Plan*. These assumptions will form the foundation for future planning for facilities, financial resources, information technology, and human resource planning. It is important to recognize that these are starting point assumptions that will not limit the flexibility of the colleges or service centers. Rather they describe the overall long-range intentions of the colleges and district service centers regarding critical educational issues, which will be refined and developed through detailed implementation efforts.

EMP Priorities: The educational master planning priorities present the detailed processes and procedures developed for improving delivery of educational programs and services, especially regarding enhanced processes for collaboration. The priorities were developed collaboratively through discussions at DWEMPC, SMT and the college educational planning committees. There are three priorities:

- Students First
- Culture of Collaboration
- Shared Governance and Decision Making

Peralta's Vision

We are a collaborative
community of colleges....

Building communities

Transforming lives

Creating leaders

Long-Range Assumptions

- Programs of Distinction
- Distance Education
- Education Centers
- Enrollment Management
- Active Learning
- Non-State Funded Education

Educational Master Plan Priorities

Students First

The Colleges will tailor instruction, student services and delivery to the needs of students.

Culture of Collaboration

Instructional and student services departments will regularly coordinate planning on a district wide basis to support student success.

Shared Governance and Decision Making

There will be an annual process to integrate educational, facilities, technology, and staffing resource planning and allocation.

LONG RANGE ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions describe the overarching educational approach and priorities of the district at for the next 15 years. The projections respond to the scan and set out an ambitious, achievable growth path. This is based on the finding that Peralta is below historic levels of access.

The enrollment projections analysis evaluated the differential participation and demographic growth rates to determine a feasible and robust scenario for the district's overall growth (see appendices). The projections assume that PCCD's market penetration (MP) is projected to increase by one-fourth, from 64 fall enrollment per 1,000 district 15+ population in 2007 to 80 per 1,000 by 2022. This significant improvement would take total district enrollment to its the highest level of market penetration since 1983, just prior to the beginning of tuition for California community college students.

LONG-RANGE FTES TARGETS				
	Annual Growth Rate	FTES		Annual Growth Rate
	1993-07	2007-08	2022-23	2007-22
Laney College	0.7%	8,647	10,600	1.2%
Merritt College	0.8%	4,404	6,600	2.4%
College of Alameda	0.0%	3,635	6,000	3.4%
Berkeley City College	7.3%	3,490	6,000	3.8%
TOTAL	1.2%	20,176	29,200	2.5%

To achieve this high level of access, the projections are based on the following assumptions, which are described in detail on pages 12 and 13:

1. Development of shared and unique programs of distinction
2. Increase in distance education delivery, both hybrid and full online
3. Development of education centers
4. Use of enrollment management to attract and support the success of additional students
5. Use of active learning to improve success and retention
6. Increase in use of non-state funded education (contract, community service, grant, etc.)

The colleges will use these assumptions to guide the expenditure of Measure A funding, especially the balance of expenditures between facilities modernization, technology and equipment. Peralta has a high need for upgraded classroom technology and equipment. Also, the plan calls for a significant increase in distance learning and smart classrooms. The development of the facilities master plans in accordance with the educational planning assumptions described in this section will ensure that spending on bricks and mortar is balanced so that the modernized facilities have the equipment and technology to support educational success.

Much of the growth in enrollments is projected to occur through off-campus instruction and distance education, as shown below.

	Percent of WSCH Off-Campus	
	2007	2022
Laney College	1%	13%
Merritt College	6%	17%
College of Alameda	1%	16%
Berkeley City College	11%	29%

Assumption 1: Programs of Distinction

The colleges and service centers will support a coordinated set of shared and unique programs of distinction. The colleges will develop new programs and maintain existing programs that respond to enduring and emerging community and workforce needs. In some fields, two or more colleges will provide coordinated programming, while in others are unique areas where only one college will focus. (See CC5 Implement a Coordinated District-Wide Program Strategy)

The colleges will share the following broad themes:

- Foundation skills
- Business and Technology Applications
- Biosciences
- Environmental Sustainability and Civic Engagement
- Global Awareness and Languages

The colleges will focus in the following areas:

- Laney: green design and construction, wellness, bio-manufacturing, performing arts, business, public service
- Merritt: health, bioscience, public safety, child development, hospitality, landscape horticulture
- Alameda: transportation and logistics, green technology, bioinformatics, biotechnology
- Berkeley: biotechnology, bioscience, multi-media arts, human services, international trade, American sign language

Assumption 2: Distance Education

Peralta will increase its use of hybrid and fully online courses. The assumptions are that the district will shift one of every 10 courses to online hybrid status by 2012, and continue that expansion such that one in every five courses are online by 2017. (See SF7: Distance Learning.)

Assumption 3: Education Centers

Development of three education centers will be explored as a strategy to increase access. The college will start with a model for the centers and phase one in as a pilot. A possible phase in schedule is to open the three centers in 2010, 2012, and 2014. The exact locations of these sites are subject to further study, but should be somewhere in the district's northern end and southern end, south of Merritt. Student out-of-class services as well as instruction would be offered at these centers; i.e., they are more substantial than "store-front" operations, may be owned by the district, and may qualify for extra State "foundation" operating support as well as for capital funding. (See SF10 Education Centers.)

Assumption 4: Comprehensive Enrollment Management

The colleges and service centers will initiate several enrollment management (EM) strategies directed largely at targeting recruitment, retention and student success for specific student cohorts. (See SF1: Implement Comprehensive Enrollment Management by Cohorts.)

- Further improving the PCCD's market penetration (MP) among younger, <25 year-olds, through concurrent high school enrollments, expanded basic skills instruction, ESL and counseling, targeting current high school students as well as those who've dropped out or who've graduated, but do not continue.
- The 55+ year-old cohort, especially in the hills area and for specific skills niches like customer service reps, teacher aids and information technology.
- More business and industry partnerships for the (re)training of 25-54 year-olds.
- Improvements in marketing, yield, enrollment, scheduling and retention.

Assumption 5: Active Learning Classrooms

Modern pedagogy and use of technology and group projects requires flexible learning spaces. This assumption indicates that some instruction delivered in active learning labs, while still using larger lecture rooms. Overall productivity targets are still attained. A long-term goal is to use active learning classrooms to support effective learning. There needs to be additional analysis to reconcile the state's inadequate space allocation with active learning. (See SF8: Facilities and Equipment for Student Success.)

Assumption 6: Non-State Funded Education

There are several types of alternative education delivery, which are important options for increasing non-state revenue and serving a broader set of needs. This assumption indicates that there will be an increased and coordinated effort to offer grant-funded, contract, community service education, as well as educational visiting international students and out-of-state students. (See SF9: Non-State Funded Education.)

PRIORITIES

There are three overarching priorities, each of which will be implemented through a series of action initiatives:

1. *Students First:* The first priority is to ensure that student needs and success are the foundation for all decision making about educational programs and services. This priority will be implemented through the following strategies.
 - SF1 Implement Comprehensive Enrollment Management by Cohorts
 - SF2 Foundation Skills
 - SF3 Equity Goals and Removing Access Barriers
 - SF4 Student Learning Outcomes
 - SF5 Student Services and Matriculation
 - SF6 Library Instructional Programs and Services
 - SF7 Distance Learning
 - SF8 Facilities and Equipment for Student Success
 - SF9 Non-State Funded Education
 - SF10 Education Centers
 - SF11 Special Programs and Grants

2. *Culture of Collaboration:* Build on current collaborative processes expand service to students and the community. This priority will be implemented through the following strategies.
 - CC1 Student Services-Instruction Collaboration
 - CC2 Institutionalize District Wide Educational Decision-Making
 - CC3 Update Budget Allocation Model
 - CC4 Implement A Coordinated District-Wide Program Strategy
 - CC5 Implement and Institutionalize CSEP Grow/Revitalize Criteria in Unit Planning/Program Review
 - CC6 Implement Annual Process of Collaborative Discipline Planning (CDP)
 - CC7 Partnering with Area Colleges and Universities
 - CC8 Schedule Coordination

3. *Shared Governance and Decision Making:* Strengthen structured processes for evaluating evidence, considering innovative options, and making effective decisions. This priority will be implemented through the following strategies.
 - SG1 Implement Annual Planning-Budgeting Integration Cycle
 - SG2 Implement Annual and Multi-Year Planning Calendar

PRIORITY I: STUDENTS FIRST

Student success is the overarching goal of the colleges. This section presents a series of strategies for ensuring that the needs of students are at the core of Peralta's planning and decision-making processes. The following principles present an overall educational framework for the strategies in the plan.

Core Educational Principles

The following educational principles are the foundation for Peralta's programs and services.

- 1 **Student empowerment:** Students are supported to become active and responsible participants in achieving academic success.
- 2 **Social engagement, peer-learning, mentoring and tutoring:** Peralta builds on best practices demonstrating the effectiveness of socially-based learning models.
- 3 **Convergence of academic and career-technical education:** Opportunities for integrating academic and career-technical fields are sought.
- 4 **Service Learning and Civic engagement:** Students are provided opportunities to apply learning actively in the community.
- 5 **Foundation skills as integrated institutional priorities:** The provision of foundation skills – also known as “basic skills” – is a central priority of Peralta's educational philosophy.
- 6 **Active learning:** Pedagogy emphasizes application of learning and active demonstration by students.
- 7 **Contextualized learning:** Peralta creates opportunities to place learning in the career and educational contexts that are most meaningful to students.
- 8 **Diverse learning styles:** Teaching and learning opportunities reflect the full range of learning modes.

SFI Implement Comprehensive Enrollment Management by Cohorts

The Vice Chancellor, Educational Services will lead the Vice Presidents and instructional and student services faculty and staff in implementing an integrated and comprehensive approach to enrollment management. The key to this strategy is to tailor an overall approach to meet the needs of distinct student cohorts.

Cohort 1: Beginning the Journey—Traditional college age and concurrently enrolled		
<i>Sub-Cohort</i>	<i>Age Range</i>	<i>Percent of Students</i>
Early Starters	12-18 years	10%
Intensives	19-24 years	31%
Cohort 2: Adjusting the Course—Re-Entry, Incumbent Workers, Life-Long Learners		
Re-Entry		
Incumbent Workers	25-54 years	51%
Life-Long Learners		
Cohort 3: Enriching Life: Incumbent Workers and Life-Long Learners		
Incumbent Workers	55+ years	8%
Life-Long Learners		

The approach will integrate marketing, student services, instruction and the college experience in a way that is tailored to the needs of the distinct cohorts. The desired result is a highly coordinated approach that results in high levels of access, retention and success. Enrollment management will integrate the following elements:

Marketing: Changes to the host of strategies for reaching PCCD's markets and the specific educational niches which it can and should serve.

Pricing: How to effectively differentiate student costs by delivery, financial aid, and other means

Enrolling: Improvements to the policies and procedures of application, admissions, counseling, registration, advising, scheduling, and the like

Instruction: What learning and delivery strategies work best? What changes are needed to embrace those strategies? Balancing face-to-face and distance learning.

Retaining: How current strategies are working. Needed changes? If so, how? Appropriate classroom, assessment, counseling and follow-up strategies.

The total experience: What kinds of (changes to) student life activities, opportunities, and “TLC” are needed to round out the “PCCD experience?”

Follow-up: Placing and following students: you’re gone, but not forgotten. The use of alumni in marketing and college development.

Cohorts: The cohorts have clearly different profiles based on their stated goals and course taking behavior. This suggests methods for more appropriately meeting their needs.


Cohort (Fall 2006 Data)	Age	Proportion of All Students	Full Time (%)	BA + (%)	Undecided	Transfer	Career	Cultural Enrichment
1 Beginning the Journey	19-24	31%	44%	6%	33%	23%	22%	
2 Adjusting the Path	25-54	51%	23%	27%	27%	18%	31%	
3 Enriching Life	55+	8%	11%	47%	36%	5%	24%	
Total / Average *		90%		20%				

The cohort-planning model recognizes that “one size does not fit all” given the colleges’ diverse students. The unique needs of each cohort will guide the planning and delivery of all aspects of planning and service delivery. The core principles guiding the implementation of the cohort approach include the following concepts:

- Each cohort is an important student population and will receive services designed to meet their needs.
- There are sub-cohorts for each cohort, especially the 25-54 age group. Specialized approaches will be developed for these groups.
- Once outreach, student success and curriculum/scheduling approaches are determined for each cohort, an integrated approach will be developed that meets as many of the needs as possible. For example cohort one will need a schedule of non-overlapping courses that would facilitate graduation within two years, while cohort 2 will benefit from evening and weekend classes (and on-site contract education). Where appropriate, strategies will be devised that meet the needs of several cohorts.

Current Student Distribution

Although cohort 2 is the largest overall, this is because it includes all students from age 25 through age 54. Disaggregating the data shows that when a consistent age increment is applied, the 19-24 year old group is by far the largest five-year age category.



The following table presents the overall strategy for meeting the needs of the cohorts. This will be reviewed and incorporated into college and district-wide planning and implementation for recruiting, student services, instruction, scheduling and delivery.

