EVALUATION REPORT

LANEY COLLEGE

Oakland, California

A Confidential Report Prepared for

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team's visit to
Laney College, March 9-12, 2015

Sonya Christian, Chair

ACCREDITATION EVALUATON TEAM

Chair
Dr. Sonya Christian
President
Bakersfield College

Assistant
Ms. Kate Pluta
Professor, English
Bakersfield College

ACADEMIC REPRESENTATIVES

Faculty
Dr. Allison Moore
Associate Professor, Accounting
Los Angeles Southwest College

Faculty
Dr. Trina Nahm-Mijo
Professor, Psychology
Hawaii Community College

Faculty
Dr. Kevin Bontenbal
Instructional Technology Librarian
Cuesta College

Ms. Meridith Randall
Vice President of Instruction
Shasta College

Mr. Kevin Fleming
Dean of Instruction, Career &
Technical Education
Norco College

Mr. Mark Williams
Vice President of Instruction
Taft College

Dr. Sherrie Guerrero
Associate Superintendent-Instruction
and Student Services
Chaffey College

ADMINISTRATIVE REPRESENTATIVES

Dr. Michael Collins
Vice President, Administrative Services
Santa Ana College

Dr. John Weispfenning
President
Santiago Canyon College

OTHER REPRESENTATIVES

Research
Ms. Crystal Kollross
Director Institutional Effectiveness
Pasadena City College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

Laney College is a comprehensive community college located in downtown Oakland, California. It is the largest of the four Peralta Community College District campuses, and one of the earliest community colleges, celebrating its 61st year of service in 2014.

The College serves a diverse community which is reflected in the student population: Asian and Asian Americans make up 30 percent of the student population, African Americans represent 26 percent, Whites make up 16 percent, and Latinos represent 13 percent. Approximately 20,000 students attend annually, drawn from the nearby cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, and Piedmont, and also from the Greater Bay Area.

	Laney Service Area*	% of Total	Laney Student Headcount (Fall 2013)	% of Total	Alameda County	% of Total	San Francisco County	% of Total
Total Population	618,736		12,775		1,515,136		807,755	
Race/Ethnicity								
Asian**	120,877	19.5	3,519	27.5	397,475	26.2	268,548	33.2
African American	122,561	19.8	3,340	26.1	181,711	12.0	46,293	5.7
Latino	124,484	20.1	1,702	13.3	339,441	22.4	121,628	15.1
Native American	1,649	0.3	29	0.2	4,318	0.3	2,044	0.3
Pacific Islander	3,335	0.5	70	0.5	12,442	0.8	3,422	0.4
White	218,041	35.2	1,999	15.6	516,580	34.1	337,443	41.8
Multiple	24,956	4.0	1,368	10.7	57,750	3.8	25,199	3.1
Other	2833	0.5	748	5.9	5,419	0.4	3,178	0.4
Gender								
Men	299,271	48.0	6,449	50.0	742,993	49.0	409,803	51.0
Women	319,465	52.0	5,565	44.0	772,143	51.0	397,952	49.0

Source: Institutional Self-Evaluation (Page 4)

Built in 1969, Laney's main complex of 517,475 square feet is an arrangement of 19 contiguous two-story reinforced concrete buildings with brick façade, holding 265 classrooms and dominated by the nine-story Tower Administration building, which houses administrative and faculty offices. The upper level of the campus is organized in quads around small, planted courtyards. Many of the CTE classrooms, labs, shops, and offices are located on the ground level; the upper level houses most of the general education, liberal arts, and science facilities. Within the past decade, the College has added a new 19,000 square-foot, one-story building which houses art and ceramics classes; and an 18,000 square-foot, two-story Athletic Field House.

Laney College's educational programs are consistent with its mission and are based on recognized fields of study. In 2014, Laney offered 93 different programs and more than 800 courses, 269 through distance education using Moodle as a learning management system. Its course mix includes transfer general education, career and technical classes, and foundational skills. The College served 9,434 students through distance education over two years (2012-

2014). The most recent annual report notes that courses overall had a 66.5% success rate. The number of degrees and certificates awarded has increased 33% over the last six years, with the largest increase shown by male students. In addition, the number of degrees awarded to Latino students has doubled in that same time period. Course success and completion rates have held steady for several years at about 65% and 80% respectively.

The Visiting Team conducted a comprehensive accreditation evaluation site visit from March 9-12, 2015, reviewing evidence that Laney College meets Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). During the site visit the Team reviewed evidence, past evaluation reports, and additional evidence gained in campus interviews. The Team met with faculty, staff, and students in open forum events; attended selected classes; and interacted informally with campus community members.

In preparation for the site visit, the Team reviewed the evidence presented in the College's Institutional Self Evaluation (ISE) report. The Team found the ISE report at times non-responsive to compliance with the Standards and was at times aspirational in nature rather than providing evidence to establish current practice relative to the Standards. Evidence was organized by standards.

The Team reviewed the College's accreditation history (from 2009 to the present), paying particular attention to the history and status of recent recommendations and concerns of the Commission, most notably:
- 2009 accreditation reaffirmed with conditions
- 2010 placed on probation
- 2011 placed on warning
- 2013 removed from warning

During the site visit, the Team was warmly received and well-supported. The College staff provided the Team with everything needed from technology to supplies and made sure that there was a constant stream of snacks and beverages to fuel the work at hand. The organization and attention to detail provided in support for the Team was very professional and greatly appreciated. The meals provided by the culinary department were abundant, exceptional, and delicious.
The administrators, faculty, staff, and students of Laney College engaged in interview conversations with openness and candor, individually and in groups. These interviews were helpful in completing a picture of the quality work being done at the College. It was everywhere evident that the community and staff are passionate about learning and passionate about student success.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are advanced with the purpose of assisting Laney College in meeting the Standards and strengthening its operations and outcomes.

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

Recommendation 2: Program Learning Outcomes and Assessment
In order to meet the Standard, the College must:
- Identify and publish program learning outcomes
- Ensure official SLOs align with SLOs on course syllabi
- Regularly assess course and program student learning outcomes; publish results of program level assessment.
- Use assessment results to take actions that may result in improvement and evaluate results of these actions.
  (II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; IIA.2.i; ER 10)

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

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

Fiscal Management

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

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

Global Planning

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

Institutional Effectiveness

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

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

Governance

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

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

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

COMMENDATIONS

Commendation 1: The Team commends Laney for its signature Career Technical Education (CTE) programs that are well regarded by business and industry. CTE faculty across department and divisions are well informed of local, regional, and statewide issues impacting CTE students and keep their programs current. The Team applauds the CTE Advisory Committee and its diligent focus on interdisciplinary collaboration across CTE disciplines (e.g. technical math and technical English 1A classes).

Commendation 2: The Team commends Laney College for its efforts to serve the adult basic education community after the closure of other adult schools with programs such as the Foundational Skills Pathway and innovative ESL curricula and recognizes the Foundational Skills Committee for its work in meeting the needs of several student populations.

Commendation 3: The Team commends the College for its "esprit de corps" and dedication to students. The College leadership and community are commended for their resilience and commitment to students in the face of a myriad of challenges. The Laney College community's passion to maximize the human capacity in the lives of its students and its dedication to the College mission are evident and exemplary.

Commendation 4: The Team commends the College for creating a supportive "Laney family" environment and engaging their students in "learning by action" projects such as the interdisciplinary Community Garden project; the Dance Study Abroad summer exchange; and the Ethnic Studies program; all of which contribute to understanding issues of social justice and cultural diversity   The student population is diverse, and the College ensures that programs, practices, and services support their needs and develops them personally and professionally.

Commendation 5: The Team commends the College, President, Administrative Team, faculty, and staff for their commitment to advancing civic engagement through service, bringing student work and learning to the community, and bringing the community to student work and learning on campus. Through this work the College creates true learning opportunities for students.

Commendation 6: The Team commends the College for its ability to attract a diverse workforce such that in nearly every category, the College mirrors the ethnic profile of the local service area.

District Commendation 1: The District's Institutional Research Department is commended for its work in creating a robust data system for a complex multi-college district. By continuously refining its data model, by developing and supporting a multitude of standard reports and dashboard/data mining reporting strategies, and by providing the needed user training, the department makes available a critical toolset that should be used as the foundation of evidence-based practice.

District Commendation 2: The team commends the District and the individual colleges for their efforts to ensure that hiring practices cultivate a workforce that is as diverse as the student population. The District and the colleges within it have successfully maintained college personnel that mirror the student demographics, which enrich the college environment and promote equity.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Authority

The Team verified that Laney College is one of four colleges in the Peralta Community College District. The Board of Trustees of the Peralta Community College District derives its powers from the Constitution and the Acts of the Legislature of the State of California and the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Laney College's authority to operate as a degree-granting institution derives from its continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. Mission

The Team verified that the Laney College Mission Statement is appropriate for a degree-granting institution of higher learning and defines the institutional commitment to achieving student learning. The Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees adopted the Mission Statement on January 12, 2010. The College publishes its Mission Statement on the College website, in a variety of college publications including the Catalog, and publically posts the Mission Statement in multiple locations on campus.

3. Governing Board

The Team verified that the Peralta Community College District consists of four colleges led by a governing board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution's mission is being carried out. This board is responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities. The governing board consists of seven elected members and two non-voting student members. The governing board is an independent policy-making body with policies on conflict of interest and ethical practices.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The Team verified that the Board of Trustees appointed the CEO in January 2010. She holds the appropriate experience and authority to administer board policies.

5. Administrative Capacity

The Team verified that Laney College has an adequately prepared and experienced administrative staff sufficient in number to support the College's mission and purpose. During the time of budget decline, there was staff reduction at the college; however, in the last several years the College has been filling additional faculty and staff positions.

6. Operational Status

The Team verified that Laney College is operational and has been in continuous operation since 1953. Students are matriculating through programs and completing degrees and certificates.

7. Degrees

The Team verified that Laney College offers Associate of Arts/Science degrees in 42 majors and certificates of proficiency/achievement in 40 areas of study.

8. Educational Programs

The Team verified that Laney College's educational programs are consistent with its mission, are based on recognized fields of study, are of sufficient content and length (in terms of units and hours), and maintain appropriate levels of quality and rigor for the degrees and programs offered (evidence includes recent leveling of courses and reduction on course sequence patterns, e.g. ESL).

9. Academic Credit

The Team verified that Laney's courses and programs are awarded using the Carnegie unit and acceptable units/hours as outlined in the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Program and Course Approval Handbook.

10. Student Learning and Achievement

The Team could not verify that all programs define and publish expected learning and achievement outcomes. Program learning outcomes are required for approval of all new programs, but some existing programs may lack learning outcomes. Programs which have defined learning outcomes are asked to provide assessment results in annual program updates.

11. General Education

The Team verified that Laney College has a General Education requirement consisting of a minimum of 19 credits. One class is required from each of the following areas: Natural Science, Social and Behavioral Science, Humanities, and Ethnic Studies. In Language and Rationality, students must select one course from each sub-area: English, Mathematics, Oral or Written Communication or Literature, and Computer Literacy.

12. Academic Freedom

The Team verified that Board Policy 4030 addresses academic freedom; it is available on the website and published in the catalog. The Team confirmed through interviews with instructional administrators and faculty that the concept of academic freedom is understood and respected at the institution.

13. Faculty

The Team verified that Laney College employs 125 full-time faculty, 18 of whom are counselors or librarians. Faculty duties include development and review of curriculum, and faculty provide a self-evaluation of their assessment of learning.

14. Student Services

The Team verified that Laney College provides an impressive array of student services that meets both the general and specific needs of all students. In addition to the usual services (e.g., admissions and records, financial aid, counseling, and disabled student programs and services), Laney provides an extensive set of learning communities to support students.

15. Admissions and Records

The Team verified that Laney College adheres to admissions policies consistent with its mission and is compliant with state regulations governing California community colleges. Admissions requirements and policies are prominently displayed in printed documents (e.g., catalog, schedule of classes) and on the College website.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The Team verified that Laney College provides students and staff with access to adequate information and learning resources and services to support its mission and all educational programs.

17. Financial Resources

The Team verified that Laney College has an annual funding base allocated through a district resource allocation model that meets the funding requirements for the College. The financial resource planning and development is adequate to support the College's student learning programs and services, institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

18. Financial Accountability

The Team verified that Laney College and the Peralta Community College District undergo regularly scheduled external audits performed by a qualified Certified Public Accountant. The audits are conducted in accordance with standards contained in Governmental Auditing Standards by the Comptroller General of the United States and are available for public scrutiny. The College submitted for review a copy of the budget, the financial audits, and the corresponding management letters.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The Team verified that Laney College uses data on student achievement and student learning in its planning, evaluation, and resource allocation processes. The College has articulated the links between evaluation, planning, and resource allocation but was unable to provide evidence of a systematic evaluation of its processes. The College makes publicly available information on student achievement, student learning, and processes for improving institutional effectiveness. The College sets goals that are linked to District wide goals.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public

The Team verified that Laney College provides an electronic catalog which contains general information, requirements, and major policies affecting students.

21. Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The Team verified that Laney College adheres to the Eligibility Requirements except for ER10, Accreditation Standards, and policies of ACCJC. Laney College has been required to submit successive follow-up and annual reports to the Commission and has continued to do so effectively and in a timely manner, responding to concerns raised by the Commission. There appears to have been extensive preparations made for the current accreditation cycle providing evidence of the College's responsiveness to the Commission.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement
The College has institutional set standards for student achievement at the program and institution level which includes course completion and are in alignment with the College's stated mission. Through its evaluative processes the College examines its standards of performance and where necessary makes programmatic or institutional changes to address performance expectations. Results of the evaluative process are disseminated across the campus through newsletters, campus wide retreats, and their participatory governance structure of committees.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition
The Team confirmed through an examination of the catalog and interviews with instructional personnel that degree program length is within range of good practice and that the assignment of credit hours is reviewed by the Curriculum Committee for consistency and accuracy. Tuition is consistent across programs and clock hour conversion to credit hours adheres to the Department of Education's conversion formula. Overall, the institution demonstrates compliance with Commission policy.

Transfer Policies
Transfer of credit policies appear in the 2013-15 catalog in both print and electronic versions. The College conforms to the minimum semester program length of 60 credit hours to earn an associate degree. The three hours of student learning per week ratio for each unit of credit is cited in the Peralta Community College District Administrative Procedure 4020.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education
In reviewing Laney College's mission and its curriculum and program review processes, the Team found that courses and programs are completely in line with the mission, including those offered as online distance education. All distance education courses are clearly identified as being offered by Laney College which also controls the creation, scheduling, and outcomes assessment of those courses and programs. The College's Distance Education Coordinator provides oversight of their Learning Management System (Moodle). As elaborated in the following evaluation of the Standards, Laney College has established student learning outcomes for its distance education courses and provides the resources and structure needed although the outcome statements are not publicly accessible. Student training/tutorials on using Moodle and being successful in an online environment are lacking. In addition the College does not provide equivalent quality of student services such as tutoring or counseling to online students. The Team verified that Laney College issues every student a unique identifying number which is required for log in to Moodle every time the student participates in an online class. In addition to some proctored exams and sufficient interaction between students and their instructor, the unique login authentication process is the mechanism by which the College assures that each student who registered for an online class is the student who is participating in the course and receiving credit. Laney College's self-evaluation report claims they do not offer any program in which 50 percent or more of the courses are offered via distance education; however, the Team found contrary evidence. Evidence shows that Laney College offers multiple certificate and degree

programs where 50 percent or more of the courses can be offered online. The College must submit a substantive change proposal to ACCJC.

Student Complaints
The College has established published processes for managing student complaints and follows them. A review of student complaint files revealed no recurring patterns of complaints. The College is following its process for student complaints.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials
The institution provides accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information to students about its programs, locations, and policies. The institution complies with all aspects of the commissions policies and provides the required information about its accredited status.

Title IV Institutional Compliance
All of the Financial Aid findings have been resolved and are in full compliance with Title IV regulations. The District has automated the Enterprise Resources Planning (ERP) PeopleSoft system to implement procedures to ensure full federal compliance with Enrollment reporting in a timely manner. In addition, Laney College continues to demonstrate diligence in keeping loan default rates at an acceptable low level rate.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES
TO PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Recommendation (Commission Concern) 1. Student Learning.
The team recommends that the college continue its work, with a specific focus on assessment and the use of results from assessment in order to achieve the proficiency level of implementation by the Commission's 2012 deadline. (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.f, II.A.3, II.B.1)

The Commission did not require follow up reporting related to this recommendation. This implies that the recommendation was previously cleared by the Commission. However, the 2015 Evaluation Team identified more recent concerns related to this recommendation.

Recommendation (Commission Concern) 2. Library Funding.
The team recommends that to improve the level of services the college identify a long-term funding source for library technology and periodical and college collection upgrades to ensure the ongoing quality of its library resources and services. (II.C.1, II.C.2)

Laney College has addressed this recommendation and resolved the deficiency. Various funds have been leveraged to supplement the library's budget in order to support its library resources and services to ensure they are of high quality and sufficient in quantity, currency, and depth. The College is committed to continue stabilizing funds in the future for Library and Learning Support Services to guarantee resources and services facilitate the College's educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery. (II.C.1, II.C.2)

Standard III – Resources

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

The recommendation from 2010 stemmed from the hiring of an Inspector General who reported directly to the Board. As noted in the self-evaluation and verified by the Team, the Inspector General position has been eliminated. In addition, all board policies and administrative procedures have been reviewed and revised and are posted on the District's website. The recommendation has been addressed and the deficiencies resolved.