Cohort 1: Beginning the Journey		Strategic Approach
Early Starters	Strengthen K-12 partnerships to include curriculum alignment and early assessment through top-to-bottom approach.	
Intensives	Freshman experience, summer bridge, targeted foundation skills, tutoring/mentoring, campus life, scheduling to meet needs of Intensives	
Cohort 2: Adjusting the Course		
Re-Entry	Re-Entry Program: counseling; peer support/tutoring;	
Incumbent Workers	Contract Education and certificate and degree CTE offerings.	
Life-Long Learners	Continue provision of fine arts, language, physical education and other courses. Explore scheduling options	
Cohort 3: Enriching Life		
Incumbent Workers	Emeritus College offering targeted programming and support services. Address both career-technical training for those still in workforce and life-long learning interests.	
Life-Long Learners		

Success Goals

An important benefit of the cohort model is that student outcome data can be more accurately interpreted in the context of student goals and behaviors. For example, the Beginning the journey cohort is much more likely to seek transfer to a four-year institution, making the transfer goal more meaningful for the Adjusting the Course student cohort, for which taking one or two courses is more relevant.

Cohort	Persistence	Retention	Degrees
1. Beginning the Journey (19-24)			
2007 Baseline	60%	78%	90
2010 Goal	62%	80%	110
2012 Goal	65%	82%	150
2 Adjusting the Path (25-54)			
2007 Baseline	54%	74%	218
2010 Goal	56%	76%	260
2012 Goal	59%	78%	300
3 Enriching Life (55+)			
2007 Baseline	60%	83%	24
2010 Goal	62%	85%	30
2012 Goal	65%	86%	40

SF2. Foundation Skills

The Foundation Skills subcommittee of DWEMPC will lead a district wide effort to make effective foundation skills education an institutional priority. The subcommittee will build colleges' work in implementing the statewide Basic Skills Initiative, which is being led by the Statewide Academic Senate as part of the implementation of the *California Community Colleges System Strategic Plan*.

Each college completed a self-assessment in Spring 2008. Common themes and strategies from the assessments will form the foundation for the shared district wide strategy.

The District wide effort will identify methods for coordinating and leveraging resources across the four colleges to support effective basic skills. The Basic Skills Subcommittee will also help to integrate basic skills effective practices with the cohort approach described in SF1, which is intended to enhance student success by treated Peralta's student subgroups holistically based on their distinct needs.

The Foundation Skills strategy will build on *Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges*, which is the literature review and organizational assessment tool developed to assist colleges in implementing the statewide initiative.

Basic Skills as a Foundation lists four areas of best practice. A critical concept is that foundation skills – called “developmental education” in the state report – are not a compartmentalized effort off that is treated as a secondary concern, but rather central to overall student success and institutional priority setting. The following is a summary of the best practice research.

Organizational and Administrative Practice: Developmental education is a clearly stated institutional priority, and a clearly articulated developmental education mission drives the program. Developmental education is centralized or highly coordinated, and institutional policies facilitate student completion of developmental course work early in the educational sequence. There are comprehensive support services, which are highly integrated between instruction and student support services. Faculty who are knowledgeable and enthusiastic about developmental education are recruited and hired to teach in the program, and institutions manage faculty and student expectations regarding developmental education.

Program Components: A number of components are characteristic of highly effective programs. These include:

- Orientation, assessment, and placement are mandatory for all new students
- Regular program evaluations are conducted, disseminated, and used for improvement
- Counseling support provided is substantial, accessible, and integrated into academic courses/programs
- Financial aid is disseminated to support developmental students

Staff Development: Comprehensive training and development for faculty and staff who work with developmental students is essential and has been shown to improve student retention and performance. Specific training is correlated with success in tutoring, advising, and instruction.

Instructional Practice: Effective instructional practices are the key to achieving desired student outcomes. Learning theory is applied in the design and delivery of courses. Effective discipline-specific curricula and practices are used. All aspects of the student's development are supported, and Culturally Responsive Teaching is applied. A high degree of structure and a variety of instructional methods are used. Entry/exit skill levels are aligned among levels, and course content is linked to college-level performance requirements. Developmental faculty share instructional strategies, and faculty and advisors closely monitor student performance. Programs provide comprehensive support mechanisms, including trained tutors.

SF3 Equity Goals and Removing Barriers to Access

There are differential rates of access and success for some student populations. Key issues include access of historically disadvantaged groups, and sub-groups within these groups. In some cases, there are disparities of both access and success, in other cases there is parity of access but disparity of success. Key groups of concern include:

- People of all race/ethnic groups with high levels of educational need
- Latino/Hispanic access and success
- African American access and success, especially African American males
- Native American access and success
- Asian and Pacific Islander, especially some countries of origin.

Equity of access will be addressed by developing solutions to barriers related to the cost of text books, child care, transportation, financial aid and other challenges faced by students. By addressing these factors, Peralta will facilitate students' enrollment and persistence. Addressing these issues will also support student success by supporting students' basic needs.

Equity of success – persistence, retention, degrees, certificates, and transfer – are supported by the range of strategies in this section. In particular, SF 1 (the student cohort strategy), SF2 (foundation skills), SF4 (student learning outcomes), SF5 (student services/matriculation, and SF6 (library services) will support equity of success.

SF4 Student Learning Outcomes

Student learning outcomes (SLOs) state the knowledge, skills, or abilities that a student should be able to demonstrate as a result of completing a course or program. Student learning outcomes describe observable results. They must be regularly assessed to see if students actually are able to demonstrate the learning or competencies from a class.

From "Introduction to the Accreditation Standards" by ACCJC:

The primary purpose of an ACCJC-accredited institution is to foster learning in its students. An effective institution ensures that its resources and processes support student learning, continuously assesses that learning, and pursues institutional excellence and improvement. An effective institution maintains an ongoing, self-reflective dialogue about its quality and improvement.

The good news about the new standards is that they are considered "best practice" and these methods really do lead to improvement. There is a great deal of research showing the effectiveness of this approach. Instructors rarely make the time to talk about teaching and learning, and by focusing on SLOs and assessment and discussing assessment results, this dialogue is built in to the process. Many faculty report that this dialogue is one of the most valuable parts of the SLO/Assessment process.

Development of SLOs started with January 10, 2007 Professional Development activities featuring the kick off of Accelerated Program Review Training presented by the District Academic Senate and the Peralta Community College District's Department of Educational Services as part of the Strategic Planning Process.

In Fall 2006, the colleges' Vice Presidents of Instructions and the District Academic Senate chose to address accreditation with Student Learning Outcomes for one or two programs and the updating of college course outlines. In Spring 2006 the District Academic Senate with input from all four colleges signed off on a Memorandum of Understanding regarding Assessment Philosophy and related activities at College of Alameda, Laney, Merritt College and Berkeley City College. Based on the Memorandum of Understanding the "responsibility for the implementation and evaluation of student learning outcomes and the interpretation of the results shall remain the purview of individual faculty department/programs or student services units." "The assessment is not a single cycle of actions, but an ongoing process, which ideally permeates the institution. The assessment process involves both gathering information and using that information to modify and improve teaching and student learning."

January 5 and 6 2007 all four colleges sent faculty to the State Academic Senate's new Accreditation Institute: Collegial Consultation and the Successful Self Study. The Institute focused on the relationship between local governance and the creation of the successful self-study. The teams from the four colleges had shared and continue to support each other in this part of the Accreditation process.

During the State Academic Leadership Institute, faculty from Laney and College of Alameda received additional training on Accreditation, SLOs and Program Review. In July 2007 the State Academic Senate conducted the Student Learning Outcome and Assessment Institute; an intensive training providing two tracks addressing: 1) training for new SLO Coordinators and programs and 2) topics for experienced SLO coordinators with growing programs on their campuses. Berkeley City College, College of Alameda, and Merritt sent one representative, and Laney sent two. We all came away from the Institute with the plan to work even closer together to strength our individual college committees and commitment as we continue our Accreditation process.

An outgrowth of attending the Spring 2007 State Academic Senate Curriculum Institute, the attendees from the four colleges have encouraged the Vice Presidents of Instruction, to achieve a commitment from District to secure "CurricuNet- Curriculum Software, a comprehensive software program for curriculum development, curriculum tracking (across the district) and posting course outlines and syllabi on the Internet.

Instead of focusing on what instructors cover, the focus changes to whether students are actually learning. The point is to make changes and improvements that lead to deeper and more effective student learning, and to base our decisions on evidence rather than vague, general impressions.

Current Status

All four colleges have begun the process of writing Student Learning Outcomes for their courses and programs. Each college has developed its own institutional or general education outcomes. Each college has assigned a faculty member on release time to serve as the SLO/Assessment Coordinator.

Future Directions and Needs

In order to fully implement SLOs and assessment,

- SLOs must be completed for all courses, programs, and student services units.
- Each college must begin the process of assessing course, program, and general education outcomes.
- Results of the assessments must be reported and must be used for improvement.

- Gradually, all SLOs for all courses, programs, the general education program, and student services units must be systematically assessed and the results used for improvement.

Infrastructure required

Developing and assessing SLOs across a college is a new methodology for evaluating institutional effectiveness and requires high levels of training and work for implementation. The accreditation commission expects institutions to allocate appropriate resources in support of student learning outcomes and assessment.

These necessary resources include:

- A SLO coordinator at each college with release time to give training, work with departments, and keep track of what is being done.
- A Committee of faculty and others to discuss and implement SLOs and assessment.
- A Researcher and clerical support – departments and programs need assistance in developing quality assessment tools, developing effective surveys, collecting and analyzing data, storing data, and reporting results.
- Stipends or other support to faculty engaged in time-consuming work on developing assessment tools and compiling assessment information
- Visible support from all levels of the administration: the chancellor, presidents, vice presidents, and deans must continually emphasize the importance of engaging in assessment of SLOs and must keep prodding people to get the work done.
- Professional development days should be used to discuss assessment results and plan improvements. Somehow, assessment must be built in to normal routines so that it doesn't seem like something "extra" and excessively burdensome.
- Assessment results must not be used for evaluation of individual faculty and staff. There must be serious efforts to reduce anxieties and fears about how the results will be used. It is vitally important that instructors and staff not feel threatened by this process, or they will set standards that are too easily attained. If this happens, we will not get useful information that can be used for improvement. Honesty and risk-taking should be encouraged.

SF5 Student Services and Matriculation

A central charge of student services is the matriculation process. The district follows the "Model District Policy" which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1994 and is referenced in chapter seven of the Board Policy Manual and is outlined in each college catalog. The matriculation process focuses on the following components: admission, orientation, assessment, counseling and advisement, follow-up, and research. Each college is required to have a Matriculation Committee, as well as a Matriculation Plan which is regularly updated. There is a well established District-wide Matriculation Committee which meets regularly. Matriculation planning involves a variety of strategies ranging from researching, selecting, implementing, and evaluating appropriate assessment testing instruments to classroom assessment, to early alert, to determining which students need matriculation services, and the list goes on.

Recent studies have shown that statewide, in California Community College, one-third of credit students are exempt from orientation, three of every ten from assessment, and one of five from

counseling. According to the study, less than half of those directed to counseling actually receive services. It is well known that the difficulty of improving counseling derives from scarce staffing which often is the result of counseling faculty not directly garnering FTES which is the basis for state funding, as well as the 50% law and counseling being on the non-instructional side of the law. Statewide, the ratio of counselors to students is 1:1,900.

As many have noted, student services and the matriculation process relates to the area/theme of "basic or foundational skills." In the recent state study, "Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges," several of the effective practices cited in the literature review speak to student support services. These effective practices include the following:

- A comprehensive system of support services exists, and is characterized by a high degree of integration among academic and student support services (A.5);
- Orientation, assessment, and placement are mandatory for all new students (B.1);
- Counseling support provided is substantial, accessible, and integrated with academic courses/programs;
- The developmental education program addresses holistic development of all aspects of the student. Attention is paid to the social and emotional development of the students as well as to their cognitive growth; and
- Faculty and advisors closely monitor student performance.

The colleges and the district will need to speak to these best practices when addressing student services and matriculating students.

Other areas that will need attention when setting a resource planning agenda is the need for additional learning labs with tutors and study aids for English, Mathematics, and specific disciplines. With the growth in online education, attention will need to be given in how to guide these students through the matriculation process if they are never or rarely on site at one of the colleges.

This work relates closely to the theme of "basic or foundational skills" and might even be tied to that, recognizing that PCCD colleges are already working on the issue. As part of this, the notion of bona fide and common teaching/learning labs for English, Math and certain other disciplines with tutors and study aids – at each of the colleges – should be considered for funding from Measure A. (These facilities really work!)

SF6 Library Instructional Programs and Services

Library Instructional Programs and Services aim to help improve student success and retention by expanding and developing instructional opportunities and services via library instruction, intensive one-on-one instruction at the Reference/Research desk, and distance education. Library public access services serve students and add value to a successful educational experience.

The four colleges will continue to support collaboration between librarians and instructional faculty to expand the understanding of information literacy as a library program and extend it across the curriculum. The colleges also will support efforts of collaboration between librarians and faculty to develop library collections (print, online, and multimedia) with appropriate and current materials to better support the curriculum.

Librarians of the four colleges meet regularly to address areas of collaboration. One major area

for needed collaboration is in technology which includes the following: (1) planning for a selection and migration process for a new integrated library system, given the discontinuance of the Horizon system, and the need for ongoing upgrade and maintenance of the system; (2) eBook Collections owned and coordinated by all campus libraries; (3) library servers for additional library publications; (4) an improved process for funding and development of library IT as the libraries move into advanced formats (streaming information, MP3, etc.) and equipment required to view and use these formats and materials; as well as, attention to maintenance and upgrades to library IT equipment to conform to district/college standards; and (4) purchasing authentication software, such as EZ Proxy, to provide access for distance learners to use library electronic resources. Additionally district-wide librarians stress the need to make library programs and services a fundamental priority in all planning ranging from educational master planning to facilities master planning.