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

Through interviews with college staff, the evaluation Team found evidence that showed the functional issues associated with the implementation of the District wide adopted software

management information system have been partially remediated, while some issues still exist. The District did, however, upgrade from the 9.0 version. Through interviews, the Team noted that the PeopleSoft Resolution Team has not been meeting regularly in order to remedy some of the outstanding functional issues. The Financial Aid component has been upgraded, and the Human Resources component has not been fully implemented. The recommendation has been addressed. However, the 2015 Evaluation Team identified more recent concerns related to this recommendation.

Recommendation 4. **Technology Resources (College).** *The team recommends that the college ensure that adequate information technology support is provided for software, hardware, and networking in order to improve institutional operations; and that additional training is provided to staff for the effective use of technology in order to improve effective application. (III.C.1.a-b)*

Laney College and the Peralta district offices collaborate on technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware and software in a manner that aims to support learning programs and services. Evidence exists that training for staff has been adequately provided. This recommendation has been addressed. However, the 2015 Evaluation Team identified more recent concerns related to this recommendation.

Recommendation 5. Financial Accountability and Controls (District). *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).*

In 2011, the District created administrative accountability and support via the hiring of permanent personnel including the Director of Enterprise Services. Also, the District upgraded the PeopleSoft (Oracle) Enterprise PROMT computer information management system (IMS) including the modules for student, financial aid, human resources and finance, which has allowed for a more integrated approach. Further, the District created and addressed a series of financial control matters that were illuminated in its Corrective Action Matrix; reflecting progress being made to address each of the audit findings including the financial accounting system procedures, information systems, Bursar's office and Trust fund activity reporting changes, accounts payable/purchasing functions, use of Associated Study Body fund to account for general fund revenues. Together, this progress, along with the other accomplishments, helped to ensure that the College and District could manage its resources effectively, for it ensured that the College had the wherewithal to carry out its essential administrative, instructional, and student support services while also assuring a significant increase in the level of financial integrity and accountability. Expected corrective action and system testing has been completed. During this period, the governing board was provided regular updates of process and, ultimately, achievements. Still, the governing board continues to receive updates on a regular basis via the District Office of Information Technology. (March, 2015)

2011 Recommendation 2. Monitor Corrective Action Matrix & Address OPEB Bond. *The team recommends that the district continue to monitor its progress toward meeting the issues listed in the corrective action matrix. In particular, the district needs a plan to address the OPEB bond and to be evaluated on keeping to its 2010-11budget. (III.D.1,2,3)*

Two previous district recommendations required that the Peralta Community College District address OPEB obligations and the liabilities associated with the District OPEB bonds. Further, in 2013 the Peralta Community College District was required to file a special financial report that provided the District's plan for funding its OPEB obligations.

The special financial report which was filed with ACCJC on April 1, 2013 provided details from the OPEB Substantive Plan (December 2012; updated September 2014). The OPEB Substantive Plan fully addresses the issues that were cited by ACCJC. The District has a Retirement Board which meets regularly to provide oversight of OPEB bonds and planning and to review investment portfolio updates.

Beginning in fiscal year 2011, the District made substantial changes on how it valued and funded its OPEB liabilities and debt. In order to manage and reduce liabilities, the District successfully negotiated with collective bargaining units to place maximums or caps on district paid health benefit plans, implemented a OPEB charge that brought new revenue into the OPEB trust, changed the investment policy statement such that it matches the targeted rate of return with the OPEB liability, and restructured the program oversight to one that provides more transparency and accountability. As a direct result of these changes the actuarial value of the OPEB liabilities had decreased $39 million by April 2013, trust assets had increased by $50 million and related debt service had been held to approximately 5% of the unrestricted general fund. The current actuarial determined liability is $174,703,920 compared to trust assets of $218,549,849 million.

With this being said, an audit finding was delivered in the District's 2014 external financial audit that found a material weakness (audit finding 2014-001) related to the lack of an established vehicle (irrevocable trust) from which payments can be made to offset the District's future OPEB obligations. The external financial auditors recommended "long-term planning for the continued financial stability of the District should continue to include attention to obligations that will be due in the future, such as the OPEB and the annual line of credit repayments."

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

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

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

The Colleges have the ability to access and run all of their financial information, as all of the College business managers have the capacity to run their financial statements at any time during the fiscal year. The College business managers have access to the general ledger to allow for inquiry and report processing as needed. The vice chancellor of finance and administration, the College business managers, and the associate vice chancellor of information technology meet on the first Thursday of every month for ongoing assessment of the PeopleSoft financial management functions providing for an ongoing discussion of how to improve the system and continue the dialog regarding effective electronic budget management. These monthly meetings will be important as the District moves to upgrade the financial management modules to PeopleSoft version 9.0 during the 2014-2015 academic year. It should be noted that this upgrade is a priority in the District information technology strategy plan.
This recommendation was addressed and deficiencies resolved as of the last ACCJC site visit. (March, 2015)

Standard IV.B – Board and Administrative Organization

2009 District Recommendation 1 (Team Recommendation 6)
The team recommends that the district assess the overall effectiveness of its service to the college(s) and provide clear delineation of functional responsibilities and develop clear processes for decision making. (IV.B.1, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

This recommendation was previously cleared by the Commission. However, the 2015 Evaluation Team identified more recent concerns related to this recommendation.

2010 District Recommendation 2
In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends the district evaluate the reporting structure with regard to the inspector general so that the position is properly placed in the hierarchy of the district organization. (IV.B.1.j)
2010 District Recommendation 7
In order to meet the Standard, the visiting team recommends a change in the reporting relation of the inspector general from the Board of Trustees to the chancellor. (IV.B.1.j)

The institution responded to these recommendations in the 2010 Follow Up Report. The governing board moved the inspector general to report directly to the Chancellor in July

2010. In January 2011, the position of inspector general became vacant, and the position was discontinued. These recommendations have been addressed and the deficiencies resolved.

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

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

2010 District Recommendation 5 (Revised 2011 District Recommendation 1)
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the district engage in ongoing discussion about the role of the board and how it serves its trustee role for the good of the district. The role of the board should be reviewed regularly with each board member. (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.j)

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

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

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

This recommendation was previously cleared by the Commission. However, the 2015 Evaluation Team identified more recent concerns related to this recommendation.

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

The Board conducted a review of its code of ethics and conflict of interest code in 2010. In September 2010, the Board agreed to an annual self-evaluation each December. In 2012, the Board reviewed and updated its related board policies and administrative procedures. BP 2710 Conflict of Interest was approved in January 2013, BP 2715 Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice was approved in October 2012, AP 2710 Conflict of Interest Disclosure was approved in February 2012, and AP 2712 Conflict of Interest Code was approved in February 2013 and again in July 2014. This recommendation has been addressed and the deficiencies resolved..

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

This recommendation has been addressed and the deficiencies resolved..

2011 (January) District Recommendation 3 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
The team recommends that the Board of Trustees develop and implement a plan to review all board policies so that the policies reflect only policy language and that the operational processes for these policies be reflected in a system of administrative regulations. (IV.B.1.e, IV.B.3)
2011 (June) Commission Recommendation 4 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
While evidence identifies progress, the district has not achieved compliance with Standard IV.B and Eligibility Requirement #3. Specifically, the district has not completed the evaluation of board policies to the end of maintaining policies that are appropriate to policy governance and excluding policies that inappropriately reflect administrative operations. Therefore, in order to meet Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the District must evaluate all board policies and implement actions to resolve deficiencies.
2012 District Recommendation 4 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures
While evidence identifies progress, the district has not achieved compliance with Standard IV.B and Eligibility Requirement #3. Specifically, the district has not completed the evaluation of board policies to the end of maintaining policies that are appropriate to policy governance and excluding policies that inappropriately reflect administrative operations. Therefore, in order to meet Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the District must evaluate all board policies and implement actions to resolve deficiencies. The district has revised a significant number of its board policies. This project needs to be completed so that all policies are reviewed and revised as necessary by March 15, 2013.

The College reports that all board policies have been updated since 2009. Going forward, Board Policies will be reviewed and updated as needed. These recommendations have been addressed and the deficiencies resolved.

2009 District Recommendation 3 Management Systems
The team recommends that the district immediately resolve the functional issues associated with the implementation of the district-wide adopted software management information systems for students, human resources, and financial aid administration. (III.C.1.a, III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d, IV.B.3.b)

The District established a PeopleSoft Resolution Team (PRT), chaired by the director of enterprise services. The PRT coordinates implementation of software modules and provides regular updates to the District Technology Committee. An online ticket request for technical support has been developed. Staffing has increased to assist with PeopleSoft issues, and the 2013-14 implementation of the financial aid module was successful. This recommendation has been addressed and the deficiencies resolved..

2009 Recommendation 7
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, IV.B.1.e)

This recommendation was previously cleared by the Commission. However, the 2015 Evaluation Team identified more recent concerns related to this recommendation.

Standard I – Mission and Institutional Effectiveness

Standard I.A – Mission

General Observations

Laney College has a mission statement that defines its educational purposes: transfer, career-technical education, foundation skills, and support services for students of an urban community college. The mission statement also identifies the College's commitment to community partnerships and creating opportunities to respond to the cultural, economic, social, and workforce needs of the community it serves. Educational programs and services to students are aligned with the needs of their students. (I.A.)

Findings and Evidence

The updated mission statement is published on the website, accessible both from the "About Laney" menu, and by searching for "mission" on the Laney website; it was approved by the Peralta Board of Trustees on January 12, 2010 as item #10 on the consent agenda. The mission is published and included in planning documents such as the Educational Master Plan. The College reviewed its mission in 2010; College Council discussed and reaffirmed the mission

> *Laney College, located in downtown Oakland, California, is a diverse, urban community college committed to student learning. Our learner-centered college provides access to quality transfer and career- technical education, foundation skills and support services. These educational opportunities respond to the cultural, economic, social, and workforce needs of the greater Bay Area and increase community partnerships and global awareness.*
> Laney College Mission Statement.

in 2012-13; and a regular review based on their review cycle is scheduled for Fall 2015. (I.A.1, I.A.2, I.A.3)

The Mission identifies its intended population geographically; i.e. its location in "downtown Oakland" and serving a "diverse urban community." The evaluators observed the high level of diversity of students through the website as well as on campus. Laney College program reviews, annual program updates, institutional planning and assessment of qualitative and quantitative data are conducted in a manner that has an implicit alignment with the mission. However, there is a lack of recognition of the intended student population through the systematic use of student subpopulation data. The evaluators found some instances where the College has responded to the success of a specific sub-population, for example the Asian and Pacific American Student Success Initiative in recognition that 30% of the student population is Asian or Pacific Islander. The evaluators suggest the consistent use of disaggregated data to ascertain program demographic alignment of the campus population with the intended student population as stated in the mission statement. (I.A.4)

The mission is a framing statement for the Educational Master Plan which in turn informs other campus planning processes. However, the Team notes with concern that the "analysis of qualitative and quantitative data" done for program review addresses the mission implicitly, but not explicitly. The Proposed Institutional Effectiveness Plan-11-22-14 document is a draft that

does not appear to have been widely used. The Annual Program Update Forms and Template do not refer to the mission. The evaluators suggest that the mission be visibly and more directly used in institutional planning and decision-making. (I.A.4).

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard.

Laney College's mission statement defines the broad educational purposes, intended student population and commitment to student learning. (I.A.) The College has established "student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population." (I.A.1)

The Peralta Board approved the Laney College mission on January 12, 2010. (I.A.2). The Laney College mission subject to a regular three-year cycle, and was reviewed and reaffirmed by College Council in 2012-13. (I.A.3). The mission is implicitly stated in planning meetings and documents like the Educational Master Plan; however, it does not appear to explicitly drive planning. The Team suggests that the mission be visibly and more directly used in institutional planning and decision making. (I.A.4).

Recommendation

None

Standard I.B – Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISE) on Standard I.B – Institutional Effectiveness provides an overview of the committee structures, planning processes, and evaluation mechanisms that the College has used to improve student learning and institutional processes. The campus community engages in dialog on student learning and institutional effectiveness. The College sets goals, makes progress on achieving goals, engages the College community to assess goals and communicates that assessment to the College community. The College meets on a regular cycle to reflect on its goals and accomplishments. However, during interviews there was a general perception that these practices are not systematic and transparent College wide.

Findings and Evidence

Laney College has created opportunities for campus wide dialog on student learning, student achievement, and institutional effectiveness. The President uses the retreat at the end of the academic year to review assessment and institutional performance data and to engage in a self-reflective dialog on the well-being of the College and the students it serves. During the academic year, the President sponsors monthly "Brown Bag Lunches" to discuss topics of interest in an informal gathering. The President's newsletters keep the College community informed of progress made on college goals and strategic priorities. (I.B.1)

The ISE cites the results from a faculty and staff accreditation survey as evidence that the College is maintaining an ongoing and collegial dialog on continuous improvement of student learning including the achievement of the College's stated goals. In addition, the ISE states, and the Faculty Senate leadership confirmed, that the College's Flex Day workshops are used to engage faculty in dialogs around student learning, achievement of college goals, and overall institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1)

The College sets goals consistent with its mission as a "diverse, urban community college committed to student learning." The goals are developed through campus wide discussions at the President's retreats and College Council Committee meetings and approved by the President. On a process level, the Team notes with concern that although the Educational Master Plan (p 64) in 2010 identified the goal of addressing the need for SLO/PLO implementation, this goal has yet to be fully addressed. The evaluators suggest effective goal setting "in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed." (I.B.2)

The Team verified that the District Research office provides data sets for program review and the Annual Program Update (APU). The data sets include enrollment, success and retention rates, persistence, section offerings FTES, FTEF, award counts, and SLO assessment. However, there appears to be a gap in effectively utilizing the data to promote integrated planning and decision making. The College community stated the need for college level support with research and evaluation to promote institutional effectiveness. Currently the research function is centrally located at the District office. The College has requested a researcher at the College level to disaggregate data and provide analysis to inform planning and resource allocation. (I.B.3)

The Faculty Senate and the Learning Assessment Committee have collaborated on a "Lunch and Learn" series and sponsored discussions focused on improving student learning and engagement. Meeting minutes from the Learning Assessment Committee and College Council, as well as interviews, provide evidence that faculty are engaged in dialog about student learning and student achievement. However, the evaluators noted that there was a lack of evidence in moving from dialog to institutionalizing systematic assessment activities and using the results of assessment to improve student learning and achievement. (I.B.3, I.B.4)

The Foundation Skills Committee meeting minutes and interviews with members of the committee provide sufficient evidence that they are focused on improving student outcomes in foundational skills and allocating state Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) funds to support foundational skills programs. Foundational Skills Committee members provided evidence that the assessment of student learning was used to inform planning and resource allocation. However, there is lack of evidence that this process of planning and resource allocation leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness campus wide. (I.B.3, I.B.4)

The College has established committee structures that provide opportunities for dialog on institutional planning. College goals were developed through participation in planning retreats, participatory governance committees, listening sessions, and small forums. The committee structure the College has in place (Facilities Planning Committee, Faculty Prioritization Committee, the Technology Planning Committee and the College Council) is comprised of constituent groups. Although the Team found evidence of broad-based participation, there was lack of evidence that the planning led to improvement of institutional effectiveness. (I.B.4)

The District Research Office has publicly available reports on student demographics, success, retention, persistence, transfer, and awards. The District Research Office also provides links to Gainful Employment Disclosure, survey outcomes, Student Equity and Achievement Gap reports. The ISE states that the evaluation of planning is embedded within the work of each committee and their workgroups and that it is within these committees and workgroups that resource allocation recommendations are developed and prioritized to improve institutional effectiveness. The evaluators were able to locate on the website agendas and minutes for several campus committees like the Learning Assessment Committee, Foundational Skills Committee, and the College Council. However, this was not the case for all campus committees. For example, the Technology Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee do not have agendas or minutes consistently posted on the College websites. In interviews with the Institutional Effectiveness committee members, it seemed that they were unclear about their purpose and what role they played in evaluating the College processes and plans for improvement. The President's Newsletter to the College community is also publicly available and it provides information on progress on achieving the College's goals, the College's accreditation, planning and budget development. The College has adopted and trained staff in the use of WordPress to allow staff to make effective use of the web and help ensure timely updates. (I.B.5)

The ISE states that the College plans to use the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Budget Advisory Committee, and the College Council to assure the effectiveness of its cycle of integrated planning and resource allocation. The College acknowledges that they are only in the

draft stages of the institutional effectiveness plan and the report titled the "Institutional Effectiveness Plan" was provided.   The ISE identifies "gaps" that participatory governance groups have recognized in their practices. In some instances the gaps have solutions developed, but the Team was not able to substantiate that the solutions had been implemented. In other cases solutions for gaps are still in the development phase, such as the development of the Planning and Budgeting Resource Allocation and Evaluation (PBRAE) strategy, but the ISE does not indicate which committee, department, or workgroup would be responsible. The ISE states, but the Team could not fully substantiate, that participatory governance groups are consistently informing the planning process throughout the year. The Team confirmed that not all of the participatory governance groups were aware of their roles and responsibilities in the integration of planning and resource allocation. Although campus members are engaged in committee work; documentation of the roles and responsibilities of these participatory governance groups was not well defined or widely communicated. The Team was able to confirm through interviews with members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Budget Advisory Committee that there is some confusion on how the participatory governance groups interact to inform planning and resource allocation. Additionally a significant part of the planning and resource allocation is dependent on the District wide planning and resource allocation. The evaluators note that there is mistrust of the District resource allocation process among committee members. The Team recommends that the College assure the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation both at the campus level and the District level. (I.B.6)

Evaluation of the effectiveness of instructional programs, student support services, and other learning support occurs through the program review process. Program reviews are done on a three-year cycle, and Annual Program Updates (APUs) are meant to inform the planning process. Although the Team was able to verify that APUs are completed on a regular basis, how the documents were used to inform the planning process was not completely evident. The Facilities Planning Committee, Faculty Prioritization Committee, and Technology Planning committee are responsible to evaluate their processes and to make recommendations on resource prioritization in support of student learning and achievement. The Team was not able to substantiate that these committees or any of the participatory governance committees engage in a systematic evaluation of their processes to insure institutional effectiveness (I.B.7)

The report discussed various mechanisms for gathering evidence such as student satisfaction surveys, SENSE, CCSSE, curriculum reviews, unit and program reviews, faculty and staff evaluations and the work of its committees, but the report does not provide clear evidence that there is a systematic review of these mechanisms to insure that the information gathered is analyzed appropriately and used to improve instructional programs, student support services and library and other learning support services. It was evident in interviews with the faculty, College Council, and Institutional Effectiveness Committee members that this is a highly engaged campus that values reflective dialog and input from all members of the College community but was unsure how to use data and survey results to inform college processes. (I.B.7)
The ISE states that the College has an Institutional Effectiveness Committee that will "recommend to the College Council and present data that shows the health of the College and information to inform decision-making." Through interviews, the Team was able to establish that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is a college wide committee that provides an

opportunity for dialog around improving institutional effectiveness and has the potential to provide for the College a systematic evaluation mechanism for assessing intuitional processes for planning, program review, and resource allocation. However, the evaluators did not find evidence that this is currently occurring. The Team recommends that the institution assess its evaluation mechanisms, both at the campus level and the District level, through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving programs and services. (I.B.7)

Conclusions

The College does not meet the Standard.