SF7 Distance Learning

Use of broadcast and interactive TV in California community colleges is declining while online instruction is growing rapidly – up by 371% since 2000 while traditional face-to-face (FTF) instruction has increased by just 2%. The average California community college delivers 6% of its instruction online; PCCCD delivers 26 FTES (<1%) this way and if it were to move just to the statewide average would need to enroll about 1,100 FTES online. Arguably, given their locations, PCCCD colleges should deliver more by this medium.

To reduce student transportation costs (high in the East Bay) and become more competitive (the East Bay has many PSE options, among them many virtual), PCCCD should increase its online delivery – just under two dozen online courses in its Spring 2008 catalog – preferably using the *hybrid model* where online classes include an FTF component with the requisite support for struggling students and the opportunity to chat with faculty and join a community of student colleagues exists.

The Distance Learning subcommittee will guide the implementation of a coordinated district wide learning strategy. An inter-college technology task force developed the guiding vision for this effort: “ Educational technology now plays a critical role in learning and teaching in many disciplines. It is our belief that our students now require a consistent, powerful, and transparent application of our educational technology applications across disciplines and across the various campuses.” One goal of the technology task force was to select a common online Course Management System (CMS) for the Peralta Community Colleges. The task force recommended Moodle as the common CMS. The task force also recommended implementation begin as soon as possible using the following steps:

- Determine a timetable for migration and notify instructional staff of the decision.
- Establish a Distance Education Budget for 2008-2009 to support ETUDES for the 2008-2009 academic year and sunsets ETUDES no later than June 30, 2009; build upon the 2007-2008 academic year structure for Distance Education as recommended by the campus DE Coordinators in the DE Strategic Plan; and delineate line item costs, such as technical support, server maintenance, training, administrative & faculty cost, memberships, travel, technology conference costs, etc.
- Provide training to faculty and staff for the (new) CMS migration.

- Transfer existing online courses to the new CMS by Fall 2009; and
- Identify a cycle of ongoing distance education evaluation & planning is identified. Three (3) year CMS commitment –
 - Year 1 – adoption/implementation
 - Year 2 – evaluation and recommendations
 - Year 3 – adoptions and movement to upgrade/new system.

SF8 Facilities and Equipment for Student Success

The colleges will upgrade their classroom facilities and equipment to support student success. Faculty have shifted away from simply lecturing to students seated in chairs, because this modality is not effective and students expect (well-working) media and prefer to learn proactively and interactively in a hands-on fashion, and (research shows) far more productively in groups than individually. A preliminary review of college facilities, together with discussions at faculty focus groups, suggests a general lack of technology tools in PCCD classrooms – too few stationary or mobile projections systems, smartboards, computer stations/laptops in the classroom or even tables for group work. This investment is critical to student success and will be an important aspect of the colleges' facilities and equipment planning for Measure A.

Moreover, the importance of information technology (IT) in all aspects of today's world suggests that all faculty (part-time as well as full-time) should have access to computers – a laptop or ready access to area(s) with stations. Arguably also as a matter of PCCD policy, *all* students should have access to computers. Studies show that about six of every 10 community college students already have computers, either laptops, stations at home or their convenient library or cybercafé. Students at PCCD colleges are probably similarly equipped, and, if so, provision should be made for the other four students, possibly through partnerships with hardware vendors.

SF9 Non-State Funded Education

The colleges will explore options for new fee structures, reflecting community need and cost-benefit factors related to state funding rates and faculty pay scales. This is an area for targeted development where investigation and analysis suggests that there is a need and that Peralta can meet the need cost-effectively.

Currently, the PCCD colleges rely almost entirely on regular credit instruction (generating FTES which, in turn, are supported from the State General Fund). Very little (less than 1%) of PCCD activity is generated through non-credit instruction, which also generates FTES, though at a lesser support rate. Non-credit classes, however, are a viable delivery mechanism for the many foreign immigrants and others PCCD should train in basic/fundamental skills, ESL (see above), citizenship, VESL, and other skills for job performance and for, say, seniors 55+, where credits are less important than knowledge and skills. While PCCD's non-credit instruction is far below the average statewide (8%), only San Francisco of Bay Area community colleges offers a substantial non-credit program at its Centers.

PCCD's activity in community service and contract education – both delivered at the cost of education, the former from enrolled students fees and the latter from employers or other partners – is just one-fourth that of the typical community college and far below that of colleges at both Chabot-Las Positas and San Francisco in the Bay Area. PCCD community focus group participants call for more PCCD partnerships with local area agencies, NGOs, and private firms that could involve contracts, public and private grants, and in-kind sharing of scarce resources. At present, PCCD colleges do little of this and any expansion will require “entrepreneurial” staff, possibly at the district level, to aid college faculty and staff in the time-consuming activity of identifying opportunities, making the appropriate contacts and applications, implementing the initiative(s), and generally monitoring the work.

More community service classes – less than 50 annual FTES are instructed this way now at PCCD colleges – would provide the opportunity to differentially-price PCCD students at or near the cost of education in those cases where most students enrolling can afford to and would pay the fee. This is often the case among older students and obviously among those with higher incomes.

SF10 Education Centers

Preliminary analysis of PCCD's market penetration (enrollment/population cohort or MP) shows substantial differences in both level and recent change by neighborhood and community across the service area. The formerly high MP area around Merritt College has declined rapidly. Areas like Emeryville and Berkeley West with formerly average MP rates are increasing rapidly while others like Piedmont and Kensington report low and rapidly decreasing rates. Future population growth will shift from South Oakland to North Oakland and Berkeley. With continued growth, BCC will be fully occupied within several years. And community focus groups call for PCCD to do more outreach, more “Town and Gown” activities, and with accessible job-training partnerships.

These arguments all suggest more PCCD community or neighborhood centers. Not only beyond BCC in the northern area, but in other areas as well. Other than Merritt College's Fruitvale Center, PCCD colleges have few outreach/off-campus centers or operations. Centers can focus on specific training like in Fruitvale, serve underserved niches in specific neighborhoods, and/or be located at worksites for specific job training partnerships (more on this elsewhere). Or, for those 55+, at Senior Centers. Churches and K-12 schools also can serve as accessible sites for instruction and other educational services.

SF11 Special Programs and Grants

The district will continue to develop and implement special programs and grants to meet a range of needs.

- Tech Prep
- Career Advancement Academy
- California High School Exit Exam Preparation
- International Students

PRIORITY 2: CULTURE OF COLLABORATION

The district service center will promote a facilitative model leadership that brings the colleges together around common processes and shared goals.

The premise of the culture of collaboration is that a continuation and strengthening of the college's coordinated efforts will provide important benefits to the community and students. As shown in the box at right, collaboration promotes student success, conserves resources, and supports the sharing of best practices throughout the district. The following are guiding principles for successful collaboration.

- 1 **Student and Community Benefits are the Purpose for Collaboration.** Continuing and strengthening Peralta's ability to collaborate across the colleges will enhance program innovation, idea sharing, effectiveness and efficiency.
- 2 **The Service Centers Support Structured Collaborative Processes.** The district service centers promote coordination and collaboration across the colleges. This includes facilitating inter-college dialogs and assisting the colleges in presenting a coordinated and unified approach to external partners, agencies, and funders.
- 3 **All Colleges Provide All Missions.** Each college will provide all missions: transfer, career-technical education, basic skills, degrees, certificates, and life long learning.
- 4 **Colleges Specialize in Career-Technical Areas.** Each college will continue to specialize in certain career-technical programs, especially where specialized labs or facilities are required. This will help to create recognized areas of excellence and avoid duplication and competition between the colleges. (Programs using standard classrooms equipment with high demand can more easily be offered at more than one college.)
- 5 **Colleges Coordinate in Common Programmatic Areas.** Two or more colleges will continue to share some programmatic areas. In these cases, the colleges will coordinate closely to avoid duplication and identify opportunities for the respective programs to mutually support one another. In some cases, programmatic coordination and leadership may be provided primarily by one college.
- 6 **Each Discipline Coordinates Across the District.** Each discipline will regularly coordinate across the district. The goal is to identify and implement coordinated improvements to benefit students and use resources wisely. The desired outcomes include: development of consistent student learning outcomes for courses and disciplines; development of consistent academic policies regarding prerequisites, grading, etc.; sharing of best practices, especially with regard to basic skills, retention, and student success; collectively identifying and addressing common

Benefits of Collaboration

Key points from a convening of the four college educational planning committees on March 14, 2008, at Merritt College.

- Supports accreditation recommendation
- Coordinating the schedule helps students and avoids duplication
- Share best practices
- Identical course outlines in some disciplines allows students to take sequence of courses at different colleges seamlessly
- Increases enrollment
- Being more coordinated will increase the community's pride if we're more "on the ball" – this will increase satisfaction and increase retention
- Conserves resources when we avoid duplication
- By being more efficient we can do more for students
- Standardizing information outputs
- Build positive human relationships across the colleges.

challenges and opportunities, for example changing state curricular requirements, accreditation standards, etc.; identifying opportunities for resource sharing, including faculty, equipment and facilities; and coordinating schedules to provide the maximum options for students.

- 7 Budget Allocation Supports Specialization/Coordination.** A budget model will be developed to support each college's planned program mix. The goal is to give each college predictability to develop programs in support of its areas of specialization and overall college mission and identity. The budget will support the college's long-term educational master plan growth path, as opposed being developed around historic allocation patterns.

Foundations for Collaboration

The graphic on the following page presents the collaborative model. This is the desired organizational framework for supporting the principles of specialization and collaboration above. The following foundations are needed to ensure the success of collaboration:

Culture. Values, beliefs, attitudes and practices are critical in supporting collaboration as the way Peralta operates.


Capacity. Skills, leadership, and professional development need to reinforce and enable collaboration.

Incentives. Budget allocation, recognition, rewards, and advancement processes all need to provide benefits to those who collaborate.


Structure: Organizational structure, district-wide collaborative processes and planning-budgeting integration need to be aligned to the goal of coordination.

Foundations of Collaboration

Strategic Goals



Benefits of Collaboration



CULTURE	CAPACITY	INCENTIVES	STRUCTURE
Values	Skills	Budget allocation	Organization
Beliefs	Leadership	Recognition	District-Wide Collaborative Processes
Practices	Professional Development	Rewards	Planning and Budget Integration
Attitudes	Facilitation Corps	Advancement	

Foundations for Collaboration


CC1 Student Services-Instruction Collaboration

Integrating student services and instruction is a key support for student and institutional success. Creating linkages between the classroom and support services ensures timely and appropriate referral to guidance and additional resources.

A key venue for integrated planning is DWEMPC and its related subcommittees. DWEMPC brings together the Vice Presidents of Student Services and Instruction, and the subcommittees provide an opportunity to integrate deans and faculty from instruction and services. Another area of linkage is in the student cohort model (see SF1), which is premised on a holistic approach that tailors instruction and services to meet student needs. The colleges are committed to the ongoing integration of all aspects of students' educational experiences.

CC2 Institutionalize District Wide Educational Decision-Making

The District Wide Educational Master Planning Committee (DWEMPC) will be institutionalized as a shared governance committee. Its charge is to recommend and monitor shared district-wide educational goals, processes, and planning processes. The Committee's overall mission is to encourage coordinated and consistent educational policies and processes across the four for the benefit for students and the community. These core educational processes are the "collaborative infrastructure" of transparent and structured decision-making mechanisms for building effective collaborative strategies that are shared by the four colleges.



The Committee will be chaired by the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and receive research and planning support from the Associate Vice Chancellor, Research and Planning. The Committee will have four subcommittees to provide strategic planning and coordination for specific educational topics: the Council for Instruction, Planning and Development; the Career Technical Education Subcommittee; the Distance Learning Subcommittee; and the Foundation Skills Subcommittee. There will be at least one member from each subcommittee on DWEMPC to ensure communication. Guests will be invited to the committee and subcommittee on an as-needed, issue-specific basis. Minutes will be kept. There following are the major annual milestones and deliverables from DWEMPC.

April/May	Planning Framework for Next Academic Year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Updated program review data ▪ Updated Unit Plan template ▪ Update of community, labor market, and student success trends ▪ Status/Assessment of major educational initiatives ▪ Flex Day Topics
October	Planning Priorities: Provide guidance for budgeting, faculty hiring, and facilities/equipment decision-making


Institutional Relationships: The college representatives to DWEMPC and the subcommittees will report regularly to their college decision-making councils and committees including budget, planning, and facilities. It is important for administrative committee members to communicate committee matters to the Deans/VPs meetings, Matriculation Committee, etc.

Group	Weeks of an Academic Term															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Deans/VPs Meeting	●				●				●				●			
District EMP Committee		●				●				●				●		
Subcommittees																
Distance Education			●				●				●				●	
Career-Technical				●				●				●				●
Matriculation					●				●				●			
Basic Skills																
Curriculum			●				●				●				●	
College Councils/Cmtes		●		●		●		●		●		●		●		●
Strategic Mgmt Team		●		●		●		●		●		●		●		●

CC3 Update Budget Allocation Model

Summary: The Budget Allocation committee will update budget allocation model to support the planned program mixes and growth paths presented in the long-range assumptions. The revised budget allocations will support each college's planned CTE-specialization and general education offerings. The purpose for adjusting the budget allocations is to establish stable and predictable budget allocations that will support the Colleges in developing their long-term program. This predictability is an essential foundation that will support the colleges' efforts to operate in a collaborative manner.

The recalculated college budgets will establish the basic FTES and productivity targets for each college based on the specific program mix of each college, including budgeting to support new programs under development. The result will achieve the District's financial goals for reserves and investments in new programs and sites, etc. Options are to include incentives for higher productivity levels and an "innovation fund" to support new initiatives.

Program	Productivity Standard (based on mandates, safety, hours)	FTES Targets
Discipline A		
Discipline B		
Discipline C		
Discipline D		
COLLEGE TARGET	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: 0 auto;">Productivity Target Based on Program Mix</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: 0 auto;">FTES Target</div>

To effectively advocate for needed funding changes in this uncertain environment, PCCD staff need data that *benchmark* the college against its peers and competitors among other California community colleges. These data include not only unit costs for organizational units and how those have changed over time, but also analysis of the allocation of real resources behind those cost differences (or similarities) that can inform PCCD about desired funding changes. For instance, why do PCCD colleges spend so much more per student – nearly \$1,500 – than the typical college? And, if PCCD admissions, records, counseling and guidance staffing and outlays appear relatively low – which they are: PCCD spends \$314 per FTES versus the statewide average of \$336, \$22 or 7% less – to what degree is that a problem, how has it changed over time and relative to other community colleges, and how may PCCD ensure that general student support service resources are effectively and equitably allocated as between the district office and the four colleges?

College curriculum-based academic plans are informed by program review and course-based assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs), then integrated with financial planning and synthesized by the district Strategic Management Team (SMT). The SMT, aided by topical

subcommittees, integrates college and district strategic, academic and budget planning – a process that can be aided by the budget allocation and mid-range simulation models.

A modified *budget allocation model* would cover the short-term – budget year – and be strategically connected to the mid-range simulation model, allocating resources across the colleges, sites and open campus based on functions agreed-to by the district’s budget planners.

Like many budget processes, an allocation model builds on past and current year budgets for the district’s various entities, as well as expected price and workload changes. Unlike many budget processes, the allocation model would build budget proposals on known staffing patterns (and likely retirements), explicit choices about patterns of curriculum change (growth and decline), approved new programs and strategic initiatives, and (importantly) movement toward ideal budget and resource allocation levels based on those factors that are revealed by the internal cost and benchmarking studies (see below) to drive costs differentially.

Mid-Range Simulation Modeling (MSM) of the PCCD budget over the mid-range (five-years) would project the relationships between the California economy, state aid, tuition and fees, enrollment, costs and local taxes in support of PCCD. This mid-range simulation model (MSM) would capture the interaction of these complex relationships and their “bottom-line” impact on the funding of PCCD.

The MSM would not only identify projected funding for the budget year – the basis for the inter-college allocation model above – but also for each year up to five-year forecasts so as to test the long-term feasibility of short-term changes in policies, formulas and other factors.

MSM results would show, for instance, the impact of changes in state aid formulas and student costs (resulting from fees, transportation, and the like) on the ability of PCCD to increase student access and simultaneously improve programs and services, when overall State funding is flat, enrollment demand continues to increase, and increased efforts are made to secure extramural funding (federal, private, or other non-public funding). Various financial scenarios can be specified and their consequences readily examined. For example, different sets of PCCD enrollment management strategies can be specified and enrollment and fiscal results simulated.

An *internal cost and benchmarking* study of PCCD operating outlays would help staff to prepare budget estimates of the cost of growth at the four colleges, and in any other potential delivery mechanisms. PCCD costs for departmental and supporting units need to be disaggregated into those (a) fixed and variable, (b) direct and indirect, and (c) average and marginal. This would facilitate estimates of “start-ups” versus “ongoing” programs. In addition, the actual, full costs of growth in various PCCD departments and disciplines will be better identified for resource allocation and budgeting decisions.

CC4 Implement A Coordinated District-Wide Program Strategy

The Colleges will continue to implement a coordinated offering of educational programs to achieve the following goals:

1. Anticipate and respond to the needs of the district service area for career-technical, ESL, transfer and general education.
2. Coordinate offerings across the colleges to maximize access and the range of offerings and avoid duplication.
3. Continually review and update curricular offerings.

The district's integrated educational planning process ensures a dynamic educational program that responds to student and community needs. As described in detail in strategy EP4 – EP7 below, the colleges will separately and collectively maintain a process that continually reviews and updates their offerings and pedagogy.

As shown in figure CC5 on the page 34 the colleges have devised a coordinated strategy to address major workforce, community and social trends and needs. The colleges will collaborate to address the overarching themes of Foundation Skills, Enterprise Studies, Biosciences, Social Justice/ Environmental, and Global Awareness and Languages.

These themes encompass both academic subjects and career-technical areas. For example, Social Justice/Environmental Sustainability addresses both the social, political and philosophic implications of human impact on natural systems and the workforce implications related to “green technology”. As such these themes can serve to provide frameworks for aligning and integrating career-technical programs with the arts, humanities, and sciences.

The shared district-wide program themes serve three purposes:

- Provide a common focus across the colleges on areas of community interest and need.
- Clarify the programmatic areas in which the colleges will collaboratively as opposed to one or two colleges having exclusive responsibility.
- Encourage program innovation in emerging areas where new curricula, content and pedagogy are needed.

The themes are areas for ongoing future exploration. In some of the themes, such as biosciences, society at large is still at an early stage of developing the scientific and industry models. There may not initially be high numbers of career openings, so the colleges will monitor trends and experiment with programs and partnerships. For some themes, the focus will be in sciences, arts and humanities, in others in career-technical programs.

The themes are highly interrelated. Foundation skills provide a connecting theme across the themes, while the links are clear across global awareness and social justice/environmental sustainability.

The themes will be defined through ongoing discussions by faculty, students, staff and administrators. Brief initial descriptions follow.

Foundation Skills: Skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, as well as learning skills and study skills which are necessary for students to success in college-level work. Foundation skills are critical both in basic skills classes and discipline classes.

Business and Technology Applications: Subjects encompassing business, economics, finance and the use of technology applications to advance organizational effectiveness.


Biosciences: The uses of the life and social sciences to address medical, energy, environmental and other applications.

Environmental Sustainability and Civic Engagement: The interrelated study of economic opportunity and social equity with the disciplines related to studying patterns of life that can be maintained indefinitely and that provides quality of life and preserves natural ecosystems.

Global Awareness and Languages: Programs and courses intended to expand students' awareness of the culture and contributions of other countries and to teach foreign languages.

Figure CC5: Peralta's District-Wide Program Framework

Shared District-Wide Program Themes



<p>Berkeley City</p> <p><i>Career Technical Programs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-Media ▪ American Sign Language ▪ Human Services ▪ Biotechnology
--

<p>College of Alameda</p> <p><i>Career Technical Programs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transportation/Logistics ▪ Apparel Design ▪ Dental Assisting ▪ Bioinformatics

<p>Laney College</p> <p><i>Career Technical Programs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applied Arts, Media & Design ▪ Center for Performing Arts ▪ Cosmetology ▪ Culinary ▪ Green Tech & Design & Construction ▪ Physical Fitness & Wellness ▪ Biomanufacturing
--

<p>Merritt College</p> <p><i>Career Technical Programs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AD Nursing ▪ Radiologic Technology ▪ Nutrition/Diet ▪ Respiratory Therapy ▪ Bioscience: Microscopy/Genomics ▪ Child Development ▪ COSER ▪ Landscape Horticulture ▪ Public Safety ▪ Real Estate

<p>Humanities</p> <p>Fine Arts</p> <p>Natural Sciences</p> <p>Social Sciences</p>

<p>Assessment and Placement</p> <p>Counseling and Advising</p> <p>Library and Information Services</p> <p>Tutoring / Mentoring / Learning Communities</p>

CC5 Implement and Institutionalize CSEP Grow/Revitalize Criteria in Unit Planning/Program Review

The Vice Presidents, Deans, and Vice Chancellor, Educational Services will coordinate the implementation of the criteria developed by the Committee for Strategic Educational Planning (CSEP). There are two forms of the CSEP analysis:

1. Disciplines Using General Classrooms: Productivity standard is 17.5
2. Disciplines Using Specialized Labs: Productivity standards will be established based on class-size limits from specialized accreditation standards or regulations; and safety requirements.

CC6 Implement Annual Process of Collaborative Discipline Planning (CDP)

The Vice Presidents, deans, and Vice Chancellor, Educational Services will coordinate a process of district-wide discussions within each discipline. Collaborative Discipline Planning will identify areas of common concern or opportunity for the discipline as a whole within Peralta. The process is intended to explore possible collaborative actions that would benefit the discipline and students. The end product would be a collaborative action plan describing joint initiatives and resource sharing opportunities. The table on page 36 provides an example of collaborative discipline planning.

There are two areas for discussion:

Key Issues and Opportunities

Discipline members will collectively consider key issues and opportunities related to Curriculum, Equipment and resources, Staffing, Academic standards, Basic skills / preparation, SLO's, productivity, etc. The review will also examine district wide productivity data, student success, and environmental scan data.

Options and Action Plans

The discipline will identify strategies or next steps to be pursued collectively.

Example of Collaborative Discipline Planning: Math 2007

The August 2007 flex day included district-wide discipline discussions. A brief summary of the Math faculty's discussion of issues, opportunities, and action steps is shown below.

Common Issues

- There will be a big increase in Math 203 due to grad requirement changes.
- There are program changes like new intermediate math.
- The basic skills initiative is creating a need for new courses.
- We need to clarify what we expect students to know at the end of Math 203.

Collaboration Opportunities

- Collaboration will show us what courses work so we could avoid reinventing the wheel.
- We could strategize common problems, like basic skills and the new math requirements.
- A collaborative process would encourage course innovation by making it easy to get concurrence and input from the discipline at all four colleges.

Action Steps

- Collaborate on innovations regarding basic skills Math delivery and online delivery.
- Encourage college wide consistency in grading by using a common rubric. (CCC librarians have done this systemwide—it can be done.)
- Strengthen assessment requirements so students are placed in the right courses to improve student success and feed information to program review

CC7 Partnering with Areas Colleges and Universities

“Partnering”, in the broadest sense, with four-year colleges and universities provides opportunities for clear transfer pathways for PCCD students. One “path” is the concurrent enrollment and cross registration program. This provides students the opportunity to enroll concurrently in one class per semester/ quarter at schools such as the University of California, Berkeley; California State University, East Bay; Mills College; Holy Names University; and John F. Kennedy University. A second “path” is the Transfer Admissions Guarantee (TAG) program which guarantees admission to a student who completes a TAG form and meets the contractual requirements of the program. The four Peralta colleges have such agreements with schools such as UC Davis, UC Riverside, UC Santa Barbara, UC Santa Cruz, and CSU East Bay. As agreements become available with other institutions, the colleges readily participate. An additional “pathway” is the ongoing work in course-to-course articulation providing students the opportunity to complete lower-division major preparation coursework in an effort to be more competitive when applying for a specific major at a four-year institution. Such articulation is an ongoing effort between college articulation officers and instructional faculty. Further, a decision

will need to be reached as to the use of the Lower Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP) with the CSU system and whether it provides "value" to students.

PCCD colleges' close proximity to many four-year colleges and universities in the East Bay offers the opportunity for partnerships that should ease barriers to the transfer transition for PCCD students. The character of these partnership arrangements can vary substantially. Some community colleges, like Canyons in Santa Clarita, host several four-year schools – public and private – who offer popular BA and MA degree programs on its (Canyon's) main campus. Other community colleges, like Highline in the Puget Sound of Washington state host upper division work by one school – in this case, Central Washington University, with much of the work tied to CWU's main campus, over 100 miles to the east, to other CWU centers through an effective ITV operation. BCC currently offers courses on the UCB campus and is designing in-service training for UCB staff.

Arrangements with East Bay four-year colleges and universities that encourage and ease transfer for potential PCCD students will make its colleges more competitive and further guarantee a viable transfer function in the face of the predicted decline in numbers of PCCD service area young students progressing through feeder high schools after 2008.

CC9: Schedule Coordination

Conduct a regular and early process of schedule coordination across the colleges. The goal is to make most effective use of resources, avoid duplication, and provide more schedule and access options for students.

PRIORITY 3: SHARED GOVERNANCE AND DECISIONMAKING

SGI: Implement Annual Planning-Budgeting Integration Cycle

The Strategic Management Team will oversee a structured process for linking research data, district-wide planning, college planning, and budget allocation. The planning and budgeting integration calendar was developed based on work of the District Wide Educational Planning Committee and the District Budget Advisory Committee. This integrates district wide educational and budget planning and encompasses education, facilities, staffing, IT, marketing, and is inclusive of the four colleges and the communities served by the district. (See diagram in addendix.)


RESEARCH PHASE

In May and June of each year, the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services oversees development of the *Annual Planning Budgeting Framework*, which has the following purposes: highlight emerging educational trends; assess effectiveness of prior strategic, educational and service center unit planning initiatives; document trends and issues regarding retention, persistence, basic skills improvement, degrees/certificates, transfer and productivity; review demographic and labor market trends; and preliminary budget forecast. In August, Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, Education, provide overview of major planning and budgeting issues at Fall convocation.