Laney College has created opportunities for campus wide dialog on student learning, student achievement, and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1). The College develops goals through a campus wide process and is consistent with its purpose. However, when a goal is not achieved, there is no mechanism to take necessary steps to meet the goal. The evaluators suggest effective goal setting "in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed." (I.B.2). The College engages in dialog across constituent groups through the committee structure. However, the evaluators noted that there was a lack of evidence in moving from dialog to institutionalizing systematic assessment activities and using the results of assessment to improve student learning and achievement. (I.B.3, I.B.4). The ISE states that the evaluation of planning is embedded within the work of each committee and their workgroups and that it is within these committees and workgroups that resource allocation recommendations are developed and prioritized to improve institutional effectiveness. The evaluators were able to locate on the website agenda and minutes for several campus committees but this was not the case for all campus committees. (I.B.5). Although campus members are engaged in committee work, documentation of the roles and responsibilities of these participatory governance groups was not well defined or widely communicated. Additionally a significant part of the planning and resource allocation is dependent on the District wide planning and resource allocation. The evaluators recommend that the College assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation both at the campus level and the District level. (I.B.6). Evaluation of the effectiveness of instructional programs, student support services, and other learning support occurs through the program review process. Program reviews are done on a three-year cycle, and Annual Program Updates (APUs) are meant to inform the planning process. Although the Team was able to verify that APUs are completed on a regular basis, how the documents were used to inform the planning process was not completely evident. (I.B.7)

Recommendation 1:

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

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIA – Instructional Programs

General Observations

Laney College's educational programs are consistent with its mission, are based on recognized fields of study assigned with state TOP codes, are of sufficient content and length (in terms of units and hours), and maintain appropriate levels of quality and rigor for the degrees and programs offered (evidence includes recent leveling of courses and reduction of course sequences, such as ESL). In 2014, Laney offered 93 different programs and more than 800 courses, 269 through distance education using Moodle as a learning management system. The College served 9,434 students through distance education over two years (2012-2014). The most recent annual report notes that courses overall had a 66.5% success rate. Laney College, as part of a four-college district, has comprehensive instructional offerings to serve its community. Its course mix includes transfer general education, career and technical classes, and foundational skills. Laney also has an early college program for community high school students. As reported in the Institutional Self Evaluation (ISE), Laney has 93 state-approved degrees and certificates, including 44 associate degree programs (10 are ADTs) and 41 certificates of achievement. Laney has 13 certificates of proficiency that are less than 12 units. The College is experiencing declining enrollment and served 19,620 students in 2013-2014; more than 60% of those students were under age 29. Enrolled students report that 36% intend to transfer and 51% are pursuing degrees. The number of degrees and certificates awarded has increased 33% over the last six years, with the largest increase shown by male students. In addition, the number of degrees awarded to Latino students has doubled in that same time period. Course success and completion rates have held steady for several years at about 65% and 80% respectively. Statistics show a gap in success and completion between the highest performing group and Latino or African-American students. Success rates have decreased over the past six years in both foundational skills courses (52% to 47%) and distance education courses (59% to 52%). In addition, there is a 14% gap between success rates in face-to-face courses and distance education courses. Distance education headcounts have increased from 1,265 in Spring 2012 to 1,836 in Spring 2014. Several committees, such as the Foundational Skills Committee and CTE Advisory Committee, meet to discuss student achievement data and make recommendations about improvements in curricula to address student needs.

Findings and Evidence

An examination of class schedules confirmed that the curriculum offered includes face-to-face and distance education offerings. A 2014 survey found that 71% of faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed that the College's instructional programs meet the mission of the institution. Laney College utilizes online course delivery (via Moodle) to provide educational access to its community remotely. Based on interviews with the Vice President of Instruction, Curriculum Committee, faculty, and instructional deans, the Team verified that new courses and modified courses are reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee through an established process. Interviewees were not able to identify clearly the criteria used by the Curriculum Committee when approving a new program nor did they confirm that the committee examined

whether a new program fit with the College mission. In addition, they did not explicitly identify the intended student population as stated in the mission statement. Courses offered at Laney College do not have student learning outcomes (SLOs) documented on the official course outline of record in CurricUNET, but on a separate report not accessible to the public. An examination of sample syllabi showed that frequently the student learning outcomes on syllabi do not match the official student learning outcomes in CurricUNET. A Distance Education Course Addendum is added into the official record in CurricUNET when a course is proposed and approved to be offered via distance education. While the College accurately reported it does not offer any programs strictly through distance education, the Team discovered evidence that multiple certificate and degree programs (e.g. Banking & Finance and Business) can be completed 50% or more online. (II.A.1).

The 2014 Faculty-Staff Accreditation Survey and interviews with instructional administrators revealed an interest in student development and educational quality and a focus on improving student outcomes. Their ISE (p.105) states that "To ensure the quality of our programs, the College Curriculum Committee maintains a continuous schedule for reviewing all programs and courses." The Team was able to verify that such a schedule exists but was not able to verify, at the time of the visit, that it is completely followed. At the time of the visit, the Team found evidence that many active course outlines of record have not been reviewed or updated in more than ten years. Interviews with Curriculum Committee members confirmed that some faculty and departments are not adhering to the three-year review cycle. (II.A.1)

Through interviews with deans, faculty, and committees such as the CTE Advisory Committee, the Team found ample evidence that Laney College uses both qualitative and quantitative data to identify and address the needs of their students and community. The Team found evidence such as demographic analyses, surveys, RP Research, selected industry advisory boards, and student cosmetology placement scores. Data documented that approximately 30% of Laney College's student body is Asian or Pacific Islander, thus the College developed the Asian and Pacific American Student Success Initiative. The College's CTE curriculum has been significantly modified in recent years to address the contextualization of basic skills and program-specific, cross-disciplinary experiences (e.g. Technical mathematics and English courses). The Team verified that placement tests for online students are the same as face-to-face students. However, the Team was unable to find easily accessible, public reports of SLO or PLO assessment, and internal reports (via Taskstream) revealed only a small percentage of courses and programs are being directly assessed on an ongoing basis. (ER10, II.A.1.a)

Laney College has a well-documented, but not always followed, curriculum approval and review process. The Team verified via the many courses modified in the past few years that Laney College conducts ongoing curriculum review. Depending on the term, the Distance Education (DE) offerings at Laney College range from less than 10% to 25% of their semester offerings, but a higher percentage of courses is approved to be offered via distance education. The DE course approval and evaluation process is the same as face-to-face courses. The Team verified that DE course approvals are maintained within CurricUNET via a course addendum which identifies how the course will maintain substantial student-faculty interaction, and if the course will differ from the face-to-face offerings of the same course. The online LMS system (Moodle) has accompanying instructor-training resources, videos, and classes offered District wide via

Merritt College which are available to all Laney College instructors. However, no evidence was found that students receive any training, assessment readiness, or orientation to Moodle, and the DE Coordinator confirmed the lack of online student support services, such as tutoring and counseling, for online students. The ISE states that faculty teaching DE courses undergo the exact same evaluation process (p.105); however, there is also an actionable improvement plan to establish policy, instructor certifications, and quality assurance for DE. (II.A.1.b)

Through document review and interviews during the visit the team concluded that there was a lack of coordination, documentation, and dissemination of course student learning outcomes. First, the College does not have a systemic process to uniformly publish student learning outcomes. They are not publicly available for students or faculty on the official course outline of record in CurricUNET; they are only accessible via password-protected access. Second, there is apparent confusion across the College regarding the terminology utilized to identify student learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, course objectives, key learning objectives, and the student performance objectives which are included on the official course outlines of record and often interpreted as the official SLOs. The Team conducted a random sampling of class syllabi to verify the consistency and accuracy of SLOs printed/disseminated on syllabi to ensure alignment with the official SLOs, which are password protected in CurricUNET. The Team verified that many course syllabi SLOs do not align with the official SLOs – occasionally within the same course but different sections. Some course syllabi did accurately reflect the official SLOs (such as BUS-2-Spr14; ENG-201AB-21437; ESL-52AB-21544; KIN-1A-Spr15; KIN-1B-Spr15; MATH-201-22005; MATH-201-22001; PSYCH-7A-22611; SOC-1-22678). Other course syllabi included SLOs, but they were inaccurate and not identical to the official SLOs (such as ENG-269AB-21320; MATH-201-22003; LRNRE-269-21883; CARP-207-23821; HIST-3B-23656; MUSIC-101-23863; POLI-1-41279). In some cases, the student performance objectives listed on the official course outline of record closely mirrored the official SLOs, but they were still incorrectly listed on course syllabi (for example, HUMAN-30A-43333). Some course syllabi included the student performance objectives (listed on the official course outline of record) as the student learning outcomes (PSYCH-21-23818). Yet other syllabi published "course objectives," "course goals," or SLOs, but they neither aligned with the official course SLOs nor the student performance objectives listed on the official course outline of record (BIO-11-42877; COMM-1A, Spr15; SOC-1-22677. Note that the Team could not find official SLOs in CurricUNET at all for COMM-1. All of this indicates that the College needs to publish the official SLOs and develop a system for ensuring the accuracy of the SLOs on all course syllabi. In the most recent annual report to ACCJC, the College reported that 28.7% of courses have ongoing assessment and 3.6% of programs have ongoing assessment. The College will need to put processes into place in order to meet this standard. (II.A.1.c)

Laney's Curriculum Committee is charged with ensuring the quality of courses and programs. Courses are supposed to be reviewed every three years using a variety of measures; the Curriculum Committee reports annually on the status of this review to the Academic Senate. Interviews confirmed that not all courses have been reviewed on this cycle. Courses and programs not meeting standards or serving the mission are deactivated through a process described in a document posted on the website. However, there is no evidence that the College has ever discontinued a program. According to the Vice President of Instruction, program reviews are produced every three years by instructional programs; the last iteration took place in

2012. The Curriculum Committee, co-chaired by two faculty, is comprised of 15 faculty plus administrative and classified members. When developing a course, faculty work with instructional deans; the Team could not verify that the process for developing a course or program includes explicit consideration of the College's mission. (II.A.2)

The Team could not find evidence that learning outcomes for courses and programs are consistently identified and evaluated. Faculty reported that the Learning Assessment Committee provides support and encouragement and that the faculty union has been an obstacle to full participation. Some departments, such as biology and chemistry, meet regularly about SLO assessment and plan improvements. Other departments are not as active. Courses undergo a clearly delineated approval process that begins with submission through CurricUNET and culminates with approval by the Curriculum Committee and District level CIPD to ensure that there is not duplication in the District. CTE programs must be reviewed by the CTE Advisory Committee and industry advisory boards. Courses will not be approved through this process unless they have SLOs; it was reported by faculty that new programs must have PLOs in order to be approved. Interviewees stated that SLOs are consistently evaluated and discussed at biannual flex days and department meetings, but results are not publicized to students. PLOs are difficult to locate, and at the time of the Team visit were not on the public website, and assessments have not been completed for the majority of programs. The 2013-14 Annual Report to ACCJC cited that only four out of 110 College programs, 3.6%, had ongoing assessment of SLOs, although another report by the Academic Senate Chair stated that 22 out of 45 college programs, 49%, had ongoing assessment of SLOs. Often documents had conflicting or different statistics for the same metric. Instructional faculty, staff, and administrators have to agree on how to define what a program is before being able to effectively assess PLOs. Department Chairs reported that there was no common understanding about the operational definition of a Program on their campus. Course syllabi should include SLOs, according to the Vice President of Instruction, but some syllabi reviewed by the Team have SLOs that do not match CurricUNET and it is not clear who is responsible to check that the correct SLOs are on the syllabi. Just recently, interviewees reported that the faculty self-evaluation was revised to include assessment of their participation in the learning outcomes assessment process. (II.A.2.a)

As noted, faculty have the primary responsibility for developing course competencies and SLOs; industry advisory boards assist for CTE courses. The College states that faculty develop PLOs as well, but the process is not fully described and from interviews, the Team observed that confusion exists at the College about where PLO statements and assessment results can be found. Some reported to the Team that PLOs are available through CurricUNET, but Team members could not locate them without a co-chair of the Curriculum Committee logging into the system. Even with that assistance, a random sample of programs revealed that some were missing PLOs. For CTE programs, the CTE Advisory Committee reviews PLOs before they go to the Curriculum Committee. The ISE states that SLOs and PLOs are assessed on a three-year cycle, but the Team was unable to find consistent evidence to verify this statement. The PLO assessments examined in Taskstream were sometimes neither direct nor ongoing. The Learning Assessment Committee, which is chaired by two Learning Assessment Coordinators, each with 50% released time from faculty duties, requests each year that faculty provide a schedule of SLO assessments and gives workshops to support them. Department chairs are responsible to follow up that the work gets done. However, not all have been completed nor have many programs

closed the loop by taking action for improvements based on SLO assessment results and evaluating those improvements; there does not appear to be any consequences for this failure. The Team verified by looking at Taskstream that 820 course assessments have taken place since 2008-2009 (some assessments were for the same course in different years); however, only 158 of those assessments "closed the loop" by reporting on the final step of the assessment cycle: evaluating the improvements that were implemented. (II.A.2.b)

The Team interviewed the Vice President of Instruction, the instructional deans, the Academic Senate, and various instructional committees, all of whom confirmed that instruction is high quality and programs have appropriate breadth and depth. To ensure high quality of instruction, faculty are evaluated regularly and curriculum reviewed by faculty and the Curriculum Committee every three years although there has not been complete compliance with the curriculum review cycle. Full-time faculty are hired via a rigorous process that included a teaching demonstration and several levels of interviews; once hired, the tenure committee and Vice President of Instruction meet with the new faculty member to provide support. The Academic Senate, through delegation to the curriculum committee, oversees academic quality, and the Learning Assessment Committee meets twice a month to oversee use of SLO assessment. The LAC also offers support and periodic workshops to faculty to assist with SLO assessment. A review of program requirements in the catalog confirmed that programs have appropriate time to completion and sequencing. The College has developed ten ADTs recently for students planning to transfer. (II.A.2.c)

The Team reviewed a sample of online and face-to-face courses and concluded that their quality is appropriate to a higher education institution. The College has made an effort to support the learning needs of many groups of students, including those with disabilities, distance learners, CalWORKs clients, and ESL students, to name a few. When the Oakland Adult School closed, Laney took on many of its students who start at low levels of math and/or English; the Foundational Skills Pathway program is one effort to provide additional support for such students and is commended for its work. The College intends to use interventions to increase the success of Latino students. Faculty generally "are responsible for keeping up with current pedagogical approaches" (ISE 119) although the College has provided some workshops with guest speakers. There was no mention of systematic assessment of learning needs for students or a comprehensive faculty development plan to address those needs. Distance education faculty are encouraged to complete pedagogy training prior to teaching online, but participating in that training is not a requirement in order to teach online. Laney has a flex program that consists of six days identified for professional development, some of which is focused on pedagogy and funded through an annual district allocation of approximately $60,000. While the professional development committee does require individuals that receive conference funds to present on their experience/findings, the College does not have an evaluation process to verify the effectiveness of its professional development offerings. In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Team suggests the professional development committee discuss and develop processes to ensure that the professional development it provides is appropriate and effective. (II.A.2.d)