DISTRICT WIDE AND COLLEGE PLANNING

In September, the District Wide Education Master Plan Committee (DWEMPC) meets to review *Annual Planning Budgeting Framework* and develop planning and budgeting guidelines and methodologies. The Committee will develop agreements between the colleges in areas requiring coordination. College Councils and/or educational committees review status of prior educational master plans, program reviews, and unit plans and identify preliminary areas of focus for future planning. District service centers review status of prior institutional reviews and unit plans and identify preliminary areas of focus for future planning.

In October, College Councils (or educational committees) and District service centers review district wide planning and budget guidelines and modify/adapt to fit circumstances. College VP's and District Vice Chancellors prepare templates to update existing accelerated program review/unit planning and distribute to instructional, student service and administrative programs. Units update their accelerated program reviews/unit plans and including updates to grow/maintain/watch action plans. These include program and service initiatives, and resource



requests (faculty, staffing, professional development, equipment, facilities)

In November, College budget committees and review recommendations from the college community, including faculty and staff hires, and statutory cost increases based on Educational Master Plan priorities. DWEMPC reviews compiled college and service center requests to identify any areas of potential collaboration or overlap between colleges, or between colleges and service centers. DWEMPC recommends solutions. SMT reviews DWEMPC recommendation

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PHASE

In January, the Governor's proposed budget is published. Informational memorandums on the governor's budget proposal to all constituent groups (board of trustees, academic senate, budget advisory committee, faculty union, classified unions); SMT meet to review proposed budget. Chancellor's budget advisory committee meets to review the governor's proposed budget and begins to develop budget assumptions.

In February, the BAC reviews colleges' actual FTES, review college/district expenditures for the first half of the fiscal year. Prepare estimate of spring/intercession FTES and expenditures. Chancellor approves targeted FTES to realize growth and over cap funding. Propose board of trustees' budget workshop (February or March). Colleges' budget priorities submitted to district office. District office begins preparation of preliminary budget allocation.

In March, initial proposals submitted to chancellor for the district budget. Review status of budget development with the academic senate and faculty union. Academic senate submits recommendation on budget process.

In April, budget proposals reviewed by budget advisory committee. In May, Discuss carry-over fund priorities and colleges submission of justification; Governor presents May revise to budget (May 15); and Draft tentative budget submitted to chancellor

June: Tentative budget submitted to board of trustees at last June meeting (California Code of Regulations, section 589305[a]).

In July, several state and district milestones occur:

- Legislature approves and governor signs state budget by Jul 1.
- California Community Colleges State Chancellor's budget workshop in Sacramento.
- Informational memorandums issued on proposed budget revenues to all constituent groups (board of trustees, academic senates, faculty union, and classified unions).
- Colleges meet with academic senates, faculty union, and classified unions on budget priorities.
- Colleges' revised budget priorities submitted to chancellor.
- Approved tentative budget input into financial accounting system

In August, the preliminary adopted budget is submitted for review by the Chancellor and stakeholders:

- Preliminary adopted budget available August 15 for chancellor's review.

- Comply with Title 5, section 58301 by publishing dates, time and locations where the public can review proposed adopted budget (budget must be available at least three days prior to public hearing).
- Adopted budget available for public review at the district office, each college library, and the offices of each college president.

In September, the Board holds hearing and the final budget is submitted to the State Chancellor's Office.

- Board of trustees holds public hearing and final budget is presented for approval (on or before September 15) [California Code of Regulations, section 58305 (c)].
- Completed annual financial report and adopted budget to be submitted by September 30th to the State Chancellor's Office, with a copy filed with the County of Alameda Office of Education [California Code of Regulations, section 58035 (d)].

In following this budget development calendar, it is further proposed first to provide each college with a base budget which would include funding for fixed costs and funding determined necessary to meet FTES goals for the academic year. This funding would be available by July 1st. If the state chancellor's office in any given fiscal year makes cuts in funding or provides additional funding, this could affect the base budget. Second, beyond providing a base budget for each college, the proposal is to determine annually the availability of discretionary monies that could be divided among the colleges. The distribution of these discretionary funds would be based on priorities set in the educational master plans (i.e., faculty positions, classified positions, funds for new program start up) and determined through a review process wherein the district-wide educational master planning committee and the district budget advisory committee would make recommendations to the Strategic Management Team with a final decision by the chancellor on the allocation of the discretionary funds.

SG2: Implement Annual and Multi-Year Planning Calendar

The Associate Vice Chancellor, Research and Planning in coordination with the Vice Presidents and guidance and input from DWEMPC, will support a multi-year planning calendar. (See Section IV for details.)

Cycle	Process
Annual	Update Unit Plans
Three Years	Program Review
Five Years	Master Plan Updates
Six Years	Accreditation Self Study

IV. CULTURE OF EVIDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The colleges will use the District Wide Educational Master Plan as a living document. There will be annual reviews of the implementation milestones listed for each strategy in Section III, as well as the establishment of a regular cycle of planning.

Annual Unit Plan Updates

Each year, all instructional and student service units will update their unit plans based on an assessment of issues and completion of prior year initiatives. This will form the foundation of an integrated planning and budgeting process. Annual updates are also needed to provide continuity to multi-year improvement efforts, especially where emerging programs are being piloted or watch programs are being revitalized.

Annual EMP Milestone Progress Reviews

The Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Planning will compile information on the progress in implementing each of the strategies of the District Wide EMP. The information will be presented to SMT and DWEMPC at the start of the Fall term to inform development of annual educational planning priorities.

Three-Year Program Review Cycle

The program review process will proceed on a three-year cycle. Program reviews will use many of the same data elements and topics as unit review but also include a more comprehensive set of data items and have a longer-time horizon.

Educational Master Plan Update and Accreditation Self Study Cycle

The district wide and college master plans will be updated every five years, in the year preceding the accreditation self-study. This will allow the district as a whole to review comprehensively its programs and services. This cycle will also be efficient in that the master planning process will address many of the issues required for the accreditation self study.

Cycle	Process
Annual	Update Unit Plans Review District Wide EMP Milestones
Three Years	Program Review
Five Years	Master Plan Updates
Six Years	Accreditation Self Study

Appendices

Internal Environmental Scan

External Environmental Scan

Long Range Enrollment Projections

Committee for Strategic Educational Planning Summary Report

Accelerated Program Review Handbook

District Wide Discipline Planning Handbook

Please contact the Educational Services Department for appendices.



Peralta Community College District

UNIT PLAN UPDATE Template ~ September 2009

Each discipline will complete this form to update the unit plans developed in 2008. These will be reviewed at the college level and then forwarded to the district-wide planning and budgeting process. The information on this form is required for all resource requests – including faculty staffing requests – for the 2010-11 budget year.

I. OVERVIEW

		Date Submitted:	
Discipline		Dean:	
Department Chair			
Mission/ History <i>Brief, one paragraph</i>			

II. EVALUATION AND PLANNING

Please review the program review data and the CSEP review criteria and complete the following matrix.

Baseline Data

	Fall					CODE	Comments
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008		
Quantitative Assessments							
1. Enrollment (duplicated)							
2. Sections (master sections)							
3. FTEF							
4. FTES							
5. FTES/FTEF							

Qualitative Assessments	Narrative
6. Community and labor market relevance Present evidence of community need based on Advisory Committee input, industry need data, McIntyre Environmental Scan, McKinsey	

Economic Report, etc. This applies primarily to career-technical (i.e., vocational programs).	
Licensure & Job Placement Rates (CTE specific)	

7. Strategic Planning Goals

Check all that apply, and give a brief description of how

- Advance Student Access, Success and Equity
- Engage Our Communities and Partners
- Build Programs of Distinction
- Create a Culture of Innovation and collaboration
- Develop Resources to Advance and Sustain our Mission

. College strategic plan relevance	
<p>Check all that apply</p> <input type="checkbox"/> New program under development <input type="checkbox"/> Program that is integral to the college's overall strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Program that is essential for transfer <input type="checkbox"/> Program that serves a community niche. <input type="checkbox"/> Programs where student enrollment or success has been demonstrably affected by extraordinary external factors, such as barriers due to housing, employment, childcare etc. Other _____	

Action Plan Steps to Address CSEP Results

Please describe your plan for responding to the above data. Consider curriculum, pedagogy/instructional, scheduling, and marketing strategies. Also, please reference any cross district collaboration with the same discipline at other Peralta colleges.

8.ACTION PLAN -- Include overall plans/goals and specific action steps.

Full Time FTEF/ Total FTEF ratio this is where you put your total Full time faculty/your total faculty (Full time and part time combined for a ratio) If 3 full time FTEF and Total Full time, extra serv., and temp= 12 3/12 25% of the classes taught by full time faculty.	Full Time Faculty FTEF (A)	Extra service FTEF (B)	Temp FTEF (C)		Total FTE (A+B+C)	Ratio A/ (A+B+C) 3/12=25%
	3	2	7		12	

Narrative: *are PT faculty available? Can FT faculty be reassigned to this program? Implications if not filled*

Personnel	CD Enrl	Tot FTES	Contract FTEF	Ext Srv FTEF	Tmp FTEF	Total FTEF	Contract %	FTES/FTEF

Equipment/Material/Supply/ Classified/Student Assistant Needs:
 Please describe any needs in the above categories.

Facilities Needs (Items that should be included in our Facilities master Plan) for Measure A funding:
 Please describe any facilities needs.

Technology Needs

Additional Planned Educational Activities	
9. Health/safety/legal issues:	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) 2008/09		
10. Have you completed Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) for all your courses?	YES _____	NO _____
11. If you answered no to question 12 then, what percentage have you completed?		
12. What are you assessing this year? Please attach your assessment results and action plan. List needed resources in Section III of Unit Plan.	_____ course outcomes _____ program outcomes (please provide the program definition you used for your #s) _____ institutional learning outcomes	

III. RESOURCES

13. Budget Categories	Allocated 08/09	Expended 08/09	Requested 09/10	Comments
Fund 1				
Fund 14				
Fund 17				
Measure A				
VTEA				
Total				

14. Additional Revenue (grants, private sales, and donations etc)	Awarded/Generated 08/09	% Expended 08/09	Comments

PERSONNEL NEEDS

FACULTY DIVERSITY

Ethnicity	# of Contract	# of Adjunct	Total
Asian			
African American			
Filipino			
Hispanic/Latino			
Native American			
Other			
White			
Unknown			
Total			

Gender	# of Contract	# of Adjunct	Total
Male			
Female			
Not Supplied			
Total			

IV. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EQUITY

Table X: Student Access by Ethnicity Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Ethnicity	Discipline	College
Asian		
African American		
Filipino		
Hispanic/Latino		
Native American		

Other		
White		
Unknown		
Total		

Table X: Student Access by Gender Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Gender	Discipline	College
Male		
Female		
Not Supplied		
Total		

Analysis
1. What are you doing to increase access?

Table X: Student Retention Rate by Ethnicity Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Ethnicity	Discipline	College
Asian		
African American		
Filipino		
Hispanic/Latino		
Native American		
Other		
White		
Unknown		
Total		

Table X: Student Retention Rate by Gender Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Gender	Discipline	College
Male		
Female		
Not Supplied		
Total		

Analysis
1. If your disciplines retention rate is beneath the colleges rate, then why?
2. If your retention rate is below the college rate, then what are you doing to increase retention?
3. If your retention rate is above the college's rate do you have any best practices to share?

Table X: Student Successful Course Completion Rate (SCCR) by Ethnicity Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Ethnicity	Discipline	College
Asian		
African American		
Filipino		
Hispanic/Latino		
Native American		
Other		
White		
Unknown		
Overall Rate		

Table X: Student Successful Course Completion Rate (SCCR) by Gender Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Gender	Discipline	College
Male		
Female		
Not Supplied		
Total		

Analysis
1. If your disciplines successful course completion rate (SCCR) is beneath the colleges rate, then why?
2. If your sccr is below the college rate, then what are you doing to increase it?
3. If your sccr is above the college's rate do you have any best practices to share?

Table X: Student Program/Discipline GPA by Ethnicity Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Ethnicity	Discipline	College
Asian		
African American		
Filipino		
Hispanic/Latino		
Native American		
Other		
White		
Unknown		
Overall GPA		

Table X: Associate Degree Awarded Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Ethnicity	Discipline	College
Asian		
African American		
Filipino		
Hispanic/Latino		
Native American		
Other		
White		
Unknown		
Total		

Table X: Associate Degree Awarded By Gender Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Gender	Discipline	College
Female		
Male		
Not Supplied		
Total		

Table X: Certificates Awarded Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX		
Ethnicity	Discipline	College
Asian		
African American		
Filipino		
Hispanic/Latino		
Native American		
Other		
White		
Unknown		
Overall Total		

**Table X: Certificate Awarded
By Gender
Fall Semesters XXXX-XXXX**

Gender	Discipline	College
Female		
Male		
Not Supplied		
Total		

Analysis

1. What efforts are you taking to ensure students with an educational goal of degree or certificate attainment from your program are achieving their goal? *(If your program does not award degrees or certificates then, please skip this question).*


Peralta Community College District

UNIT PLAN TEMPLATE Student Services

2009-2010

This presents the common elements to be addressed by each discipline/department in unit planning. Depending on College preferences, these common elements may be formatted or addressed differently.

I. OVERVIEW

		Date Submitted:	
Program/ Department		Administrator:	
Department Chair/ Coordinator			
Mission/ History Service provided <i>Brief, one paragraph</i>			

II. EVALUATION AND PLANNING

Quantitative Assessments	Narrative
Include service area data such as number of students served by program. Include data and recommendations from program review.	