Laney College's 2010 Educational Master Plan documented that "There are insufficient degree level SLOs completed to determine whether course SLOs are aligned with them…There is no evidence of students demonstrating awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in

which they are enrolled. In theory, if the SLOs are included in the syllabus, referred to by the instructors, and placed on department websites, students will be able to demonstrate awareness of these goals and purposes" (p.64). Later, in Fall 2012, Laney instituted a cycle of review to ensure that all courses and programs would be current within three years. It states that more than half of the College's courses have been reviewed within the past two years. The Team found that some courses still have not been reviewed for ten years or more. On the program level, Laney cites several examples of programs that have been developed recently to respond to community needs; in interviews, both the biomanufacturing and legal and community interpreting programs were mentioned as recent additions that responded to community requests and/or job opportunities. Programs write annual program updates which comment on progress in assessing learning outcomes, and every three years instructional programs complete program reviews. During interviews, Instructional administrators could not identify programs that had been eliminated within the last several years, and some were not aware about the discontinuance process. A revised draft of the program discontinuance process is currently being reviewed. (II.A.2.e)

The Team could not confirm that all course and program learning outcomes are evaluated on a regular basis or that the results inform institutional planning. Laney relies on the Annual Program Update and program review process to ensure that courses and programs are reviewed systematically and appropriately. Although the program review reports are produced every three years, through interviews and review of materials, it is not clear whether they are made available internally and externally. A Program Review Task Force was convened recently to revise the program review template; they anticipate finishing their work by spring 2015. The College notes several groups on campus that discuss planning for improving student outcomes. College personnel noted that it will become stronger after hiring a college researcher. (II.A.2.f)

Laney has few departmental exams or external certifications–some examples are the standardized American Chemical Society exams and the American Welding Society Certification –and states that it minimizes biases by testing anonymously and validates effectiveness by analyzing results over several years. Standardized tests that have been independently validated are used in several CTE areas. (II.A.2.g)

Based on interviews with the Curriculum Committee, the Team established that units of credit are reviewed during the course approval process and awarded consistently based on Title 5 guidelines. An individual course's objectives align with SLOs, and students are awarded credit based on meeting objectives in the syllabi, which are not always consistent with officially approved SLOs, as discussed in more detail above. Laney follows the Carnegie system of awarding credit in compliance with ACCJC and USDE policies and regulations. (II.A.2.h)
The Team confirmed through interviews with faculty and instructional administrators that Laney employees believe that students obtain degrees and certificates based on achieving program objectives. However, those objectives are not consistently aligned with SLOs, nor are they consistently mapped and aligned to program learning outcomes (as noted above, not all programs appear to have PLOs). Existing PLOs are approved by the Curriculum Committee, are password protected in CurricUNET, are occasionally transferred/copied into Taskstream, and occasionally are linked to advanced courses in a program. The Team could not identify evidence that all

SLOs were mapped to PLOs and therefore could not confirm that degrees and certificates are awarded based on a student's achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes. (IIA.2.i) The Team confirmed that Laney College has clearly stated requirements for GE courses in its catalog and website, and that the District Articulation Officers review all additions to its general education offerings. Laney College's catalog states the minimum 19 units of GE curriculum requirement for all AA/AS Degrees. Distance Education Addenda are approved by the College's curriculum committee, and documented in CurricUNET, indicating that 15 of these general education units could be completed online. Their Curriculum Committee reviews courses for GE based on course objectives aligned with course SLOs. The College Articulation Officer confirmed that new course additions to GE were reviewed by the Curriculum Committee and then through a process which involved all four District Articulation Officers. A review of program requirements confirmed that GE is a necessary component for successful completion of all associate degrees. (II.A.3)

The College's General Education requirement has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete degrees. The General Education core requires an understanding of five basic areas of knowledge, including Natural Science (Area 1); Social and Behavioral Sciences (Area 2); and Humanities (Area 3). (II.A.3.a)

Laney's published catalog and website verify that GE Curriculum Requirements include Area 4: Language and Rationality with one course required from a) ENG., b) MATH, c) Oral or Written Communication or Literature and d) Computer Literacy. (II.A.3.b)

> **Laney College Institutional Learning Outcomes**
> 1. **Communication:** Students will effectively express and exchange ideas through various modes of communication.
> 2. **Critical Thinking and Problem Solving:** Students will be able to think critically and solve problems by identifying relevant information, evaluating alternatives, synthesizing findings and implementing effective solutions.
> 3. **Career Technical Skills:** Students will demonstrate technical skills in keeping with the demands of their field of study.
> 4. **Global Awareness, Ethics and Civic Responsibility** Students will be prepared to practice community engagement that addresses one or more of the following: environmental responsibility, social justice and cultural diversity.
> 5. **Personal and Professional Development:** Students will develop their knowledge, skills and abilities for personal and/or professional growth, health and well-being.

The College's published information describes courses designated to meet their Area 5 requirement: Ethnic Studies. The courses designated under this area meet the standard for students to appreciate ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and/or the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities. Their Area 5 GE requirement aligns with their ILO #4: Global Awareness, Ethics, and Civic Responsibility. Interviews validated that for a course to receive approval for GE, it is initiated by a faculty member and reviewed by a long string of titles: department chair, dean, librarian, assessment coordinator, technical reviewer, and college articulation officer before being approved by the Curriculum Committee. (II.A.3.c)

After reviewing the College Catalog and ISE-provided evidence (their Program and Course Approval Process Manual for Faculty and Administrators), the Team concluded that Laney has

adequate controls and curriculum approval processes in place to ensure all programs maintain a focused study in at least one area of inquiry or an interdisciplinary core. (II.A.4)

Laney College maintains more than three dozen Career and Technical Education certificates and degrees. The Team verified participation with the statewide CTE Employment Outcomes Survey which is facilitated and conducted by the RP Group. This survey indicated that 86.6% of former CTE students who received degrees or certificates from Laney were very satisfied or satisfied with the education and training they received. The Team reviewed industry advisory minutes, job placement survey results, and CTE Advisory Committee agendas/minutes to verify that student completing CTE programs at Laney College meet employment and industry standards. The Team does express concern that the cosmetology student exam pass rates from July 2008 – June 2013 are significantly below the institutional set standard of 65% (aggregate written pass rate was 47% and aggregate practical pass rate was 61%, although the practical pass rate did exceed the institutional set standard six out of the past seven most recent exams). The Team commends the active industry engagement with the Industrial Maintenance Machinist/Mechanic program and encourages all CTE programs to meet with an industry advisory board at least annually. The Team also commends the individual tracking of culinary students' employment upon completion of the program. Of particular note is the Academic Senate's Career and Technical Education Advisory Committee. This group demonstrated in interviews a strong command of the issues impacting CTE on a state, regional, and local level. The CTE faculty engaged on this committee are part of the infrastructure that keeps the vocational programs throughout Laney College well-informed and connected. Given the organizational structure of the College, CTE programs are sprinkled through various disciplines/departments. The Team was impressed with the intentionality and diligence with which this body connects all the dots for these high-intensive program areas, and this effort is to be commended. (II.A.5)

The Team examined the most recent hard copy college catalog and college website. The College produces a catalog every two years; the latest one covers 2013-2015. Changes are captured in a catalog supplement. Laney College's catalog contains clear and accurate information about their educational courses, programs and transfer policies, especially to the UC and CSU systems. The catalog also describes degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, and course requirements, but their expected student learning outcomes are not listed for programs. As mentioned above, many syllabi do not list SLOs consistent with those on the approved course outline of record; interviews with instructional faculty and administrators confirmed that there was not a consistent process to cross check SLOs in course syllabi with those appearing on CurricUNET. (II.A.6)

As part of the Peralta Community College District, Laney College has a well-articulated system of transfer between the UC and CSU systems with comprehensive information available to students via the website: www.assist.org. ASSIST (Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer) is California's statewide repository of transfer information which offers easy access to a single articulation database. The catalog contains clear and accurate transfer information. The process for granting credit to incoming students from other institutions involves evaluation by a counselor once the student produces an official transcript. When uncertainty arises, students must produce more information about the course they are attempting to use for Laney credit, such as a syllabus. The Team could not confirm

that learning outcomes for courses accepted by Laney are comparable to learning outcomes of their own courses. The College has created articulation agreements for the benefit of students. (II.A.6.a)

The College states that when a program is eliminated or modified they notify students through counseling faculty, college catalog, catalog addendum, advisory flyers, and departmental websites. Course substitutions and the waiver process are also used to assist students when program changes occur. However, the Team verified through interviews that there was not a clear understanding among instructional faculty and administrators what the process was to eliminate a program. No one interviewed could recall a program being discontinued in recent memory. The Team learned that the College's policy on program discontinuance is currently being revised, but there was not clarity among curriculum committee and assessment committee members regarding the process for program discontinuation. In fact, the Team learned that some programs still listed in the catalog are intended for termination, and based on this fact, do not have program learning outcomes nor completed assessments. (II.A.6.B) Data to be published is crosschecked by the academic support services specialist, the Curriculum Committee Chairs, and the Articulation Officer. Administrators at all levels also conduct regular checks to insure integrity and accuracy of published information. The College uses a variety of outlets to inform the public about its programs and achievements, both in hard copy and through the College website. (II.A.6.c)

The Team reviewed Board Policy 4030, which addresses academic freedom and is available on the website. It was last reviewed in December 2012. Academic freedom is also ensured to faculty in the collective bargaining agreement under Article 4. AP 5500 addresses student academic honesty and was last reviewed in 2014; five principles of academic integrity are in the 2013-2015 Laney College Catalog. Interviews with instructional deans, the Vice President of Instruction, and faculty confirmed that there is consistent awareness of the academic freedom policy and no significant issues have arisen. In its ISE, Laney cites many examples of pedagogy and classroom methodology that support fairness and objectivity. It also states that the culture of the campus is to inform rather than indoctrinate. (II.A.7, II.A.7.a)

AP 5500 addresses academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty; the College adheres to a process for student discipline which includes due process and appeal rights. Principles of academic integrity appear in the catalog and on posters in many classrooms. Distance education students are held to the same standards, which are listed on the distance education webpage under *Academic Dishonesty, Due Process and Conduct*. All students are required to agree to adhere to district policies concerning academic honesty. The Team did not find that statements of academic honesty were consistently included in class syllabi. (II.A.7.b)

II.A.7.c is not applicable.

Laney does not offer curricula in foreign locations other than to DE students taking online courses. Those students must adhere to all applicable college procedures and policies. (II.A.8)

Conclusions

The College does not fully meet the Standard. Specifically the College does not meet Standards II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, and II.A.2.i.

All instructional programs meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity. The College uses data to identify student and programmatic needs. However, the College has not fully implemented ongoing assessment of course and program learning outcomes, use of those outcomes for improvement, and publication of outcomes to prospective students. The College offers curricula and programs through a variety of methods that meet the needs of its identified student population. At the time of the visit, SLOs, PLOs, and program assessment data were not posted internally nor are they available to the public. (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c)

When program reviews do occur, faculty appear to be central to the process. The College relies on faculty and advisory committee members to identify competencies and learning outcomes for courses, certificates, and programs including general and vocational education and degrees. However, student progress toward outcomes is not consistently gathered or analyzed. The College offers high quality instruction with appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion and synthesis of learning. The College uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students. Through interviews and review of materials, there appeared to be a lack of evidence that assessment of learning outcomes is occurring systematically and suggested improvements are being implemented and assessed. Further there was lack of evidence that ongoing, systematic evaluation of student learning is taking place and being used in its integrated planning process, including resource allocation and strategic planning. The College validates the effectiveness of departmental exams and minimizes test biases. The units awarded are consistent with generally accepted norms in higher education. At the time of the visit, there was lack of evidence that all programs have stated learning outcomes; therefore, the Team could not confirm that degrees and certificates are awarded based on student achievement of program learning outcomes. (II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i)

The College follows its general education requirements as stated in the catalog. The College requires all students completing associate degrees to fulfill course requirements in humanities, fine arts, natural sciences and social sciences. Students must also take courses successfully in language and rationality; mathematics; English; oral or written communication; and computer literacy. The College requires that students complete a course in Ethnic Studies, which fosters a respect for cultural diversity and global responsibility. (IIA.3.a, IIA.3.b, IIA.3.c)

The College has processes in place to ensure that all programs include a focused study of at least 18 units in each associate degree program. The College provides assurance that students completing occupational programs demonstrate technical and professional competencies as determined by the industry. However, the Team has some concern about cosmetology pass rates. The Team commends the work of the CTE Advisory Committee for supporting CTE programs and faculty. (IIA.4, IIA.5)

The College publishes clear and accurate information about programs, courses and transfer policies. Degree and certificate requirements are on the website and in the College catalog. Course student learning outcomes on syllabi are not consistent in many cases with approved SLOs in the CurricUNET system. Transfer of credit policies are communicated and the College has a process to evaluate credits being transferred from other institutions. The program discontinuance policy takes into account the need for students to finish coursework. While a policy exists, college personnel could not confirm that it had ever been implemented. The College reviews publications for accuracy, but some discrepancies, like the wrong mission published in the current catalog, exist. (IIA.6, IIA.6.a, IIA.6.b, IIA.6.c)

The College has Board policies on academic freedom and student academic honesty. These are published on the website and in the catalog, and interviews confirmed awareness of the content and no concerns about following the guidelines. The College does not require conformity to any beliefs or world views. (IIA.7, IIA.7.a, IIA.7.b, IIA.7.c)

The College does not offer curricula in foreign locations. (IIA.8)

Recommendation 2: Program Learning Outcomes and Assessment
In order to meet the standard the College must:
- Identify and publish program learning outcomes
- Ensure official SLOs align with SLOs on course syllabi
- Regularly assess course and program student learning outcomes; publish results of program level assessment.
- Use assessment results to take actions that may result in improvement and evaluate results of these actions.
  (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A2.f, IIA.2.i, ER 10)

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

Standard II.B – Student Support Services

General Observations

Laney College provides a wide range of programs and services within the Student Services area. These include admissions and records, financial aid, assessment, counseling, disabled students programs and services (DSPS), extended opportunity programs and services (EOPS), health services, learning communities, a veterans' center, and a welcome center.

In order to validate the Institutional Self-Evaluation (ISE), Team members toured facilities and interviewed faculty and staff members and students.

As part of a multi-college system, Laney College has only the campus at Fallon Street. No other off-site centers belong to Laney. Student services at Laney are located in many locations across the campus. Counseling services are in the newly remodeled Laney Tower. The Welcome Center, Admissions and Records, and Financial Aid are located in the older A-complex, and Disabled Students Services and Program (DSPS) are located in the E-complex, across from the gym. The Tutoring Center and the Health Center are located in the Student Center. There are additional discipline-specific tutoring sites located adjacent to the disciplines. For example: the Math Lab, the Writing Center, and the Business Department lab. The college Health Services is located on the second floor of the Laney Tower.