Qualitative Assessments	Narrative
Community and college relevance Present evidence of community need based on Advisory Committee input, McIntyre Environmental Scan, Student surveys	

Identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and limitations (from the Action Plans)

College strategic plan relevance	
----------------------------------	--

Action Plan Steps

Please describe your plan for responding to the above data.

ACTION PLAN -- Include overall plans/goals and specific action steps.

Additional Planned Educational Activities

Health/safety/legal issues:	
Student Retention and Success	
Progress on Student Learning Outcomes. (SLO % Complete)	
Other	

III. RESOURCE NEEDS

Personnel Needs

FT/PT ratio	Current	If filled	If not filled	# FTE faculty assigned)
Narrative: <i>are PT faculty or staff available? Can FT faculty or staff be reassigned to this program? Implications if not filled</i>				

Equipment/Material/Supply/ Classified/Student Assistant Needs:

Please describe any needs in the above categories.

Facilities Needs (Items that should be included in our Facilities Master Plan) for Measure A funding:

Please describe any facilities needs.

Peralta Community College District

Berkeley City College
College of Alameda
Laney College
Merritt College

Instructional Program Review Handbook

Spring 2007




Table of Contents

Purpose and Goals	1.
Components in the Process	2.
The Instructional Program Review Team	3.
Core Data Elements	4.
The Instructional Program Review Narrative Report	5.
Checklist of Tasks	8.
Definitions	9.
Appendices	10.
<i>Instructional Program Review Resource Needs Template</i>	A.
<i>Integrated Planning Template</i>	B.
<i>Student Learning Outcomes Reporting Template (Course Level Outcomes)</i>	C.
<i>Student Learning Outcomes Reporting Template (Program Level Outcomes)</i>	D.



Purpose and Goals

The information gathered during the program review process provides the basis for informed decision making in the Peralta Community College District. Instructional Program Review is a systematic process for the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data concerning a program or department and its curriculum. It provides program and/or departmental accountability by collecting, analyzing and disseminating information that will inform integrated planning, resource allocation, and decision-making processes.

The primary goals are to:

- Ensure quality and excellence of academic programs.
- Provide a standardized methodology for review of instructional areas.
- Identify effective and exemplary practices.
- Strengthen planning and decision-making based upon current data.
- Identify resource needs.
- Develop recommendations and strategies concerning future directions.
- Inform integrated planning at all levels in the College.
- Ensure that educational programs reflect student needs and encourage student success.

Components in the Process

The Instructional Program Review process consists of answering a set of questions designed to aid in the examination of a discipline, department or program. These questions are consistent with the national movement toward learning assessment and the new 2002 WASC/ACCJC Accreditation Standards. They direct faculty to examine the curricular, pedagogical, and resource areas related to student success and to analyze findings in order to develop a plan that will improve the quality of teaching and learning.

The primary components in the Program Review process include:

- The Instructional Program Review Team
- Core data elements
- Completion of a Instructional Program Review Narrative Report

Additionally four templates are provided to help link the Instructional Program Review findings to annual strategic or integrated planning at each college. They can be found in the Appendix and are:

- The *Instructional Program Review Resource Needs Reporting Template* in which to summarize key resource needs.
- The *Integrated Planning Template* in which to set goals, objectives and action plans based upon the Instructional Program Review findings.
- The *Student Learning Outcomes Reporting Template (Course Level Outcomes)* for documenting learning assessment at the course level.
- The *Student Learning Outcomes Reporting Template (Program Level Outcomes)* for documenting learning assessment at the departmental/program level.

Thus, the recommendations and priorities from the Instructional Program Review process feed directly into the development of departmental and/or unit plans.

In turn, the departmental and/or unit plans serve as the driving mechanisms in formulation of updated educational, budget, technology and facilities plans.

The Instructional Program Review Team

Each discipline, department or program at the college will assemble an Instructional Program Review Team at the College that is comprised of the following members:

- Department Chair or Program Coordinator, if applicable.
- Division Dean
- Two additional faculty members, if possible.
- All faculty members within a department are encouraged to participate in the Instructional Program Review process, although participation is not mandatory.

The Instructional Program Review Team will review the core data elements and course outlines and complete the Instructional Program Review Narrative Report.

-
- The Instructional Program Review Team Chair will share the recommendations and priorities with the other Colleges that have completed a comparable disciplinary program review. This will occur at District-wide disciplinary meetings.

-
- Once the narrative report is completed, the Vice President of Instruction will summarize the recommendations and priorities of all instructional units and submit the summary to the College President, the College's planning and/or budget committees (if applicable) and the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services.

Core Data Elements

1. The Vice Chancellor of Educational Services, with the assistance of the Associate Vice Chancellor of Institutional Research and Planning, will provide the following data to the college. The data is to be disaggregated.
 - Degrees and certificates for each program or department awarded by major, ethnicity, and sex for the last three years.
 - Transfer rates by discipline, if applicable, for the last three years.
 - Enrollment data for each department (unduplicated) for the last three years, including the current semester, by age, gender, ethnicity and special populations.
 - Enrollment data for courses by time of day for the last three years.
 - Retention rates by course and department for the last three years.
 - Persistence rates by course and department/program for the last three years.
 - FTES per FTEF by course and department/program for the last three years.
 - Grades by course and discipline for the last three years.
2. The Office of Instruction at the college will provide the following data to each department or program.
 - A list of active courses in the department or program.
 - Copies of course outlines and syllabi.

The Instructional Program Review Narrative Report

1. College:

Discipline, Department or Program:

Date:

Members of the Instructional Program Review Team:

2. Narrative Description of the Discipline, Department or Program:

Please provide a general statement of primary goals and objectives of the discipline, department or program. Include any unique characteristics, degrees and certificates the program or department currently offers, concerns or trends affecting the discipline, department or program, and any significant changes or needs anticipated in the next three years.

3. Curriculum:

- Is the curriculum current and effective? Have course outlines been updated within the last three years? If not, what plans are in place to remedy this?
 - Has your department conducted a curriculum review of course outlines? If not, what are the plans to remedy this?
 - What are the department's plans for curriculum improvement (i.e., courses to be developed, updated, enhanced, or deactivated)? Have prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories been validated? Is the date of validation on the course outline?
 - What steps has the department taken to incorporate student learning outcomes in the curriculum? Are outcomes set for each course? If not, which courses do not have outcomes?
 - Describe the efforts to develop outcomes at the program level. In which ways do these outcomes align with the institutional outcomes?
 - Recommendations and priorities.
-

4. Instruction:

- Describe effective and innovative strategies used by faculty to involve students in the learning process. How has new technology been used by the department to improve student learning?
 - How does the department maintain the integrity and consistency of academic standards within the discipline?
 - Discuss the enrollment trends of your department. What is the student demand for specific courses? How do you know? What do you think are the salient trends affecting enrollments?
 - Are courses scheduled in a manner that meets student needs and demand? How do you know?
 - Recommendations and priorities.
-

5. Student Success:

- Describe student retention and program completion (degrees, certificates, persistence rates) trends in the department. What initiatives can the department take to improve retention and completion rates?
 - What are the key needs of students that affect their learning? What services are needed for these students to improve their learning? Describe the department's efforts to access these services. What are your department's instructional support needs?
 - Describe the department's effort to assess student learning at the course level. Describe the efforts to assess student learning at the program level. In which ways has the department used student learning assessment results for improvement?
 - Recommendations and priorities.
-

6. Human and Physical Resources (including equipment and facilities)

- Describe your current level of staff, including full-time and part-time faculty, classified staff, and other categories of employment.
 - Describe your current utilization of facilities and equipment.
 - Are the human and physical resources, including equipment and location, adequate for all the courses offered by your department (or program)? What are your key staffing and facilities needs for the next three years? Why?
 - Recommendations and priorities.
-

7. Community Outreach and Articulation

For vocational programs:

- Describe the department's connection with industry. Is there an Advisory Board or Advisory Committee for the program? If so, how often does it meet? Is the program adequately preparing students for careers in the field? How do you know?
- Have students completing the program attained a foundation of technical and career skills? How do you know? What are the completion rates in your program?
- What are the employment placement rates? Include a description of job titles and salaries. What is the relationship between completion rates and employment rates?
- What industry trends are most critical for the future viability of the program? How do you know? What are the implications of these trends for curriculum development and improvement?

For transfer programs:

- Describe the department's efforts in meeting with and collaborating with local 4-year institutions. Is the program adequately preparing students for upper division course work? How do you know?

For all instructional programs:

- Describe the department's effort to ensure that the curriculum responds to the needs of the constituencies that it serves.
- Recommendations and priorities.

Checklist of Tasks

1. The Office of Instruction at each College will establish the schedule for completion of the Instructional Program Review at the beginning of the academic year or the semester in which the Instructional Program Review will occur. The schedule will include a timeline and deadlines for completion.
2. The Division Dean, in conjunction with the Department Chair (or lead faculty in the discipline) will assemble the Instructional Program Review Team.
3. The Instructional Program Review Team will review and analyze the Core Data Elements.
4. The Instructional Program Review Team will assemble and review the course outlines.
5. The Instructional Program Review Team will complete the Instructional Program Review Narrative Report.
6. The Instructional Program Review Chair will submit the narrative report, electronically, to the Division Dean. The Dean will review the report and forward it the Vice President of Instruction at the College.
7. The Instructional Program Review Chair will share the recommendations and priorities with the other Colleges that have completed a comparable disciplinary program review at District-wide disciplinary meetings.
8. The Instructional Program Review Team will develop an action plan based upon the recommendations and priorities from the Instructional Program Review that feeds directly into the College's integrated planning process.
9. The Vice President of Instruction will compile a summary of recommendations and priorities from all the Instructional Program Review Narrative Reports and submit the summary to the College President, the College's planning and/or budget committees (if applicable), and the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services.

Definitions

Department/Program: For the purpose of the Instructional Program Review, a department/program is defined as a course or series of courses which share a common Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) number at the four digit level of specificity. TOP is a classification system for academic programs in the California Community Colleges.

FTEF (Full Time Equivalent Faculty): Also known as load equivalency. A full-time instructor teaching 15 lecture hours per week = 1.0 FTEF. One lecture hour = 50 minute instructional period. One lab hour = .8 of one lecture hour equivalent.

FTES (Full Time Equivalent Student): This unit is used as the basis for computation of state support for California Community Colleges. One student attending 15 hours a week for 35 weeks (one academic year) generates 1 FTES.

To approximate the FTES generated by a 17.5 week semester class use the formula:

$$\text{WSCH (Weekly Student Contact Hours from the census)} / 525 \times 17.5 = \text{FTES}$$

The WSCH of “contact hour” is the basic unit of attendance for computing FTES. It is a period of not less than .50 minutes of scheduled instruction.

For example, a class of 40 students meeting 3 hours per week generates 120 WSCH. To figure the FTES for the class, the formula yields:


$$120 / 525 \times 17.5 = 4.0 \text{ FTES}$$

FTES/FTEF: The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent instructors.

Persistence: The percent of students who attend one semester and then attend the subsequent semester (fall and spring semesters).

Retention: After the first census, the percent of students earning any grade but a “W” in a course or series of courses. To figure retention for a class, subtract the “W”s from the total enrollment and divide the number by the total enrollment.

Student Learning Outcomes: The desired knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitude that a student attains as a result of engagement in a particular set of collegiate/academic experiences.



Appendices



Instructional Program Review Resource Needs Reporting Template

Division:		Department/Program:			Contact:	
Item Identified in Program Review (justification)	Human Resources (Staffing)	Physical Resources (Facilities)	Technology and/or Equipment	Supplies Budget	Curriculum	

Integrated Planning Template

Division:	Department/Program:	Contact:
Strategic Direction _____		
Institutional Goal _____		
Objective:		
Activities/Tasks	Responsibility Lead person(s)	Resources
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
	Timeline	Comments
		College Planning Link(s) *

*College Planning Links:
 Budget Committee
 Facilities Committee
 Technology Committee
 Curriculum Committee
 Learning Assessment (SLO) Committee

Student Learning Outcomes Reporting Template (Course Level Outcomes)

Division:		Department/Program:				Course:		Contact:
		Student Learning Outcome	Outcome Measure	Definition of Data (Sample/Population)	Method of Data Collection & Source	Expected Level of Performance	Actual Level of Performance	Plan of Action

Student Learning Outcomes Reporting Template (Program Level Outcomes)

Division:		Department/Program:			Contact:		
Student Learning Outcome	Outcome Measure	Definition of Data (Sample/Population)	Method of Data Collection & Source	Expected Level of Performance	Actual Level of Performance	Plan of Action	



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD


Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

June 30, 2009

Mr. Elihu Harris
Chancellor
Peralta Community College District
333 East Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94606



Dear Chancellor Harris:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 9-11, 2009, reviewed the institutional Self Study Reports for Berkeley City College, the College of Alameda, Laney College, and Merritt College as well as the visiting team reports for each college. The Commission acted on each college; and you will receive copies of those Commission action letters.

The Commission requested that I convey to you concerns regarding the district recommendations included in each action letter and numbered appropriately to correspond to the individual college's team report. These are noted below:

Recommendation: (College of Alameda only, #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, IV.B.3.6).

Recommendation: Management Systems (Berkeley City, Laney and Merritt Colleges)

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.c, III.C.1.d, and IV.B.3.b).