> *Laney College had 12,775 students in fall of 2013. The ethnic breakdown of that student population is as follows: 26.1% African American, 25.6% Asian, 15.6% White/Non-Hispanic, 13.3% Latino/Hispanic, 10.7% Multiple, 5.6% unknown, and .9% Filipino. The American Indian/Alaskan Native, Other non-white, and Pacific Islander groups were at .5 or below per group.*
> Institutional Self-Evaluation Report

Findings and Evidence

Through evaluation of materials and interviews the Team verified that student support services provide the necessary support to diverse groups of students with the intention of promoting student learning and achievement. However, it appears that the facilities that house these services need upgrading based on the Team's tour of facilities as well as interviews with students. Some specific examples that came up during interviews are the Financial Aid Office (students complained about a lack of privacy). The College does ensure that services are provided during the day, counseling services are available one evening during the week, and students may make appointments online. There are no other centers or locations affiliated with Laney College. The ISE notes and the Team verified that student services programs and administrative units participate in annual unit planning, program review, and SLO assessment in all areas. However, the Team could not verify that there were discussions about the assessment results or what improvements were made as a result of the assessment results. In interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators as well as examination of documentation, there was evidence that one cycle of Program reviews for Student Services Units occurred in 2011-12 and another cycle is due this year, 2015. However, in discussions with staff and administrators, it was unclear whether this next cycle of Program Review was going happen. When interviewed, faculty and staff provided some examples of assessments of services and articulated service improvements

that had been made as a result of the assessments. However, this did not appear to be systematic across the college for all programs and services. Finally it should be noted that at the time of the visit, the College had not submitted a substantive change form for distance learning delivery[1]. (II.B, II.B.1)

The College catalog, available in both print and electronic format, provides information on key aspects about the institution. The location and publications where other policies may be found are also made clear. Portions of the catalog are translated into Spanish, Vietnamese, and Chinese. Admissions policies, requirements, and fees are the same for distance education programs and traditional programs. There is no distinct process for recording complaints and grievances from distance education students as opposed to traditional students. All complaints are handled informally through the deans. The Dean of Academic and Student Services and the Vice President of Student Services monitor complaints that are advanced to grievance status. (II.B.2)

The information required by the Commission with regard to general information, requirements, and major policies affecting students exists in the catalog. The College prepares two-year catalogs, and has just begun the process to review and develop the 2015-2017 catalog. The Vice President of Instruction and her staff oversee that process and ensure that the material is reviewed and updated by the appropriate departments. (II.B.2.a-d)

The ISE notes that the needs of students are identified through a variety of methods including referrals, research tools such as SLO assessments, student equity analysis and planning, and the CCSSE. That information is discussed, and programmatic improvements are designed as appropriate. The College offers services during the day and on one evening each week. In addition, online services, including online applications, registration, advising, and orientation are provided for students enrolled in distance education courses. The College also staffs a Welcome Center with student ambassadors to assist and direct students to available resources. This Welcome Center is located adjacent to Admissions and Records and the Assessment Center and houses adaptive technology equipment as a complement to the resources provided in the DSPS. There is no online counseling for distance education students; at the time of the visit, the College had not submitted a substantive change for distance learning. (II.B.3, II.B.3a)

The College excels in its efforts to provide an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. Student clubs and organizations are available and actively sponsor special events, performances, and activities that enhance the understanding of and appreciation for diversity. For example, there was an Art Exhibit at the campus June Steingart Gallery featuring art works (photos, sculptures, paintings, and multi-media) by female faculty and staff which was being curated by a Laney Art Instructor in celebration of Women's Herstory Month with twelve accompanying events focused on women. Evidence of many other events was provided. The Team found that the College's commitment to a social justice agenda that enhances the quality of life for all students was authentic and palpable. The College actively engages in outreach to students who

---

[1] Note: In the response to "review for factual errors", the college noted that the Substantive Change proposal was subsequently submitted on April 10, 2015.

might not otherwise attend college and ensures they are placed in appropriate academic pathways. (II.B.3.b, II.B.3.d)

The College provides professional development support with training of all counselors within the College. Counselors regularly participate in professional growth opportunities such as conferences and flex day activities. In addition, the counseling faculty and staff regularly convene to participate in program review and student learning outcome processes. Both full-time and part-time counselors meet minimum qualifications for their positions and are regularly evaluated in accordance with the established collective bargaining agreement. This evaluation process provides for both peer and student feedback pertaining to counseling services. (II.B.3.c)

In the self-evaluation, the College noted that the majority of the ACT/COMPASS assessment instruments were due for their six-year revalidation during the 2014/15 academic year. The Team found evidence that this work was occurring as scheduled and that the ESL COMPASS and ESL Holistic Writing Assessment were reviewed and evaluated during fall 2014. (II.B.3.e)

Laney College maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially with provision for secure backup of files regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The College publishes and follows established policies for release of student records. Records are maintained in Admissions and Records, Assessment, DSPS, EOPS, Financial Aid, General Counseling, Health Services, and Veterans' Affairs. Formal complaints are housed in the Vice President of Student Services' office. The institution insures compliance with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), California Education Code, Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and local board policies and procedures. (II.B.3.f)

The Team found evidence that some departments in Student Services evaluate their programs through the Program Review process. However, in discussions with faculty and administrators, it was unclear whether comprehensive Program Reviews are completed by units in the same three-year cycle expected of instructional Program Reviews since there is not a publicly published schedule. Not all units completed Program Reviews in 2011-12, so it was unclear when they would be expected to do a Program Review. Faculty, staff, and administrators were aware of the necessity to do quality improvement based on evidence, but these improvement efforts did not seem to be clearly linked to Program Review. The Admissions and Records Program Review of 2011-12 presented the results of a survey of students concerning their services, but they only had 25 respondents out of a student headcount of 13,000. With such a small sample size, it is difficult to make conclusions about student satisfaction. Also, in this cycle of program review, it was cited that information should be gathered from student satisfaction surveys; number and type of complaints; comparisons to professional organizations' best practices; focus groups; and time to complete tasks. However, there was no action plan or timeline attached to these suggested strategies. The Gateway to College Program Review had a well-documented Action Plan, but without the next cycle of Program Reviews, it was difficult to determine whether the program will close the loop and whether their strategies resulted in program improvement. (II.B.4)

Conclusions

The College does not fully meet the Standard. Specifically, the College does not meet Standards II.B.1, II.B.2.a, and II.B.4.

Student support services provide the necessary support to diverse groups of students with the intention of promoting student learning and achievement. However, there was lack of evidence that assessment results were systematically used to make improvements. Further, the College has not submitted a substantive change proposal although there are programs that have over 50% of their courses approved to be offered online (II.B, II.B.1). The College catalog provides information on key aspects about the institution. All complaints are handled informally through the deans. The Dean of Academic and Student Services and the Vice President of Student Services monitor complaints that are advanced to grievance status. (II.B.2, II.B.2.a-d). Faculty and staff research and identify the learning support needs of its student population and provide appropriate services and programs to address those needs. (II.B.3, II.B.3a). The College excels in its ability to provide an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. (II.B.3.b, II.B.3.d). The College designs and maintains counseling and academic advising programs and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. (II.B.3.c). Although the College engages in the evaluation of programs and services, this effort is not systematically conducted nor are roles and responsibilities clear. (II.B.4)

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

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

Standard II.C – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

Laney College's Library and Learning Support Services support student learning and contribute to student success. The Library at Laney College has a collection of 90,864 books, 3,524 audiovisual materials, 5,866 e-books, 108 periodical subscriptions, and 39 electronic databases.

Library instruction and development of information competency skills occur through library course-specific orientations, the library's *Introduction to Information Resources* course (LIS 85), and LibGuides, which strengthen active learning during and after in-person library orientation sessions. The Laney campus community is kept informed of library resources and instructional services through various means of communication, professional development workshops, and participation in college governance meetings.

Access to a variety of electronic resources, including the library catalog, full-text electronic databases, e-books, and locally developed LibGuides designed to provide research guidance and enhance instruction, is made available to students and employees at Laney College both on campus and off-campus through remote authentication. The new library building is planned and when finished, will substantially improve library and learning support services for the College.

The Laney College library has adopted services outcomes for the library and assesses these outcomes and discusses the results of such assessments at librarian and staff meetings. Through student and faculty surveys the library identified the need to purchase a third copy machine for student use and restored audiovisual delivery services. The library also updated the percentage of its collection published after 1990 from 16% in 2006 to 30% in 2014 through the use of district bond funds as a result of its annual "age of collection" evaluation process.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found that even though general fund allocations for library resources have diminished over the last few years, the College has leveraged various other funds to supplement the library's budget in order to support its Library and Learning Support resources and services. Augmentations to the library's materials budget have come from capital bond and lottery dollars, and the State's Instructional Equipment and Library Materials budget. The Team was told during interviews that the annual allocation of $40,000 of lottery dollars for electronic database subscriptions is insufficient to facilitate educational offerings. (II.C.1)

According to evidence in the library's Collection Development Policy, the template for library resources in CurricUNET, and through communication by librarians with faculty, library materials are selected and effectively support student learning. Through review of materials and interviews, the evaluators verified that the library provides multiple avenues for users to develop information competency skills including library course-specific orientations, the library's *Introduction to Information Resources* course (LIS 85), and LibGuides. The data provided shows that the library conducted more than sixty-seven orientations in 2013-14. (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b)

The Team found that the College provides students and employees with adequate access to library and learning support services regardless of their location or means of delivery. Through reviewing the library's website, the Team found multiple online resources (multiple online full-text databases, e-books, and LibGuides) available to students regardless of location. (II.C.1.c)

The Team found that the library provides effective maintenance and security for its library and learning support services. The Team learned through evidence that the library collaborates with other institutions by sharing materials through interlibrary loan. Library service contracts and databases subscriptions are evaluated annually before renewal for continued relevance to curriculum and student learning needs. (II.C.1.d, II.C.1.e)

The Team found that the library has developed service outcomes but could not verify that these outcomes are assessed regularly. The library does use surveys, provided as evidence to the Team, to identify student and faculty needs. The library further monitors its collection through annual "age of collection" reports and services through program review and utilizes the results of these assessments for improvement. The library recently developed a new assessment method for library orientations that will be implemented in 2014-15. (II.C.2)

Conclusions

The College meets the Standard.

Laney College's Library and Learning Support Services provides students and staff with access to necessary information and learning resources and services, which contribute to student success and support its mission and educational programs. On-going fiscal support for Laney's Library and Learning Support Services will contribute to institutional effectiveness and the College's ability to continue to support student learning and provide for greater student success. (II.C.1)

The library monitors its collections and responds to survey results by making necessary improvements. The library has service outcomes, but there was no evidence that these were assessed regularly. (II.C.2)

Recommendations

None

Standard III – Resources

Standard III.A – Human Resources

General Observations

The Human Resource function for the College is organized and staffed at the District level. The College works closely with the District to ensure that it employs qualified personnel regardless of their job responsibilities or classification to support student learning programs and services. District hiring policies and procedures for hiring faculty, staff, and administrators are delineated in board policies and bargaining agreements, and have been developed through participatory governance processes. The College is committed to diversity and the equitable treatment of all employees and offers a wide range of opportunities for professional growth and development consistent with the College's mission and in response to the identified needs of its employees.

The Team reviewed documents and conducted interviews with faculty, administration, staff, and students. Almost universally, faculty and staff noted how complicated, redundant, and slow human resources processes are. Examples included excessive amounts of paperwork when completing position requests and the fact that technology has not been used effectively to streamline processes. Faculty and staff also reported that the hiring processes were slow and took months to complete. The reduction in staffing due to recent budget cuts seems to have exacerbated these issues. Key staff positions are vacant.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found by reviewing documents that clear qualifications are established and these are communicated in position announcements in the hiring and selection of all employees. The Team found that faculty positions are identified as a result of the faculty prioritization process and minimum qualifications are established and verified throughout the breadth of the search and selection process. Classified and administrative positions are well communicated in all documents, and qualifications are developed based on college needs as identified in the institutional planning processes. Multiple policies, procedures, and practices are in place to select qualified personnel that can facilitate successful student learning. Faculty are given the primary role in selecting their faculty peers. (III.A.1.a)

Evaluations are systematic, formal, and conducted based on scheduled timelines. The Team found that the requirements for employee evaluations are established in board policy and administrative procedure. Evaluation procedures for faculty and staff are delineated in the negotiated contracts and administered by Human Resources. The Team was provided evidence which showed that some classified evaluations had not been completed; however, the President informed the Team that all of these evaluations were in process and would be completed by the end of the month. The Team learned that some faculty evaluations are back logged due to an insufficient number of full-time faculty available to conduct these evaluations. The faculty tenure review process is effective and provides specifically for improvement of instruction as a component of granting tenure. (III.A.1.b)

The Team found, by reviewing evidence and conducting interviews with the Human Resources Director, constituent leaders, and members of constituent groups, that discussion and documentation of effectiveness in producing student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes occurs in the self-evaluation component of faculty evaluations. The Team learned that this element of the faculty self-evaluation was just added last semester although there was no evidence that contract language was modified to reflect this addition. (III.A.1.c)

The Team found that the institution is guided by numerous policies and administrative procedures that establish professional standards of behavior and ethical codes of conduct for all college staff. These policies are effective and the principles and practices contained within them are adhered to by all district and college staff. (III.A.1.d)

The institution works creatively to maintain adequate staffing levels in order to fulfill its mission. The Team learned that the College lost $9 million in revenue because of budget cuts. In order to address this shortfall, the College eliminated key faculty, staff, and administrative positions. After the passage of Prop 30, some of the College's revenue was restored. Additionally, a new, locally-approved parcel tax provided further relief, and the College has continued to hire approved positions. The Team found that currently the College lacks a sufficient number of full-time faculty necessary to support all the needs of the institution. The Team also learned that the College has experienced a number of turnovers in administrative positions over the past few years and currently has three administrative positions with interims in place. In conversations with faculty and staff, this turnover in academic positions has adversely affected college operations. Those individuals who were interviewed noted that there had been a loss of institutional memory, roles and responsibilities were not clear, and often they did not know who was responsible for certain functions of college operations. Through the College's planning processes, the College has identified the key faculty, staff, and administrative positions that need to be filled to ensure the College maintains progress on its Educational Master Plan. (III.A.2)

The institution has an effective process for the development of personnel policies and procedures, which includes the appropriate governance constituents. New policies, procedures, and changes to existing policies and procedures are reviewed by the Planning and Budget Council, which is a District wide participatory governance group. There are policies and regulations to ensure fairness in all employment procedures and practices. The Team found through a review of board policies, that review and updates to policies occur regularly. (III.A.3, III.A.3.a)

The Team found that personnel files are located in a security code file system accessed only by the Human Resources staff. All medical files are secured and housed separately from personnel files. Any employee may make a request to review his/her personnel file in the presence of Human Resources staff. The processes for doing so are articulated in the collective bargaining agreements. (III.A.3.b)

Through review of evidence the Team found that the institution has policies and practices that demonstrate understanding and concern for issues of equality and diversity. More specifically, Board Policy 7100, Commitment to Diversity and Administrative Procedure 7102, Diversity Internship Program place a high value on the role of diversity in support of student learning.

The District has an Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee charged with "creating ongoing and intellectual dialog, increasing our efforts to recruit, hire, and retain a diverse workforce, and reviewing and updates policies and procedures." (III.A.4)

The Team found that the College ensures that effective programs, practices, and services are provided to address the diverse needs of faculty, staff, and administrators. These include professional development; specialized orientations, trainings, and workshops administrative services training and meetings; ceremonial events; and incentives such as extra compensation and released time. In a recent survey, 80% of respondents agree that the College demonstrated its commitment to diversity and over 75% agreed that the College develops its personnel through appropriate activities. (III.A.4.a)

The institution regularly evaluates its employment record on equity and diversity. The commitment to diversity is evidenced in the demographic makeup of the workforce. As reported in the self-evaluation, the makeup of permanent faculty includes 49% white, 21.7% African American, 13.9% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 12% Latino/Hispanic. For permanent classified staff, the makeup is 14% white, 41% African American, 29% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 10% Latino/Hispanic. The administrative demographics somewhat mirror the classified staff with 14% white, 35.7% African American, 21.4% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 28.5% Latino/Hispanic. These numbers compare very favorably with the overall makeup for the Laney service area: 35% white, 19.8% African American, 19.5% Asian, and 20% Latino/Hispanic. The College has an excellent track record in attracting a diverse workforce. (III.A.4.b)

Administrative Procedure 7380, Ethics, Civility, and Mutual Respect, outlines the institution's expectations for the treatment of employees. Administrative Procedure 5500, Student Standards of Conduct, Discipline Procedures, and Due Process and Administrative Procedure 5530, Student Rights and Grievance Procedure address the expectations for students. (III.A.4.c)

The Team found that employees of Laney College have opportunities for continued professional development that are consistent with the institution's mission and based on the needs of college personnel. In-service activities are regularly offered that improve employees' diversity awareness, leadership skills, and use of technology and management tools. Three FLEX days are also provided at the beginning of each semester to provide faculty with further opportunities for training in pedagogy, student learning outcomes assessment, instructional technology, and distance education, to mention a few. (III.A.5, II.A.5.a)

The Team found that the College needs to develop a more systematic and formal evaluation of it professional development programs and use the results of these evaluations as the basis for improving future professional development opportunities. (III.A.5.b)

The College assesses its human resource needs through the use of program review, annual unit plans and updates, and administrative unit reviews. These planning processes ensure that the College has engaged in a rigorous review of needs. The College plans are then integrated with the District's institutional, participatory planning vehicle, the Planning and Budgeting Integration Model. However, there is a lack resources allocated in order to assure adequate staffing to meeting the needs of programs and services. (III.A.6)

Conclusions

The College does not fully meet the Standard. Specifically, the College does not meet Standards III.A.2 and III.A.6.

The College has processes in place to identify, hire, and evaluate qualified faculty and staff to ensure the integrity of programs and services. Numerous professional development opportunities are available for all employees. The institution is committed to fostering an appreciation of diversity and has established numerous policies and procedures to ensure all employees are treated equitably.

However, at the time of the visit, the College lacked a sufficient number of full-time faculty necessary to support all the needs of the institution. The College has experienced a number of turnovers in administrative positions over the past few years and currently has three administrative positions with interims in place. This turnover in academic positions has adversely affected college operations. In addition, while the College engages in a process of assessing its needs, the District process needs to be evaluated in order to allocate resources to support the planning priorities of the Colleges.

District Recommendations: Institutional Effectiveness

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

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

Standard III.B – Physical Resources

General Observations

Laney College is an urban campus centrally located near Chinatown and Lake Merritt at 900 Fallon Street in one of Oakland's development zones. Built in 1969, Laney's main complex of 517,475 square feet is an arrangement of 19 contiguous two-story reinforced concrete buildings with brick façade, holding 265 classrooms, and dominated by the nine-story Tower Administration building, which houses administrative and faculty offices. The upper level of the campus is arranged in quads around small, planted courtyards. Many of the CTE classrooms, labs, shops, and offices are located on the ground level; the upper level houses most of the general education, liberal arts, and science facilities. Within the past decade, the College has added a new 19,000 square-foot, one-story building which houses art and ceramics classes; and an 18,000 square-foot, two story Athletic Field House.