Recommendation: Financial Resources and Technology (Berkeley City, College of Alameda, Laney and Merritt Colleges)

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 III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, and III.D.2.a).

Mr. Elihu Harris
Peralta Community College District
June 30, 2009
Page Two

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 college 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).

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).

The Commission accredits colleges, thus, the action letters direct the colleges to resolve these issues to meet the standards. However, in cases where the district or system operations and leadership play an important role in assuring institutions come into compliance with accreditation standards, it is the Commission's practice to identify the relevant issues in writing for the district Chancellor. Standard IV.B.1-3 lists those sub sections specific to the district's and board's responsibilities with respect to financial management. Internal controls and sound fiscal management are joint responsibilities at the campus and district levels (Standard IV.B.2.d; IV.3.c,d). In addition, the Commissioners expressed concern regarding recent audit findings including the financial aid audit at Berkeley City College.

The action letters detail follow-up responsibilities for each college; each must report on the status of the district recommendations regarding the management information system and financial resources and technology and resolution on the recommendation on board and district administration by **March 15, 2010**. Resolution of the management information system and financial resources and technology recommendations is required by **March 15, 2011**.

The recommendations contained in the Evaluation Team Reports represent the observations of the evaluation teams at the time of the visit. The Commission reminds you that while you may concur or disagree with any part of the teams' reports, the colleges are expected to use the reports to improve the educational programs and services of each institution.

Mr. Elihu Harris
Peralta Community College District
June 30, 2009
Page Three

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational quality and students' success. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring institutional integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/tl

cc: Dr. Betty Inclan, President, Berkeley City College
Dr. George Herring, President, College of Alameda
Dr. Frank Chong, President, Laney College
Dr. Robert Adams, President, Merritt College



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD


Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

June 30, 2009

Dr. Betty Inclan
President
Berkeley City College
2050 Center Street
Berkeley, CA 94704



Dear President Inclan:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 9-11, 2009, reviewed the institutional Self Study Report and the report of the evaluation team which visited Berkeley City College Monday, March 9-Thursday, March 12, 2009. The Commission took action to reaffirm accreditation with a requirement that the College complete two Follow-Up Reports. The first report is due by **March 15, 2010** and will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives. The second report is due by **March 15, 2011** and will also be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

The Commission asks that the first Follow-Up Report be submitted by **March 15, 2010**. The Follow-Up Report should demonstrate the institution's resolution of Recommendation 7 and the status toward resolution of Recommendations 5 and 6 as noted below:

Recommendation 7 Board and District Administration

The team recommends that the district assess the overall effectiveness of its service to the college 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)

Recommendation 5 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.c, III.C.1.d, and IV.B.3.b)

Recommendation 6 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 III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, and III.D.2.a)

Dr. Betty Inclan
Berkeley City College
June 30, 2009
Page Two

The Commission asks that the second Follow-Up Report be submitted by **March 15, 2011**. That report will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives. The report should demonstrate resolution of the following recommendations:

Recommendation 3

Although significant progress has been made since 2003 in its library's quality and services, the team recommends that in order to improve and broaden upon the progress to date, the college develop an adequate, equitable, and sustainable library allocation for staffing and library resources. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d, and II.C.2)

Recommendation 5 *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.c, III.C.1.d, and IV.B.3.b)

Recommendation 6 *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 III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, and III.D.2.a)

I wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions out of compliance with standards or on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation. Berkeley City College must correct the deficiencies noted by June 2011 or the Commission will be compelled to act.

All colleges are required to file a **Midterm Report** in the third year after each comprehensive evaluation. Berkeley City College should submit the Midterm Report by **March 15, 2012**. The Midterm Report describes resolution of any team recommendations made for improvement, includes a summary of progress on College-identified plans for improvement as expressed in the Self Study Report, and forecasts where the College expects to be by the time of the next comprehensive evaluation.

Dr. Betty Inclan
Berkeley City College
June 30, 2009
Page Three

The recommendations contained in the Evaluation Team Report represent the observations of the evaluation team at the time of the visit. The Commission reminds you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the report, the College is expected to use the Evaluation Team Report to improve the educational programs and services of the institution.

The College conducted a comprehensive self study as part of its evaluation. The Commission requires that the plans for improvement of the institution included in its self study efforts be used to support the continuing improvement of Berkeley City College. The next comprehensive evaluation of the College will occur during Spring 2015.

A final copy of the Evaluation Team Report is attached. Please disregard any earlier versions you may have. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the Evaluation Team Report and this letter dissemination to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your institutional Self Study Report. This group should include campus leadership and the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that the Evaluation Team Report and the Self Study Report be made available to students and the public. Placing copies in the College library can accomplish this. Should you want an electronic copy of the report, please contact Commission staff.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational quality and students' success. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring institutional integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/tl

cc: ✓ Mr. Elihu Harris, Chancellor, Peralta Community College District
Ms. Dona Boatright, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Board President, Peralta Community College District
Mr. Don Warkentin, Team Chair
Evaluation Team Members



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO


Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

June 30, 2009



Dr. George Herring
President
College of Alameda
555 Ralph Appezato Memorial Parkway
Alameda, CA 94501

Dear President Herring:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 9-11, 2009, reviewed the institutional Self Study Report and the report of the evaluation team which visited College of Alameda Monday, March 9-Thursday, March 12, 2009. The Commission acted to issue a **Warning** and to ask that College of Alameda correct the deficiencies noted. The College is required to complete two Follow-Up Reports. The first report is due by **March 15, 2010** and will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives. The second report is due by **March 15, 2011** and will also be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

A Warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course of action which deviates from the Commission's eligibility criteria, standards of accreditation, or policy to an extent that raises a concern regarding the ability of the institution to meet accreditation standards. The accredited status of the institution continues during the warning period. However, the institution's accreditation will not be reaffirmed until the conditions which warranted the warning are resolved. The Warning is issued for the institution's failure to comply with recommendations from the previous evaluation team as reflected in 2009 Recommendations 1 and 4 below.

The Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2010 should demonstrate the institution's resolution of the recommendations noted below:

Recommendation 1:

In order to meet standards and building 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).

Dr. George Herring
College of Alameda
June 30 2009
Page Two

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).

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).

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).

This Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2010 should also address the status of the recommendations noted below:

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.3.6).

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).

Dr. George Herring
College of Alameda
June 30 2009
Page Three

The second Follow-Up Report, which will also be followed by a visit of Commission representatives, is due by **March 15, 2011** on the resolution of the following recommendations:

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.3.6).

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).

I wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions out of compliance with standards or on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation. College of Alameda must correct the deficiencies noted by June 2011 or the Commission will be compelled to act.

All colleges are required to file a **Midterm Report** in the third year after each comprehensive evaluation. College of Alameda should submit the Midterm Report by **March 15, 2012**. The Midterm Report describes resolution of any team recommendations made for improvement, includes a summary of progress on college-identified plans for improvement as expressed in the Self Study Report, and forecasts where the College expects to be by the time of the next comprehensive evaluation.

The recommendations contained in the Evaluation Team Report represent the observations of the evaluation team at the time of the visit. The Commission reminds you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the report, the College is expected to use the Evaluation Team Report to improve the educational programs and services of the institution.


The College conducted a comprehensive self study as part of its evaluation. The Commission requires that the plans for improvement of the institution included in its self study efforts be used to support the continuing improvement of College of Alameda. The next comprehensive evaluation of the College will occur during **Spring 2015**.

Dr. George Herring
College of Alameda
June 30 2009
Page Four

A **final copy** of the Evaluation Team Report is attached. Please disregard any earlier versions you may have. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the Evaluation Team Report and this letter dissemination to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your institutional Self Study Report. This group should include campus leadership and the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that the Evaluation Team Report and the Self Study Report be made available to students and the public. Placing copies in the College library can accomplish this. Should you want an electronic copy of the report, please contact Commission staff.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational quality and students' success. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring institutional integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/tl

cc: ✓ Mr. Elihu Harris, Chancellor, Peralta Community College District
Dr. Jannett Jackson, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Board President, Peralta Community College District
Dr. Terrence J. Burgess, Team Chair
Evaluation Team Members.



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

June 30, 2009

Dr. Frank Chong
President
Laney College
900 Fallon Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear President Chong:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 9 – 11, 2009, reviewed the institutional Self Study Report, the report of the evaluation team which visited Laney College Monday, March 9 – Thursday, March 12, 2009, and information presented by college and district representatives. The Commission took action to reaffirm accreditation, with a requirement that the College complete two Follow-Up Reports. The first report is due by **March 15, 2010** and will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives. The second report is due by **March 15, 2011** and will also be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

The Commission asks that the first Follow-Up Report be submitted by **March 15, 2010**. That report should focus on the institution's resolution of Recommendation 6 below and status toward resolution of Recommendations 3 and 5 as noted below:

Recommendation 6. Board and District Administration

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

Recommendation 3. Management Systems

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

RECEIVED

JUL 01 2009

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
Perata Community College District

Dr. Frank Chong
Laney College
June 30, 2009
Page Two

Recommendation 5. *Financial Accountability and Controls*

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 (III.D.1.a-b, III.D.2.a).

This first report should also address the Commission's concern regarding the College's mission statement which should be revised to include the intended population and the college's commitment to student learning as expressed in Standards I.A, I.A.1 and I.A.4. In addition, the report should address the Commission's concern that the college accelerates the assessment and analysis of the data from Student Services as expressed in Standards II.B.1 and II.B.4.

The second Follow-Up Report is due by March 15, 2011 and will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives. That report should demonstrate resolution of the recommendations noted below:

Recommendation 3. *Management Systems*

The team recommends that the district immediately resolve the functional issues associated with the implementation of the districtwide adopted software management information systems for student, human resources, and financial aid administration (II.B.1, III.C.1.a, IV.B.3.b).

Recommendation 5. *Financial Accountability and Controls*

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 (III.D.1.a-b, III.D.2.a).

I wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions out of compliance with standards or on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation. Laney College must correct the deficiencies noted by June 2011 or the Commission will be compelled to act.

Dr. Frank Chong
Laney College
June 30, 2009
Page Three

All colleges are required to file a **Midterm Report** in the third year after each comprehensive evaluation. Laney College should submit the Midterm Report by **March 15, 2012**. The Midterm Report describes resolution of any team recommendations made for improvement, includes a summary of progress on College-identified plans for improvement as expressed in the Self Study Report, and forecasts where the College expects to be by the time of the next comprehensive evaluation.

The recommendations contained in the Evaluation Team Report represent the observations of the evaluation team at the time of the visit. The Commission reminds you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the report, the College is expected to use the Evaluation Team Report to improve the educational programs and services of the institution.

The College conducted a comprehensive self study as part of its evaluation. The Commission requires that the plans for improvement of the institution included in its self study efforts be used to support the continuing improvement of Laney College. The next comprehensive evaluation of the College will occur during **Spring 2015**.

A **final copy** of the Evaluation Team Report is attached. Please disregard any earlier versions you may have. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the Evaluation Team Report and this letter dissemination to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your institutional Self Study Report. This group should include campus leadership and the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that the Evaluation Team Report and the Self Study Report be made available to students and the public. Placing copies in the College library can accomplish this. Should you want an electronic copy of the report, please contact Commission staff.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational quality and students' success. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring institutional integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/1

cc: ✓ Mr. Elihu Harris, Chancellor, Peralta Community College District
Dr. Elnora Webb, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Board President, Peralta Community College District
Ms. Sandra V. Serrano, Team Chair
Evaluation Team Members



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

June 30, 2009

Corrected Letter

Dr. Robert Adams
President
Merritt College
12500 Campus Drive
Oakland, CA 94619

Dear President Adams:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 9-11, 2009, reviewed the institutional Self Study Report and the report of the evaluation team which visited Merritt College Monday, March 9-Thursday, March 12, 2009. The Commission acted to issue a **Warning** and to ask that Merritt College correct the deficiencies noted. The College is required to complete two Follow-Up Reports. The first report is due by **March 15, 2010**. That report will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives. The second report, due by **March 15, 2011** will also be followed by a visit.

A Warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course of action which deviates from the Commission's eligibility criteria, standards of accreditation, or policies to an extent that raises a concern regarding the ability of the institution to meet accreditation standards. The accredited status of the institution continues during the warning period. However, the institution's accreditation will not be reaffirmed until the conditions which warranted the warning are resolved. The Warning is based on Recommendations 2 and 4 as described below. Please note that Recommendation 4 was originally noted by the 2003 evaluation team.

The Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2010 should demonstrate the institution's resolution of Recommendations 2, 4, and 8 and provide the Commission with the status toward resolution of Recommendations 6 and 7 as noted below.

Recommendation 2: Program Review

The team recommends that the college further refine its program review, planning, and resource allocation processes so that they are more clearly based on an analysis of quality, effectiveness, and student learning. Furthermore, the college must develop a systematic means to evaluate those processes and assess whether its plans actually lead to improvements in programs and services (I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7).

Dr. Robert Adams
Merritt College
June 30, 2009
Page Two

Recommendation 4: *Performance Evaluations*

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the college develop a plan to complete all outstanding performance evaluations expeditiously. This was also a recommendation of the 2003 visiting team (III.A.1b).

Recommendation 8: *Board and District Administration*

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

Recommendation 6: *Management Systems*

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

Recommendation 7: *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 (III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.2.a).