Laney College's Educational Master Plan (2010) is intended to guide the prioritization of capital improvement projects, informed by the Peralta Community College District Strategic Plan. Laney collaborates with the District to develop long-range facilities master plans based on educational master planning efforts at the College. In addition to generating a comprehensive priority list, the District Facilities Planning Committee developed a Facilities Master Plan that was embedded in the 2010 Education Master Plan. The Facilities Planning Committee continues to review facilities-related needs identified annually in departmental program review documents and unit plan updates. In 2013, Laney completed a comprehensive, long-range facilities master plan that would substantially redesign and remodel the entire campus.

For major infrastructure upgrades, the District Department of General Services (DGS) has available capital funds (Bond Measures A and E). The District earmarked $144,000,000 from Measure A to Laney College for capital outlays, which is roughly commensurate to the College's comparative gross square footage area. Laney was also allocated $25 million from Measure E bond funds. These funds have been used for a range of purposes, from cosmetic upgrades of classrooms, labs, and offices across campus, to construction of the new Field House, renovation of the Laney Bistro and cooking and baking labs, and renovation of the Laney Tower Administration Building. Funds have also been earmarked for renovation of the Laney Student Center ($18 million), construction of an ultra-low-energy demonstration facility ($4.5 million), and construction of a new Library and Learning Resources Center.

Findings and Evidence

The main documents the College uses to support and address its facility needs are the Five-Year Construction Plan and the Scheduled Maintenance Five-Year Plan. Attention to safety is demonstrated through activities that include regular meetings of the District Safety Committee and the District wide Facilities Committee and safety presentations and forums on campus. Laney College's Health and Safety Committee and Facilities Planning Committee also focus on safety. The District Office of Risk Management periodically offers trainings, safety workshops, and a reporting process for accidents or injuries. (III.B.1)

Through document review and interviews, the Team verified that program facilities needs are identified, analyzed, and discussed during the College's planning processes. This process includes identifying equipment and facilities needs in annual program updates and the three-year comprehensive program reviews. Each year, physical resource needs are prioritized at the College using established criteria. This prioritized list is forwarded to the DGS, then to the District wide Facilities Committee, where facilities resource needs, including deferred maintenance and emergency items, are discussed further, prioritized District wide, and then sent to the District's Planning and Budgeting Council for further review and final recommendations to the Chancellor. (III.B.1)

Significant improvements have been and continue to be made to the facilities of the College. Most recently, those improvements include infrastructure and aesthetics, including leak remediation, breezeway repair, improved lighting, and other projects. However, the absence of funding for predictive maintenance, preventative maintenance, and routine maintenance capacity, planning, and execution serves to further exacerbate and quicken the deterioration of facilities. Of concern is the need to assure the effectiveness and reliability of various safety devices on campus, such as fire alarms systems in buildings, emergency telephones, and emergency call buttons. (III.B.1)

Facilities planning and maintenance involves several participatory governance bodies, including the College Facilities Planning Committee, District wide Facilities Committee, and District wide Planning and Budgeting Council. District General Services (DGS) is responsible for providing expertise on facilities issues, as well as maintenance and repair services. The College has processes in place for facilities planning, prioritizing college maintenance needs, and identifying emergency facilities work. For several years, maintenance was deferred at the College, resulting in a significant backlog in deferred maintenance. In reviewing the backlog list, the Team noted that the backlog is decreasing. However, the unaddressed maintenance items, many of which are for classroom and laboratory deficiencies, indicates that either oversight processes may not be effective in directing the work of DGS or that maintenance is not funded at a level that allows the necessary work to be done. In either event, the Institutional Self-Evaluation (ISE) indicates that deferred maintenance is negatively affecting the learning environment for students. Evidence of this includes non-working and failing plumbing in laboratories, broken blinds in classrooms, uneven flooring in classrooms, culinary appliances needing repairs, and a poorly installed welding exhaust system. (III.B.1.a)

The College Health and Safety Committee, a participatory governance committee, makes recommendations on policies that concern health and safety. The committee also reviews disaster and emergency preparedness and response, fire and earthquake information, American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, and campus signage. The local fire department conducts inspections; the District Department of General Services conducts occasional safety inspections to detect unsafe conditions. For new construction and upgrade projects that involve ADA compliance, DGS submits construction documents and specifications to the California Division of the State Architect (DSA) for review and approval. DSA provides design and construction oversight and also develops accessibility, structural safety, and historical building codes and standards utilized in various public and private buildings throughout the state. (III.B.1.b)

The College, however, indicates that a lack of custodial personnel is causing a lower level of cleanliness on campus, and that the custodial department "struggles to keep graffiti, dirt, debris and bacteria at bay." The evaluation Team confirmed through interviews and evidence that there are deferred safety issues, and preventative maintenance that is not occurring due to the shortage of stationary engineers and funding for facilities projects. As of spring 2014, there were 35 emergency items listed from the program reviews (six campus wide and 29 department-specific items). The evaluation Team reviewed qualitative data provided by the College that indicated while the students appear to be mostly satisfied with the level of safety, security, access, and healthful environment on campus, the faculty and staff are split on the topic, with 46% disagreeing and 43% agreeing, with 10% neutral. The evaluation Team found evidence via the County of Alameda Sheriff's crime statistics and the District's Clery Report that crime statistics had decreased in 2013 from levels seen in 2012. (III.B.1.b)

The College and District identify Laney's long-term physical resource needs by utilizing the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). The more short-term physical resource needs are identified by utilizing the College's program review process. However the evaluation Team discovered through interviews that the process and criteria used by the District for prioritization of short-term facilities needs is not clearly defined or systematically communicated with the College. The faculty-staff survey in spring 2014 overwhelmingly showed that the majority of college end users do not believe that physical resources to support Laney's programs and services meet or enhance student learning needs. (III.B.2)

Capital construction projects are prioritized at the District level via the Five Year Capital Outlay Plan (5YCP) and the Laney College FMP, which are in alignment with the College's mission, goals, and objectives. The Team did not find evidence that the District and College account for the total cost of ownership of new facilities by considering all costs associated with building assets from acquisition to disposal/replacement. The evaluation Team was provided a 2014 district total cost of ownership program document that has been produced; however, the practice of planning and budgeting for the total cost of ownership aspects at the College is not documented. The evaluation Team recommends implementing total cost of ownership principles for new construction and equipment, while implementing a comprehensive preventive maintenance program to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of current physical facilities and mechanical equipment. (III.B.2.a)

The College uses institutional planning as a precursor to resource planning and assesses effective use of facilities annually at multiple levels, including program, unit, division, and participatory governance. However, through interviews and document review the Team was not able to identify a regular and systematic evaluation process related to the effective use of physical resources and the use of results as the basis for continuous improvement. (III.B.2.b)

Conclusions

The College does not fully meet the Standard. Specifically, the College does not meet Standards III.B.1, III.B.1.a, III.B2, and III.B.2.a.

While the College has a specific and documented facilities planning and prioritization process, campus constituent groups identified a lack of timeliness in response from the District to provide safe and sufficient physical facilities for students, faculty and staff. (III.B.1) While evaluation and planning processes exist at the College and are detailed in the ISE and indicated through campus documents and interviews, the evidence suggests deferred maintenance issues have not been resolved in a timely manner and safety issues have a negative impact on the learning process and campus activities. (III.B.1.a) It appears that critical health and safety conditions exist at the College that have not been addressed by the District staff responsible for such work. (III.B.1.b)

The College has provided evidence that shows short term physical resource needs are identified through the program review process, and prioritized requests are provided to DGS and thus, the District Facilities Planning Committee. The 2014 faculty-staff accreditation survey provides qualitative evidence that the College does not meet the expectation of faculty and staff regarding the physical facilities meeting and enhancing student learning needs. (III.B.2) The District and college seek to fully account for the total cost of ownership of new facilities; however, the evaluation Team did not clearly witness the total cost of ownership principles at work on the Laney College campus. The level of deferred maintenance and lack of routine and preventive maintenance is evident throughout the College (III.B.2.a). Through participatory governance at the College and district level, physical resource needs are regularly identified and integrated with institutional planning. The evaluation Team, however, was not able to confirm through interviews and document review that there was a regular ongoing assessment of the effective use of physical resources. (III.B.2.b)

District Recommendations:

Global Planning

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

Institutional Effectiveness

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

Standard III.C – Technology Resources

General Observations

The Peralta Community College District centralizes the acquisition, maintenance, and replacement of technology and infrastructure. The District is moving to implement the PeopleSoft Academic Advising module by Spring 2015, which is tied to student success initiatives. Moodle is used for Distance Education offerings and is hosted on an external server and integrated with PeopleSoft.

Teaching and learning are supported through the technology resources available at and through the Laney Technology Center; most Laney College students responding to a 2014 student survey responded in a positive manner when asked about computer access sufficiency.

The support and maintenance for network and administrative systems is within the purview of the PCCD Office of Information Technology. Infrastructure improvements have been made and are evidenced in FY 2013-14, with a project to improve the College's wireless access points and availability currently being planned.

The College's program review process identifies technology needs throughout programs, with the self-evaluation reporting that faculty, staff, and administrators prioritize a list of equipment and technology needs via the Laney College Technology Committee; however, the Team found little evidence that outlines the criteria for prioritization. (III.C.2)

Findings and Evidence

The 2014 Institutional Self Evaluation (ISE) and interviews with key personnel confirmed that Laney College has improved its technology infrastructure in recent years including increasing the number of smart classrooms from two to 27 in 2011. Other technology resources on campus include the Oliver Writing Center, DSPS lab, library, the Welcome and Assessment Center, as well as specific student tracking software applications. Laney also utilizes a number of technology solutions including the PeopleSoft CS suite, WordPress, PROMPT, Alertify, Moodle, and PASSPORT. Additionally, many faculty are provided online course shells and just-in-time training to enhance student learning. (III.C.1)

The Team verified that the College's Educational Master Plan (EMP) technology goals and District Technology goals are linked to Laney's Institutional Strategic Goals. However, their ISE (p.232) states that "There are over 200 instructional classrooms. While there are many wireless access points most of them are outdated and obsolete. Unfortunately they do not provide adequate coverage, bandwidth nor density needed for instructional engagement; thus, the current effort to seek district support for the expansion of access." Although progress has been made, the acknowledgement of outdated and obsolete wireless access points negatively impacting instructional engagement needs to be addressed. Wireless access points are currently placed on campus but appear to have limited service for students and inadequate bandwidth. Interviews indicated that progress is currently being made during spring 2015 to complete the wireless access point project, partially funded by Measure A. (III.C.1.a.)

The District/college is moving towards virtualization, as they are currently in phase 1 of the project. PeopleSoft serves as the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), where the Campus Solutions component, e.g., gradebook, serves the needs of students. The District/college is currently implementing the financial aid component of the ERP, which will automate many of the manual functions creating greater efficiencies for students and staff. (III.C.1.a.)

Much of the training provided to Laney College employees historically via a specific vender (ProMedia trained on their 25 new smart classrooms) is now institutionalized. Additional training is provided during professional development week, ad hoc, or as the result of reviewing helpdesk ticket trends. Peralta District offers two training events for district IT staff each year, and a member of the A/V lab was made a smart classroom trainer providing individual appointments. However, according to the ISE, "the district has no formal training plan in place to address District wide technology training needs" (p.235). The Team suggests the development of a formal training plan. Although there are a number of Moodle training opportunities for faculty and staff, the ISE states that "Moodle training for students does not currently exist at the colleges" (p.236). The Team verified in interviews that only a few training videos are provided to online students and there are no systems in place to assess students' educational preparation for DE courses. The Team suggests developing a DE preparation assessment for students, and comprehensive Moodle training/tutorials for students should be appropriately linked to facilitate student learning. Although helpdesk tickets are reported to be reviewed for trends that result in training offerings, no evidence was provided. Specific trainings, such as "CurricuCamp," faculty noted in interviews, are effective in encouraging and facilitating faculty to review and launch curriculum revisions. There is limited evidence that supports the idea that technology training occurs related to the inclusion of technology campus wide, especially to students as technology end users. There is also little evidence that Laney College assesses/ensures that the training and technical support it provides to faculty, staff, and students is effective. The Team suggests assessing/evaluating the training and technical support provided and using those results to improve subsequent trainings and technical support. (III.C.1.b)

During interviews members of the Technology Committee referenced evidence indicating a cycle of maintenance/replacement for end-of-life equipment is in use resulting in all fulltime faculty receiving new laptops in 2014-15 in support of instruction. Based on interviews, it appears that there is lack of ongoing budget related to supporting and advancing technology at Laney College; however, the Technology Committed cited that this year there was a $50,000 allocation specifically for technology maintenance/repair from the general fund. (III.C.1.c)

Team review of the EMP, Information Technology Strategy, the District's Planning and Budgeting Integration Model (PBIM), the five-year Facilities/Construction Plan, minutes of the District Technology Committee, and the Planning and Budgeting Council, and results from interviews with the District Technology Committee members and the Technology Planning Committee show a lack of systematic integration of technology planning and institutional planning. The technology plan is in need of an update, which is in process, and specific projects need to be completed (such as the wireless project) in support of student learning. Following program review and analysis of technology requests by the Technology Planning Committee,

these requests are prioritized with a standard rubric which integrates technology priorities with the request in other resource areas. Available funding, or lack thereof, then determines the items for purchase/implementation. The District Department of Institutional Research (DOIR) has robust data systems that could serve as a foundation for planning and evaluation. However, the Team notes from interviews and the ISE that the lack of research capacity at the College itself negatively impacts the planning, implementation, and evaluation cycle at the College. (III.C.2)

Conclusions

The College does not fully meet the Standard. Specifically, the College does not meet Standard III.C.2.

Through its use of formal technology planning processes, the College assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning and teaching (III.C.1) The services and support provided by the PCCD Office of Information Technology are often adequate in ensuring the effectiveness of the College's facilities, hardware, and software are successfully planned, implemented to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the College, given the available budget. (III.C.1.a) Laney College offered 269 distance education courses in academic year 2013-14 serving a total of 9,484 students. Yet student LMS assessment and familiarity training for Moodle do not currently exist at the College. Thus, quality training in the effective application of its information technology is not provided to students. Moreover, there is no process in place to ensure the training and technical support provided are appropriate and effective (III.C.1.b). As illustrated with the wireless access points, the College systematically plans and acquires, but does not systematically maintain, upgrade, or replace its technology infrastructure/equipment to meet institutional needs (III.C.1.c). The distribution and utilization of technology resources do not fully support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services. (III.C.1.d)

The Team commends the District wide leveraging of resources (e.g. Merritt College's Educational Technology Program) to provide employee training in online teaching as well as the creative implementation of specific technology trainings, such as "CurricuCamp." (III.C.1.b). Further the District's institutional research department is commended for its work in creating a robust data system for a complex multi-college district.

District Recommendation:

Institutional Effectiveness

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

Standard III.D – Financial Resources

General Observations

Laney College operates under a district implemented budget allocation model, structured in principle by SB 361. Laney College is very dependent on district personnel to handle financial planning and fiscal accountability, manage financial resources and reserves, and ensure fiscal stability. The District management of annual apportionment to the College, other state and local revenues, categorical revenues, COLA appropriations, policies and procedures, and the District's ending balance/mandated reserve provides a level of assurance and expectation for both short and long term fiscal solvency.

The District has undertaken much work in order to meet ACCJC Standards related to fiscal accountability and controls, long term stability, and correcting financial control issues identified through past fiscal year external audit reports. This work culminated with the notification from ACCJC on July 3, 2013 that the Peralta district had taken its significant budget problems seriously and intently, with the result being the District is in "healthy financial condition". The budget allocation model (BAM), having been partially implemented at the College, appears to be a shortcoming when focusing on funding levels at the College. In theory, the model is fair, predictable and consistent, and uses quantitative, verifiable factors that allocate fiscal resources equitably and allow for the College to plan for future growth goals. However, from review of documents and interviews with college and district personnel, the evaluators note that the BAM has not been fully implemented and this has resulted in a significantly lower level of funding at the College than what is outlined in the model, thus having a negative impact on programs and services, the physical plant condition in particular.

The allocation and planning for financial resources is integrated into the planning process and participatory governance structure. The College and District have an integrated planning and budgeting framework that relies upon the District's mission and strategic goals as a foundation for financial planning. The District's Planning and Budgeting Integration Model allows for constituent and college-based communication and input in developing the budget. However, the evaluators note from interviews at the College that there is dissatisfaction about the resource allocation process at the District level.

The District Visiting Team interviewed six financial aid staff representing the Peralta District. The objective of the meeting was to review the Financial Aid findings from the District's Annual Financial Audit Report for 2013-2014.

Findings and Evidence

During fiscal year 2013-14, the District continued to partially utilize the BAM. Financial planning at Laney is integrated with the College's participatory governance and planning processes. Annual financial planning for all the Peralta colleges is aligned with the District's strategic goals. Via the College's program review process, and prioritized through the College's participatory governance committees, the District planning and budget council reviews the resource request priorities submitted by the College president, and makes final recommendations to the District chancellor as part of the District budget development process. (III.D.1.a)

The District uses an integrated planning and budget calendar, which is updated annually, to allow for a coordinated and timely approach to budget development. The District's budget allocation model is rooted in FTES production at each college, which theoretically allocates revenue to each college in accordance with the actual FTES produced. Review of college allocations as well as through interviews, the Team notes that the District is not following the BAM, resulting in a shortcoming related funding for Laney College. This has negatively impacted programs and services, particularly as they relate to institutional research, financial accountability and management, and facilities planning. A special parcel tax was passed by local voters that produce local revenue for the Peralta colleges. This additional revenue has proved helpful in very lean financial times, and has allowed the District to stabilize its reserves and available unrestricted funding. The College actively pursues grant funding as an alternative funding source to augment the general fund. (III.D.1.b)

The District's FY 14/15 budget assumptions include payment of long-term liabilities and obligations. OPEB liabilities are considered via actuarial reports and funded through a transfer out of the District's GF in order to keep up with ongoing long-term costs. The District's total OPEB bond obligation is $218 million. According to the District's financial statement findings and recommendations for the year ended June 30, 2014, the District has $215 million of investments related to the OPEB obligation; however the investments are not in an irrevocable trust which limits the ability of these assets to be used to offset the District's obligation (audit finding 2014-001). BP 6200 outlines the requirement for a minimum 5% minimum fund balance reserve. Cash flow reports are created and analyzed to determine the need for TRANs, none were needed in 13/14 or 14/15.The District did show a deficit fund balance of $1.6 million at year end 2014 in its Self-Insurance Fund. The District projects a positive ending balance in FY 14/15, in excess of the mandated 5% minimum fund balance. (III.D.1.c)

The District has adequate board policies and procedures for budget development and financial planning. The District also has a specific "Retirement Board" established in 2011, which has the responsibility and authority to oversee the management of the OPEB Trust for retiree health benefits. The Retirement Board has fiduciary responsibility for the OPEB program and uses the Retirement Board's investment policy statement as a framework for investment-related decision-making. The District planning and budget committee has recommended procedures for financial planning and budget development, with the constituents participating in the committee having the opportunity to develop the institutional financial plans and budgets. The College's Planning and Budget Committee engages in budget development and resource allocation funding in relation to requests originating from the program review process. (III.D.1.d)

The evaluation Team confirmed via meeting minutes that the District planning and budget committee meets regularly and information disseminated related to financial matters which are timely and dependable. The financial management system (PeopleSoft) has appropriate control mechanisms and dependable information production that allow for sound decision making by its users. The constituency groups both the campus and the District have the opportunity to engage with and analyze data that drives financial planning and budget development. The Team verified through interviews and minutes that these reports are presented at participatory governance committee meetings. (III.D.2)

Board policies and procedures are in place that ensures the District and colleges operate with fiscal integrity. There are annual audits, as outlined in Board Policy 6400, conducted by external auditors to investigate the financial condition of the District and the level at which internal controls are in place. Audit findings are organized and addressed in an ongoing process of continuous improvement via the District's Corrective Action Matrix, which tracks and monitors progress towards resolving all audit findings. As indicated in the June 30, 2014 fiscal year-end audit on all financial records of the District, the District received an unmodified audit opinion in relation to its financial statements and a qualified audit opinion related to federal and state compliance. Although the evaluation Team found appropriate Board policies and procedures that produce an acceptable level of credibility and accuracy related to financial documents, the evaluation Team noted during interviews a general dissatisfaction that the College receives adequate financial resources to support student learning programs and services. (III.D.2.a)

The 2013 and 2014 external audit report and associated Corrective Action Matrix outline the steps the District has taken or will take to remedy the weaknesses or deficiencies uncovered by the external audit Team. The 2013 audit finding for failure to report all student loan disbursements to the Direct Loan Servicing System via the Common Origination and Disbursement within 30 days of disbursement (audit finding 2013-008) was not remedied and was a repeat finding in the 2014 external audit report (audit finding 2014-004). The 2013 audit finding related to residency determination for credit course (audit finding 2013-010) was remediated , however there was a related challenge warranting the finding to be repeated again in 2014 financial audit (audit finding 2014-09). In order to meet the standard, the Team recommends that the District resolve the ongoing deficiencies identified in the 2013 and 2014 external audit findings (III.D.2.b).

Key financial information is disseminated to the Laney College community throughout the year in a timely manner using different methods. The Team confirmed through meeting minutes and interviews that the College's Budget Advisory Council reviews budget detail at the College level. In addition, the College budget director regularly meets and shares information with budget managers. Further, the director does budget presentations at campus-wide events and at division level meetings. (III.D.2.c)

The District provides oversight of finances and ensures that their use is consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source. The evaluation Team's review of external audit reports confirmed that the District is "exercising diligence in monitoring all budgets and continues to spend within its parameters". The District received an unmodified opinion related to the District's financial statements for the District's external financial audit for the year ending June 30, 2014. There is, however, a district audit finding (audit finding 2014-010) related to the District utilizing State Education Protection Account revenue on administrative position salaries. The audit stated that the District did not have controls in place to ensure that the District was in compliance regarding spending EPA funds. (III.D.2.d)

The District's internal controls over financial reporting have been found to be appropriate as indicated in the 2014 district external audit report. (III.D.2.e)

The Peralta district has established sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, and has been increasing available reserves over the last three years. Board Policy 6250 mandates unrestricted reserves shall be no less than 5%, with the funded reserve at year ending 2013-14 exceeding 12% as a percentage of total outgo. Cash flow has been sufficient over the past two fiscal years in spite of state funding volatility, allowing the District to avoid any borrowing from the county or other lending institutions in order to meet financial obligations. The District directly purchases insurance policies and participates in joint self-funded programs with other school and community college districts to meet anticipated risks and liabilities, however, as evidence in the District's 2014 financial audit, the District Self-Insurance Fund had a funding deficit of $1.6 million at fiscal year-end 2014. According to the 2014 Peralta CCD Financial Report, "As the fiscal year 2014-2015 progresses, the District is exercising diligence in monitoring all budgets and continues to spend within its parameters." (III.D.3.a)

The District is subject to an annual external financial audit as well as to internal audit processes. Deficiencies identified in the District's 2014 external financial audit, a reflection of the financial management and reporting practices, have been noted in the 2014 financial audit report, including deficiencies in the financial aid and student residency reporting processes. (III.D.3.b)

The District appropriately adheres to GASB 45 guidelines relative to its other postemployment benefits (OPEB) obligation and liabilities. Steps have been taken over the last few years to address the issues and concerns raised by the ACCJC about the long-term sustainability of the District's OPEB program. By restructuring the debt service in 2011 and the implementation of the OPEB charge, savings were identified as well as a dedicated revenue stream that will fund the actuarial accrued liability. With this being said, an audit finding was delivered in the District's 2014 external financial audit that found a material weakness (audit finding 2014-001) related to the lack of an established vehicle from which payments can be made to offset the District's future OPEB obligations. The external financial auditors recommended "long-term planning for the continued financial stability of the District should continue to include attention to obligations that will be coming due in the future, such as the OPEB and the annual line of credit repayments." In 2012, the District renegotiated collective bargaining agreements related to health and welfare benefits, controlling costs and saving the District approximately $500,000 annually. Accumulated unpaid vacation benefits are accrued as a liability as the benefits are earned. The entire compensated absence liability is reported on the government-wide financial statements. For governmental funds, the current portion of unpaid compensated absences is recognized upon the occurrence of relevant events such as employee resignations and retirements that occur prior to year end that have not yet been paid with expendable available financial resources. (III.D.3.c)

The District conducted an actuarial study on the OPEB liability as of Nov., 2012, and was in compliance with GASB 43 and 45. The study included estimates for the District's retiree health program and analyzed results from a cash flow adequacy test under Actuarial Standard Practice 6. The District's Annual Financial Report for the year ending June 30, 2014 shows that a new actuarial report is being developed to determine the future value of the OPEB liability. (III.D.3.d)

Any locally incurred debt is assessed and appropriate allocations are made through the District's annual budget planning process. (III.D.3.e)

The College's student loan default rate as of FY 2013-14 is at 13.5%, well within acceptable parameters set by the State Chancellor's Office. However, per the external financial audit prepared for Peralta Community College District for the period ended June 30, 2014, the College has failed to meet the standard of managing student loans to ensure compliance with federal regulations, specifically not having adequate documentation to show that the Colleges were reconciling the SAS data file and the Loan Detail records to the institution's financial records on a monthly basis for two years in a row. The audit finding for 2013 (audit finding 2013-008) remained unresolved in 2014 (audit finding 2014-004). The Team suggests that the College monitor the Direct Loan disbursement to ensure compliance with 34 CFR sections 685.102(b), 685.301, and 303. (III.D.3.f)

Board Policy 6340 governs the letting of contracts within the District, while Administrative Procedure 6340 guides the internal process of contracting with the District. Bid limits and specific contractual language requirements are provided in AP 6340 by the College are consistent with the goals and mission of the institution and contain appropriate terminology that best serves and protects the College and district. (III.D.3.g)

The District primarily relies on the annual external audit to ensure regular review and improvement in financial management practices, with any findings in the audits being consolidated in a Corrective Action Matrix prepared for timely remediation. Evidence shows a survey was conducted district wide, called the PBIM Assessment Survey, June 2014, where the Planning and Budget Model was assessed, however the survey instrument, the qualitative data produced, and sample size was under-powered which limited its generalizability. (III.D.3.h)

The evaluation Team, through comprehensive interviews and evidence requests and review, could not validate the College systematically assesses how effectively financial resources are used, and that results of an assessment are regularly used for improvement. The Team recommends that the District systematically evaluate the processes in order to allocate resources to support the planning priorities of the Colleges. (III.D.4)

Conclusions

The District does not meet the standard. However, the College meets the components of the standard that apply directly to the College.

The College engages in financial planning with the program review process being the vehicle that delivers resource allocation needs from the College to the District for funding consideration. (III.D.1.a) The District has not fully implemented the BAM, and this has resulted in a significantly lower level of funding at the College than what is outlined in the model, thus having a negative impact on programs and services, the physical plant condition in particular. Local voters passed a special parcel tax that produces local revenue for the Peralta colleges which has proved helpful in very lean financial times, and has allowed the District to stabilize its reserves and available unrestricted funding. (III.D.1.b) The District has not remedied the 2014 audit

recommendations outlined in its corrective action plan (2014-001) in order to address the OPEB liability and workers' compensation contribution fund deficit; therefore, the Team recommends the audit findings must be addressed to assure financial stability (III.D.1.c). The evaluation Team found evidence that outlines the work undertaken by the College participatory-based governance committees to develop institutional plans and budgets, including evidence of budget development prioritization criteria. (III.D.1.d)

The financial management system at the District has appropriate control mechanisms and the ability to generate timely reports. (III.D.2). The District received an unmodified audit opinion in relation to its financial statements, while a qualified audit opinion related to federal and state compliance aspects. (III.D.2.a) The evaluation Team credits the District in responding to most prior year financial audit findings; however, there are instances where findings have not been remediated comprehensively and in a timely manner. In order to meet the standard, the Team recommends that the District resolve the ongoing deficiencies identified in the 2013 and 2014 external audit findings (III.D.2.b) The College's Budget Advisory Council is a constituency-based group that actively reviews budget detail, with evidence showing financial information being disseminated institution-wide. (III.D.2.c). The District provides oversight of finances and ensures that their use is consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source. The Team suggests that the District have controls in place to ensure that it is in compliance with spending EPA funds. (III.D.2.d). The evaluation Team found the District's internal controls over financial reporting have been found to be appropriate as evidenced by the 2014 district external audit report (III.D.2.e).

The District currently maintains sufficient cash flow and reserves as of the 2014 external audit financial report; however the Team suggests the sunset of additional revenue stream related to the local parcel tax and EPA funding are significant issues that require advance planning. (III.D.3.a) The evaluation Team found evidence that deficiencies identified in the 2013 and 2014 external audit and financial report related to financial aid and student residency reporting, and recommends the deficiencies are remediated. (III.D.3.b) The 2014 financial audit reports the District has committed to a corrective action plan in alignment with the 2014 financial audit report finding related to OPEB liabilities, inclusive of establishing an irrevocable trust for investment assets related to the OPEB obligation. To ensure appropriate funding stream to fund ongoing OPEB debt, the evaluation Team recommends this corrective action be undertaken in a timely manner. (III.D.3.c) An OPEB actuarial study was completed in November, 2012, and the College indicates that another study will be completed as a result of the 2014 financial audit report. (III.D.3.d) The evaluation Team verified that the District's annual budget planning process takes into consideration any locally incurred debt. (III.D.3.e)

The evaluation Team identified evidence in the District's 2014 financial audit report that indicated compliance with Federal student loan program was not met, which was also a finding in the 2013 financial audit report. The College's student loan default rate in 2013-14, however, was acceptable. The evaluation Team suggests that the District implement policies and procedures to verify that the SAS data file and the Loan Detail records per the COD are reconciled to the institution's financial records. (III.D.3.f) The Team found in Board policy and administrative regulation that the District provides appropriate oversight to ensure that the College contracts are in alignment with the goals and mission of the institution and that proper

language is used to serve and protect the College and District. (III.D.3.g) The evaluation Team found that the District primarily relies on the annual external audit to ensure regular review and improvement in financial management practices, with any findings in the audits being consolidated in a Corrective Action Matrix prepared for timely remediation (III.D.3.h)

The College does not systematically assess how effectively financial resources are utilized, and how well financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The Team recommends collecting and analyzing feedback and data to guide the College's continuous improvement related to financial management. (III.D.4)

Recommendations:

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

In order to meet the standard, the Team recommends that the District resolve the ongoing deficiencies identified in the 2013 and 2014 external audit findings (III.D.2.b).

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

Recommendations

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

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

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

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance

IV.A – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Comments

At Laney College all segments of the institution are included and empowered to participate in decision-making. College participatory governance structures facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The College recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

Board Policies, Administrative Procedures, and governance structures define the roles of faculty, staff, administrators, and students in the governance of the College and decision-making processes. The College leadership and governing board demonstrate their dedication to the success of the College through their respect for input and recommendations from the many voices of college constituencies. Laney College administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution.

Laney College works responsibly and cooperatively in complying with the standards, policies, and guidelines of external regulatory agencies such as the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), the U.S. Department of Education, the Department of Labor, the National Science Foundation, and other external agencies. The College advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in those relationships.

Laney College's evaluations are locally developed and include end-of-year discussion sessions within planning and resource-related governance groups, the College Council, and other essential committees. Most often, these discussions take the form of check-ins within committees, involving a review of the initially established goals and objectives compared to achievement they have made to evaluate their progress and any necessary improvements to processes or effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

The Team found through review of documents and interviews with campus leaders that Laney College has participatory governance processes that support a culture of inclusiveness and improvement. The College encourages its staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter their official title, to take initiative in improving practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. Based on results from a 2014 faculty and staff survey, 84% of respondents indicated they understand their role in helping Laney College achieve its goals. This same survey, however, also indicated that many individuals do not feel they are as well-informed as they could be about how governance groups participate in college and institutional improvement, and only 43% of the respondents rated the performance of participatory governance as "good" or "excellent." (IV.A.1)

Although there are defined processes for communication from the various participatory governance committees, the Team observed during the interviews that there was a lack of clarity among campus constituent groups about the process and who was responsible for the implementation of plans. Based on interviews, campus leaders indicated a need for greater systemization of college processes. Such systemization they felt would provide for greater accountability, transparency, and participatory governance oversight. Further, once approved, processes would need to be evaluated to determine their effectiveness (IV.A.1)

College committees provide the framework for discussion, planning, and implementation of activities that facilitate and promote institutional excellence. This framework promotes collaboration and engagement of all internal constituents, including students, in the discussion of the College's operation, finances, and future. The work of committees at Laney College is guided by the College's core values: collaboration, respect, appreciation, diversity, integrity, accountability, innovation, and competence. College planning documents describe a process whereby the College president brings forward recommendations from the College's participatory governance processes to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees for decision. Board Policy 2510 and Administrative Procedures 2410 and 2511 reinforce the value of College wide decision-making and confirm the rights and role of each member in participatory governance activity. The faculty, administrators, students, and staff have a role in institutional governance and exercise a voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget. (IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

The College relies on faculty, its Academic Senate, the curriculum committee, and administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services. The Team found the role of the students in the participatory process was limited. The Team found through interviews with students that they do not feel included in planning processes and would like more training and their class schedules given greater consideration when setting meetings, which would allow for greater student participation on governance committees and in processes. Several committees of the College have increased student membership in an effort to increase student participation, but the Team found that the committees still do not feel inviting to the students and the students are often having difficulty in figuring out how to gain entry into the participatory governance process of the College. (IV.A.2.b)

The Team found that college administrators, faculty, staff, and students participate on campus wide committees and work together for the good of the institution. The Team concluded through review of minutes and interviews with faculty, staff, and students that the committee structure at the College provides venues for various ideas to be shared openly, and input from different constituencies to be made before decisions are rendered. During interviews with Team members, leaders of constituent groups spoke candidly about subjects and were aware of and engaged with the big issues of the College. (IV.A.3)

The Team verified that Laney College has submitted extensive reports to the Commission and has done so effectively and in a timely manner, responding to concerns raised by the Commission when it was within its purview of responsibility to do so. It was apparent that extensive preparations had been made for the current accreditation cycle providing evidence of the College's responsiveness to the Commission. The comprehensive self-evaluation, containing

signatures from the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the President and the constituent groups, assures that the College adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and policies of the Commission. It should be noted that the College has not submitted a substantive change proposal for distance learning although there are certain programs that have over 50% of their courses approved for distance learning. (IV.A.4)

The Team was unable to find significant evidence to verify the College's statement that "college decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness." There are regular end of the year retreats to review accomplishments; however, they are not systematic to address whether the institution's governance and decision making structures are effective. Further, the Team concluded from interviews that the evaluation was general, qualitative, and anecdotal in nature. Documentation of meeting agendas and minutes is inconsistent and in some cases not posted to committee websites, limiting communication by participatory governance groups to the larger campus community. (IV.A.5)

Conclusions

The College does not fully meet the Standard. Specifically, the College does not meet Standard IV.A.5.