The Follow-Up Report of March 2011 should demonstrate resolution of the recommendations as noted below:

Recommendation 6: *Management Systems*

The team recommends that the district immediately resolve the functional issues associated with the implementation of the districtwide-adopted software management systems for student, human resources, and financial aid administration (II.B.1, III.C.1a, IV.B.3b).

Dr. Robert Adams
Merritt College
June 30, 2009
Page Three

Recommendation 7: 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 (III.C.1, III.D.1a, III.D.2).

I wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions out of compliance with standards or on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation. Merritt College must correct the deficiencies noted by June 2011 or the Commission will be compelled to act.

All colleges are required to file a **Midterm Report** in the third year after each comprehensive evaluation. Merritt College should submit the Midterm Report by **March 15, 2012**. The Midterm Report describes resolution of any team recommendations made for improvement, includes a summary of progress on College-identified plans for improvement as expressed in the Self Study Report, and forecasts where the College expects to be by the time of the next comprehensive evaluation.

The recommendations contained in the Evaluation Team Report represent the observations of the evaluation team at the time of the visit. The Commission reminds you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the report, the College is expected to use the Evaluation Team Report to improve the educational programs and services of the institution.

The College conducted a comprehensive self study as part of its evaluation. The Commission requires that the plans for improvement of the institution included in its self study efforts be used to support the continuing improvement of Merritt College. The next comprehensive evaluation of the College will occur during **Spring 2015**.

A **final copy** of the Evaluation Team Report is attached. Please disregard any earlier versions you may have. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the Evaluation Team Report and this letter dissemination to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your institutional Self Study Report. This group should include campus leadership and the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that the Evaluation Team Report and the Self Study Report be made available to students and the public. Placing copies in the College library can accomplish this. Should you want an electronic copy of the report, please contact Commission staff.

Dr. Robert Adams
Merritt College
June 30, 2009
Page Four

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational quality and students' success. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring institutional integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/1

cc: Mr. Elihu Harris, Chancellor, Peralta Community College District
Dr. Linda Berry-Camara, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Board President, Peralta Community College District
Mr. Michael Claire, Team Chair
Evaluation Team Members





SurveyMonkey.com
because knowledge is everything

Logged in as "Thuy Nguyen" [Log Off](#)

[Home](#) | [Create Survey](#) | [My Surveys](#) | [Address Book](#) | [My Account](#) | [Need Help?](#)

You have a basic account.

To remove the limits of a basic account and get unlimited questions, [upgrade now!](#)

survey title: **Planning and Budgeting Integration Model Assessment** [Edit Title](#) | [design survey](#) | [collect responses](#) | [analyze results](#)

- [Edit Survey](#)
- [Survey Options](#)
- [Print Survey](#)
- [Restore Questions](#)



Edit Survey

[Preview Survey](#)

To change the look of your survey, select a theme below.

[Spring Day](#) | [New Theme](#)

[Add Page Before](#)

Page #1 [Edit Page](#) [Copy](#)

1. Default Section

[Add Question Here](#)

[Edit Question](#) | [Move](#) | [Copy](#) | [Delete](#)

1. Please evaluate the District Education Committee (a Subject-Matter Committee).

	Stongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. Agendas are published in advance.	<input type="radio"/>				
B. Committee met regularly as scheduled.	<input type="radio"/>				
C. Committee provided feedback to the colleges.	<input type="radio"/>				
D. Committee ensured consistency between college requests and existing approved plans (i.e. District-wide Strategic plan, District-wide Educational Master Plan, District-wide Facilities Master Plan, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>				
E. Committee identified opportunities for college-to-college collaboration where resource sharing could be useful.	<input type="radio"/>				
F. Committee has met the milestones it set at the beginning of the year.	<input type="radio"/>				
G. There is a report of "lessons learned"	<input type="radio"/>				

accomplishments.
 H. There is a report of priority topics to be addressed in the future.

Other (please specify)

[Add Question Here](#) [Split Page Here](#)

[Edit Question](#) [Move](#) [Copy](#) [Delete](#)

2. Please evaluate the District Technology Committee (a Subject-Matter Committee).

	Stongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. Agendas are published in advance.	<input type="radio"/>				
B. Committee met regularly as scheduled.	<input type="radio"/>				
C. Committee provided feedback to the colleges.	<input type="radio"/>				
D. Committee ensured consistency between college requests and existing approved plans (i.e. District-wide Strategic plan, District-wide Educational Master Plan, District-wide Facilities Master Plan, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>				
E. Committee identified opportunities for college-to-college collaboration where resource sharing could be useful.	<input type="radio"/>				
F. Committee has met the milestones it set at the beginning of the year.	<input type="radio"/>				
G. There is a report of "lessons learned" and accomplishments.	<input type="radio"/>				
H. There is a report of priority topics to be addressed in the future.	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (please specify)					

Other (please specify)

3. Please evaluate the District Facilities Committee (a Subject-Matter Committee).

	Stongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. Agendas are published in advance.	<input type="radio"/>				
B. Committee met regularly as scheduled.	<input type="radio"/>				
C. Committee provided feedback to the colleges.	<input type="radio"/>				
D. Committee ensured consistency between college requests and existing approved plans (i.e. District-wide Strategic plan, District-wide Educational Master Plan, District-wide Facilities Master Plan, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>				
E. Committee identified opportunities for college-to-college collaboration where resource sharing could be useful.	<input type="radio"/>				
F. Committee has met the milestones it set at the beginning of the year.	<input type="radio"/>				
G. There is a report of "lessons learned" and accomplishments.	<input type="radio"/>				
H. There is a report of priority topics to be addressed in the future.	<input type="radio"/>				

Other (please specify)

Add Question Here Split Page Here

Edit Question	Move	Copy	Delete
---------------	------	------	--------

4. Please evaluate the Planning and Budgeting Council

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. All decisions are documented and communicated.	<input type="radio"/>				
B. Council met regularly as scheduled.	<input type="radio"/>				
C. There were recommendations for resource allocation.	<input type="radio"/>				
D. Council operated with a district-wide perspective (versus, a college-specific perspective).	<input type="radio"/>				
E. Council provided feedback to the colleges.	<input type="radio"/>				
F. There is a report on "lessons learned" and accomplishments.	<input type="radio"/>				
G. There is a report of priority topics to be addressed in the future.	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>				

Add Question Here Split Page Here

Edit Question	Move	Copy	Delete
---------------	------	------	--------

5. Please evaluate the overall Planning and Budgeting Integration Model

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. The process was streamlined.	<input type="radio"/>				
B. There was effective shared governance participation.	<input type="radio"/>				
C. The process was data-driven.	<input type="radio"/>				
D. The shared governance recommendations were being informed by college planning.	<input type="radio"/>				
E. There was a clear	<input type="radio"/>				

	<input type="radio"/>				
communication between committees.					
F. The process was transparent and logical.	<input type="radio"/>				
G. Minutes were documented and published widely, using all available means.	<input type="radio"/>				
H. The process led to decision-making.	<input type="radio"/>				
I. The process promoted meaningful dialogue.	<input type="radio"/>				
J. There were coordination and collaboration.	<input type="radio"/>				
K. The process led to leveraging of resources.	<input type="radio"/>				
L. The process integrated planning and budgeting.	<input type="radio"/>				
M. There are accountability mechanisms in place.	<input type="radio"/>				
N. All decisions were documented and communicated.	<input type="radio"/>				
O. The process provided feedback to colleges.	<input type="radio"/>				
P. There was a report on "lessons learned" and accomplishments.	<input type="radio"/>				
Q. There was a report of priority topics to be addressed in the future.	<input type="radio"/>				

Other (please specify)

[Add Question Here](#) [Split Page Here](#)

[Edit Question](#) [Move](#) [Copy](#) [Delete](#)

6. General Question. What are we doing well, and therefore, we should keep doing?

Add Question Here Split Page Here
Edit Question Move Copy Delete
7. General Question. What are we not doing well, and therefore, we should stop doing?
<input type="text"/>
Add Question Here Split Page Here
Edit Question Move Copy Delete
8. General Question. What should we start doing to make us more effective?
<input type="text"/>
Add Question Here
Add Page After

[Anti-Spam Policy](#) [Terms of Use](#) [Privacy Statement](#) [Opt Out/Opt In](#) [Contact Us](#) [We're Hiring!](#)

Copyright ©1999-2009 SurveyMonkey.com. All Rights Reserved. No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of SurveyMonkey.com. 37

2009-10 ESTIMATES PER CAMPUS

Source: PeopleSoft ENR Data (July 5, 2009)

	Alameda	Laney	Merritt	Berkeley	TOTAL
Summer 08	442	890	494	468	2,294
Fall 08	1,644	3,597	2,001	1,661	8,903
Spring 09	1,611	3,902	1,874	1,712	9,099
Subtotal	3,697	8,389	4,369	3,841	20,296

PA 320 Report as of July 15, 2009

20,300

Includes Alameda's intersession that must be counted in 08-09

(97 FTES)

If FTES of 19,200 Updated August 6, 2009

	Alameda	Laney	Merritt	Berkeley	TOTAL
Summer 09	528	1,000	470	500	2,498
Fall 09	1,701	3,600	1,801	1,701	8,803
Spring 10	1,375	3,525	1,535	1,535	7,970
Subtotal	3,604	8,125	3,806	3,736	19,271

Peralta Community College District
Glossary of Terms
10/10/08

FTES

Full-Time Equivalent Student.
District receives about \$4,600 for each FTES.

WSCH

Weekly Student Contact Hour
30 WSCH = 1 FTES, an annualized term (2 semesters of 15 WSCH each.)
The District receives about \$153.35 for each WSCH
1 WSCH is 17.5 "seat hours"
District receives about \$8.76 for each hour
525 hours = 1 FTES (30 X 17.5 weeks)

TO CALCULATE FTES FROM WSCH, DIVIDE THE TOTAL WSCH BY 30. TO CALCULATE THE APPORTIONMENT ON THAT FTES, MULTIPLY THAT FTES NUMBER BY \$4,600.

FTEF

Full Time Equivalent Faculty, a load of 100% taught by one instructor (full-time) or several instructors (part-time). Part-time faculty may not exceed 67% in Jan 09.

Productivity

The efficiency with which we use our resources.
It is figured by dividing the semester WSCH by the semester FTEF. Because FTEF is also an annualized term, productivity can also be figured by dividing the WSCH by 2 times the Load Factor. District target for a productivity of 525 which is the same as 17.5 FTES/FTEF for 07-08. $17.5 \times 30 = 525$. Each decrease of 10 WSCH/FTEF in district wide productivity equates to about \$500,000 in additional costs. So if as a district we decrease from 17.5 FTES/FTEF to 16.5 FTES/FTEF that is the same as 30 point drop or \$1,500,000 in additional costs.

Examples of Different FTES/FTEF Targets

District Wide

*17.5 FTES/FTEF Budgeted
17 FTES/ FTEF \$750,000 additional costs (More
1351 \$ needs to be spent)
16.5 FTES/FTEF as a district \$1,500,000 in additional costs.
16 FTES/FTEF \$2,250,000 additional costs*

Per Campus as of Fall 2007

*If: COA is 18 % of district enrollment
BCC is 18%
Laney is 43 % and
Merritt is 21 %*

*Then For each 1 point decrease of FTEF/FTES the additional
cost or savings per college is: the percentage of \$1,500,00*

*COA: \$270,000
BCC: \$270,000
Laney: \$645,000
Merritt: \$315,000*

Effect of Accounting Rules on Student Contact Hours

Attendance-Accounting Student Contact Hours per Class Meeting

Strikeout indicates nonproductive pattern

Sample Start-Stop Times (including breaks)	Meeting Length (including breaks)	Attendance-Accounting Student Contact Hours	Required Minutes of Break
8-8:50 a.m.	50 minutes	1.0	0
8-8:55 a.m.	55 minutes	1.0	5 minutes
8-9:00 a.m.	60 minutes	1.0	10 minutes
8-9:05 a.m.	65 minutes	1.3	0
8-9:10 a.m.	70 minutes	1.4	0
8-9:15 a.m.	75 minutes	1.5	0
8-9:20 a.m.	80 minutes	1.6	0
8-9:25 a.m.	85 minutes	1.7	0
8-9:30 a.m.	90 minutes	1.8	0
8-9:35 a.m.	95 minutes	1.9	0
8-9:40 a.m.	100 minutes	1.9	5 minutes
8-9:45 a.m.	105 minutes	1.9	10 minutes
8-9:50 a.m.	110 minutes	2.0	10 minutes
8-9:55 a.m.	115 minutes	2.0	15 minutes
8-10:00 a.m.	120 minutes	2.0	20 minutes
8-10:05 a.m.	125 minutes	2.3	10 minutes
8-10:10 a.m.	130 minutes	2.4	10 minutes
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.
8-10:15 a.m.	135 minutes	2.5	10 minutes
8-10:35 a.m.	155 minutes	2.9	10 minutes
8-10:40 a.m.	160 minutes	2.9	15 minutes
8-10:45 a.m.	165 minutes	2.9	20 minutes
8-10:50 a.m.	170 minutes	3.0	20 minutes
8-10:55 a.m.	175 minutes	3.0	25 minutes
8-11:00 a.m.	180 minutes	3.0	30 minutes
8-11:05 a.m.	185 minutes	3.3	20 minutes
8-11:10 a.m.	190 minutes	3.4	20 minutes
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.