Laney College provides for an inclusive environment in which all constituent groups have the opportunity for a role in the governance of the institution (IV.A.1). Board policies, along with administrative procedures, define the roles of faculty, staff, administrators, and students in the governance of the College and decision-making processes. The College could make greater effort to provide training for students and accommodate their class schedules to allow for greater student participation on governance committees and in processes. (IV.A.2, IVA.2.a)

To increase the overall perception of substantive constituencies' participation with the performance of participatory governance, the College needs to work on ways to better inform the College community about how governance groups participate in college and institutional improvement and how this input translates into college action. Additionally, the College needs to systemize the processes so that sufficient time is available to proceed through the participatory governance process in a timely manner. (IV.A.3)

Laney College committees need to conduct formal, regular assessments to assure their role in college governance and decision-making has integrity and is effective. The College needs to document its work. (IV.A.5)

Recommendations

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

Standard IV.B – Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The Peralta Community College District is governed by an elected Board of Trustees consisting of seven members elected from specific geographic areas and two non-voting student members. Terms for elected members are four years, and elections are staggered to ensure continuity; student trustees serve a one-year term and may serve a maximum of two terms. The Board is an independent policy-making body. Board policy defines the Board's responsibilities, which include establishing policies to monitor educational quality, set prudent legal standards, and assure fiscal health and stability. Board policies also direct the processes for the selection and evaluation of the Chancellor and the delegation of authority.

The trustees select the Chancellor as the CEO of the District and delegate to the Chancellor the authority and responsibility for the operations of the District. The District has a Function Map that specifies each of the accreditation standards as primary, secondary, or shared functions for the District and/or the Colleges. Four district-level committees provide a participatory governance structure that coordinates planning, decision-making, and collaboration for the District. The committees hold a summit at the beginning of each year to review topics and issues that need to be addressed by the District.

The President is the chief administrator at the College level. The College is organized into four units, two led by vice presidents, instruction and student services, respectively, one by the director of business and administrative services and the other by the college president. There are six deans in instruction and student services units who have responsibilities in both of those areas. College governance is exercised through participatory governance committees. The Faculty and Classified Senate are two bodies that provide leadership for the two constituent groups—faculty and classified staff. The College faces the challenge of structural budget deficits dating to 2012-13. The shortfall in funding from the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) has created this structural deficit.

Findings and Evidence

BP 2200, Board Duties and Responsibilities, defines the responsibilities of the governing board, including representing the public interest; establishing policies that define the institutional mission and set prudent, ethical, and legal standards; assuring fiscal health and responsibility; monitoring institutional performance and educational quality; advocating for and protecting the District; delegating power and authority to the Chancellor; hiring and evaluating the Chancellor; respecting the authority of the Chancellor; and delegating authority to the Chancellor to issue regulations and directives. Several board policies are central to these responsibilities: BP 2431, Chancellor Selection; BP 2430, Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor; and BP 2435, Evaluation of the Chancellor. In interviews at the District and College, the Team found that members of the governing board may have stepped beyond a policy making role. (IV.B.1)

The governing board is an independent policy-making body. Evidence confirms that meetings are held at times and places accessible to the general public and that public comment is invited, in keeping with BP 2345, Public Participation at Board Meetings. The Board's Code of Ethics

and Standards of Practice are contained in BP 2715 and direct the Board to act as a whole and to speak on behalf of the District, not as individuals. Board members file annual conflict of interest reports to the state and district. (IV.B.1.a)

The District's mission statement, contained in BP 1200, identifies the mission of the District as empowering student achievement, developing leaders, and providing students with equitable access to achieve or exceed their goals. Board policies related to academic affairs and student services are developed and reviewed by the Board; the Chancellor leads the development and review of the associated administrative regulations. (IV.B.1.b)

Board policy 2200, Board Duties and Responsibilities, sets forth the responsibility to establish policies to monitor educational quality, set legal standards, and assure fiscal health and stability. The governing board publishes a Board Policy Manual that contains by-laws delineating the Board's composition (BP 2010, 2015, and 2200), duties and responsibilities (BP 2200, 2710, and 2715), organizational structure (BP 2010, 2015, 2100, 2210, and 2740), and operating procedures (BP 2100, 2310, 2315, 2330, 2340, 2345, 2360, 2510, 2710, 2715, and 2745). The Board policies also are published on the District website. (IV.B.1.c-d)

As part of its annual evaluation in December, the Board reviews its performance in light of its code of ethics and standards of procedure. Through interviews, the Team learned that Board members may have stepped beyond their role of policy into areas where authority was delegated to the Chancellor. The District adopted the format for policies and procedures of the Community College League of California (CCLC) in 2011, and all policies and procedures were reapproved at that time. Since then, many policies and procedures have been reviewed and further updated; no policies or procedures are older than 2011. However, the Team did not locate a schedule for the ongoing, regular review of board policies and administrative regulations. (IV.B.1.e)

The seven board members are elected to staggered four-year terms and two student members elected to one-year terms. BP 2100, Board Elections, contains the election policies for board members. The process for board development is addressed in BP 2740, Board Education. New members and the Board president are provided with an orientation. In addition, board members are encouraged to attend annually at least one professional conference or workshop conducted by one of the associations for community college trustees. Further, the Board conducts study sessions on focused topics at least once each year. (IV.B.1.f)

BP 2745, Board Evaluation, establishes the annual evaluation process for the governing board. In mid-November, Board members are given a self-evaluation questionnaire that they return by the end of November. The tabulated results are discussed during a board workshop in December. The self-evaluation is intended to share views, values, concerns, priorities, and recommendations among the Board members. The Team validated that the Board conducted an evaluation in December 2014. Board members also use the workshop to identify past accomplishments and to set goals for the following year. (IV.B.1.g)

BP 2715 Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice was approved in October 2012. The code directs allegations of code violations to the President of the Board, or to the vice president, if the President's behavior is in question. The President will first discuss the violation with the Board

member to reach a resolution. If necessary, the President brings the matter to the full board for possible sanctions, which may include a recommendation for censure. (IV.B.1.h)

In November 2013, the Board held a study session on accreditation. In July 2014, the Chancellor gave a detailed report to the Board on the Colleges' accreditation work. In December 2014, the governing board participated in a special workshop on the topic of accreditation. All reports to the Commission are placed on the Board's agendas for review and approval. The Board is regularly updated on the status of responses to the various evaluations and action letters. In addition, the Board participates in various conferences where accreditation is discussed. (IV.B.1.i)

The governing board selects the Chancellor of the District, as defined in BP 2431, Chancellor Selection. The current chancellor was selected in July 2012 and has announced he will retire in June 2015. The role and responsibilities of the Chancellor are set forth in BP 2430, Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor. After receiving a recommendation from the commission about micromanaging the Chancellor, the Board has delegated responsibility for district administration to the Chancellor. However, in interviews at the District and College, the Team learned that the Board members may have stepped beyond their policy making role into areas where the authority and responsibility has been delegated to the Chancellor. The Team recommends that the Board delegate full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer board policy without board interference. (IV.B.1.j)

Annual evaluations of the Chancellor are held in closed session, as discussed in BP 2435, Evaluation of the Chancellor. The Board's last formal evaluation of the Chancellor was in June 2014, although the evaluation of the Chancellor appeared on board agendas three times in the first two months of 2015. AP 7123 sets the selection process for the College President. The evaluation of the President is discussed in AP 7126, Management Performance Evaluation. The President was evaluated most recently in June 2014. (IV.B.1.j).

The President leads the campus of 125 full-time equivalent faculty members, 92 full-time equivalent classified staff, and 17 administrators, including five grant funded positions. The College's current organizational structure grew out of institutional cuts made in 2010. By 2012, the effects of the cuts were recognized as harming the College, and three administrative positions were rehired. (IV.B.2.a)

There are four units in the College: Instruction and Instructional Support Services (academic affairs); Student Support Services (student affairs); Business & Administrative Services; and the Offices of the President. Each unit is led by a member of the executive council. Notably the vice presidents of instruction and student services share some responsibility for academic and student affairs units as each supervises deans who have assigned responsibilities in both academics and student affairs. While the combination of student affairs and academic affairs responsibilities is not common in dean-level positions, the College reports that it has resulted in balanced workloads, a shared and integrated responsibility for student success, a collective understanding, and increased collaboration. Through interviews, the Team found general satisfaction with the structure of the dean positions although concerns were voiced about workloads and training. For Business and Administrative Services, the President is seeking a

reclassification of the director to change to vice president of Business and Administrative Services. Within the Offices of the President, the public information officer and the College researcher positions were eliminated during the recession, and the functions of those offices were centralized at the District. In 2011-12, the College put forward a reorganization plan to restore those positions. The Team confirmed that a request to advertise the College researcher position had been submitted to the District at the time of this visit. (IV.B.2.a)

The President leads institutional improvement of the College learning environment through collegial processes. This is demonstrated in the periodic review and development of the College mission, vision, and values conducted in the educational master planning process. One result was the development of five institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) and goals in 2010 that continue to be used. The President works with the District and College on the development of standards for student performance and institutional performance standards. The President ensures that planning and evaluation is done on an annual cycle using institutional and student data and analysis. (IV.B.2.b)

The College receives most of its institutional data from the District Office of Institutional Research (DOIR), which has increased staffing in recent years. The Team verified that the DOIR has robust data systems with data modeling capabilities and commends the DOIR for the development of these systems. However, interviews at the campus level reflected a lack of research capacity at the campus level to advance evidence-based planning and evaluation. The College has requested funding for a research position at the campus. (IV.B.2.b)

In May 2014, an end-of-the-year college retreat was held with more than 100 faculty, staff, and students learning about, discussing, and analyzing data, which formed the basis for the setting of measurable outcomes for 2014-15. Resource needs are identified in the educational master plan, unit level plans, and annual program review updates. Examples of resource needs that were identified, prioritized and met include CurricUNET curriculum software, Taskstream software, Turnitin software, hiring of faculty and staff, and the restoration of an ongoing program of professional development for faculty, classified staff, and administrators. At the same time, the College faces the challenge of an allocation deficit due to the partial implementation of the Budget Allocation Model. (IV.B.2.b)

The President serves as a member of the Chief Executive Officers (CEO) board for the California Community College League, which provides the President the ability to learn about and influence laws before they are enacted by the legislature. The President is well informed on California Educational Code, Title 5, and other regulatory requirements, and is charged with the implementation of board policies and administrative procedures at the College. Through the development of planning documents and the work of the administrative team, the President assures the College's compliance with applicable laws, regulations, policies, and procedures. The President communicates a deliberate and consistent view of the College centered in the mission, vision, values, goals, and performance of the College. (IV.B.2.c)

The President guides the budget planning and expenditure process, following the College's budget and planning framework and principles. The processes and principles appear adequate for the purpose of monitoring and controlling expenditures. (IV.B.2.d)

The President is a member of, and participates in, a number of professional organizations, institutional associations, community organizations, and partnerships with local agencies, including business/industry, education, non-profit, and government. The President maintains visibility in local media by authoring articles and college advertisements. The College hosts meetings and events for the community, including a mayoral forum in 2014, a statewide ESL summit in 2013, a manufacturing summit in 2012, and a White House summit in 2014. (IV.B.2.e)

Administrative Procedure 2430, Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor's Staff, delineates the delegation of authority from the Chancellor to the Presidents and the vice chancellors. The Chancellor's Cabinet meets weekly and consists of the College presidents, vice chancellors, associate vice chancellors, general counsel, and the executive director of public information. The cabinet provides coordination and ongoing support for the effective operation of the Colleges. The ISE includes a Function Map for the District and colleges that specifies each of the accreditation standards as a primary, secondary, or shared function for the District and for the Colleges. Through interviews, the Team found that the District did not adhere consistently to the delineation of responsibilities. The Team recommends that the District clearly delineate and communicate the operational responsibilities and functions of the District from those of the Colleges and consistently adhere to this delineation in practice. (IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a).

The District provides services to support the Colleges in five areas: educational services, finance, general services, human resources, and information technology. Each of the four participatory governance committees at the District level is co-chaired by a District administrator and a College representative. This committee structure maintains a connection between district services and the Colleges. Through interviews, the Team heard concerns about the level of funding for the College to maintain quality programs and services particularly as they relate to deferred maintenance that impacts safety and the student learning environment. The most recent review of the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) was initiated in 2013-14 and resulted in the revisions in December 2014. However, the College has not received its full base allocation and as such has a structural deficit since 2012-13; in interviews the College personnel indicated that they had never received what the BAM indicated should be its full base allocation. The Team recommends that the District evaluate the effectiveness of the services it provides to support the missions and operations of the Colleges in order to assure adequacy and quality. (IV.B.3.b-c)

The Chancellor has responsibility for the District's budget and delegates management of the budget to the chief financial officer. The President is responsible for operating the College within its budget. The Board has two policies, BP 6200, Budget Preparation, and BP 6300, Fiscal Management and Accounting, and two administrative procedures, AP 6200, Budget Management, and AP 6300, General Accounting, which set controls for the fiscal management of the District and colleges. The District presents the findings of the annual audit to the District Planning and Budgeting Committee, the Chancellor's Cabinet, and the governing board. Except for the OPEB liability and associated debt services, the District controls its expenditures. (IV.B.3.d)

Administrative Procedure 2430, Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor's Staff, describes the responsibilities of the College president, including compliance of college personnel with board policies and administrative procedures and leadership of the campus governance in an annual review of board policies, administrative procedures, and operating procedures. The Chancellor meets weekly with the Cabinet, which includes the Presidents, to discuss District and college concerns, institutional planning and resource allocation, operations, and initiatives. (IV.B.3.e)

The District, through the Chancellor, exercises its defined role as liaison between the Colleges and the Board. The Chancellor submits information on behalf of the Colleges to the Board. The District Academic Senate President provides a report at each board meeting. Through the two student trustees and four student government presidents, the Board receives information about student concerns and activities. Information about the Board is posted on the District website and is available to all internal and external constituents of the District and College. (IV.B.3.f)

In 2013, a survey was completed by 300 employees to measure satisfaction with District, and the results were posted on a website. The four district level participatory governance committees gather for a summit at the beginning of each year to review topics and issues that need to be addressed by the District. Each of the committees then sets its annual goals, following the District's strategic planning goals and objectives. At the end of the year, the committees participate in a survey of their members, with the results provided at the fall semester summit. The 2014 review of the committees resulted in improvements: committee composition, enhanced definitions of roles and processes, additional expectations for accountability, and alignment with District strategic goals and objectives. The review, however, does not include the documentation and evaluation of the processes that integrate the human, facilities, and fiscal planning that allocates resources to support the College priorities. A function map was developed for the ISE to delineate the responsibilities of the District and colleges. The Team did not find evidence of an evaluation of the effectiveness of the delineation of District roles and responsibilities as they support the College. Through interviews at the College, the Team heard concerns about the District not consistently adhering to the delineation of responsibilities. The Team recommends that the District regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the delineation of District roles and responsibilities to assure their effectiveness in supporting the Colleges. (IV.B.3.g)

Conclusions

The College does not meet the Standard.

The Peralta Community College District has a functioning governing board with appropriate board policies to define its nature, duties and responsibilities, codes of ethics, mission, and activities. Board Policy 2430, Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor, establishes the chancellor as the sole employee of the governing board. Through interviews at the District and College, the Team learned of more recent activities that indicate the Board has not fully delegated responsibility to the Chancellor. While the District has no board policies older than 2011, the Team is concerned that there is no schedule for the regular and ongoing review of board policies. The Board is active and well informed about the accreditation processes and requirements. (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.i, IV.B.1.j)

The College employs a distinctive organizational structure for its academic and student affairs deans. Through interviews at the College, the Team confirmed there is general satisfaction with the dual responsibilities of the deans although there were some specific concerns about workloads and training. The President provides leadership to the College and is an active member of the community and her professional associations. (IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.e)

The District is engaged in the delineation of responsibilities, but the Team heard concerns that the District does not consistently adhere to the delineation. (IV.B.3)

The College has identified a shortfall in funding from the Budget Allocation Model that has resulted in budget deficits each year at least since 2012-13. The Team is concerned that there is no plan for the elimination of the deficits. The College has identified several deferred maintenance issues that are negatively impacting safety and the student learning environment. (II.B.1.a, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c)

Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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