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)."

I. Introduction

Recommendation 8 addresses the need for the District to systematically evaluate: 1.) the equitable distribution of resources, and, 2.) the effectiveness of services provided in supporting the operations of the Colleges.

II. Equitable Distribution of Resources: PCCD's Budget Allocation Model (BAM)

Each year, the Peralta Community College District establishes Institutional Goals and Objectives that are assessed throughout the year. One of the five 2015-2016 Strategic Goals was: "Strengthen Accountability, Innovation and Collaboration." Tied to this Institutional Goal was Objective D.3: Institutional Effectiveness: Evaluate and update the PBIM participatory governance structure and the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) [DR8.1]. The reason for updating BAM was due primarily to the need for the District to evaluate BAM's system for the distributing resources equitably.

A. Description of the PCCD Budget Allocation Model (BAM)

Since 2011, when it was adopted by the District's Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), the District's Budget Allocation Model (BAM) has functioned as the primary mechanism for determining equitable resource allocations for the District's four College, and, indirectly, to the District Office for its Support Services [DR8.2]. The model has been revised four times, with the most current iteration approved by the PBC in December 2014 [DR8.3].

The core elements of the BAM are:

1. a demonstrative linkage between strategic planning and funding at all levels;
2. an allocation methodology that is equitable and clearly documented;
3. a model that closely tracks how revenues are received from the State of California.
4. a model based on the SB 361 State allocation model.

The BAM was designed to allocate fiscal resources (unrestricted revenues) in a transparent and equitable manner, i.e., treating similar things similarly, to the four Colleges and is comprised of state apportionment funds, non-state apportionment funds, and Parcel Tax proceeds. State apportionment funds represent approximately 70% of the District's unrestricted revenues. The remaining 30% of unrestricted revenues is comprised of Parcel Tax proceeds, state lottery funds, and non-resident tuition/fees.

The BAM provides each of the four Peralta Colleges with an allocation based on its *pro-rata* share of the credit FTES revenues generated by each College. In order to provide stability, to minimize the impacts of annual enrollment swings, and to assist in multi-year planning, these revenues are distributed based on a three-year rolling enrollment FTES average. These distributions are equitable given the *pro-rata* basis of FTES generation.

Additional growth funding, when provided by the State, is allocated to the Colleges based on incremental FTES generated, as well as on the achievement of certain productivity targets, i.e., productivity = FTES/ FTEF or a workload/ efficiency measure that determines full time equivalent faculty need to generate "x" amount of FTES (full time equivalent students) upon which our state funding is based. Moreover, the Model has a built-in 'incentive program' with respect to productivity levels, rewarding those Colleges that meet their productivity targets with additional resources. This incentive measure, however, was never implemented.

The BAM takes into account, albeit indirectly, relevant District responsibilities such as the 50% law, full-time/part-time faculty requirements, attendance accounting, audit requirements, fiscal accounting standards, procurement and contract law, employment relations and collective bargaining, OPEB debt, and payroll processing and related reporting requirements. The District Office—including Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Educational Services, Human Resources, Finance, IT, Maintenance and Operations—provides centralized support services that align with the District's Mission [DR8.4].

Subsequently, from the Total Revenue Allocation by College, the cost of District Office Support Services, as well as other centralized services, e.g., services for students with disabilities or the payment of debt service on bonds, is deducted. What remains, then, is each College's Annual Budget Allocation.

The intent of the original BAM was that each College would develop its non-discretionary and discretionary budgets based upon its Annual Budget Allocation. Non-discretionary budgets consist of salaries of full-time and part-time faculty, full-time and part-time classified staff, administrators, and related benefits. These budgets approximate 90% of a College's Annual Budget Allocation. Discretionary budgets include supplies, equipment, utilities, and other miscellaneous expenditures, comprising approximately 10%.

In 2014, in order to achieve a more equitable allocation of resources, the BAM was revised twice to include, among other changes, allocating non-resident tuition revenues to those Colleges who were generating them (and, indeed, directly supporting the non-resident students) as opposed to distributing them on a pro rata share of total FTES generated by each College as the Model required. This change to the Model, while approved and documented, was not implemented as two Colleges would have benefited from the change and two would have suffered hardship.

In August 2015, a new Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (VCFA) was hired. The VCFA quickly determined that, while the BAM had been partially implemented over the past few years from the revenue side, the District had yet to fully implement accountability on the expenditure side of the equation. Colleges had continued to underspend or overspend, compared with annual resource allocations, based on their respective situations. The VCFA then recommended to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) the establishment of a

Task Force to evaluate and revise the existing BAM.

B. Establishment of a BAM Task Force

The BAM Task Force was convened under the purview of the PBC and began its work in October 2015. The nine-member Task Force includes: representatives from each College (including faculty, staff, and administration), a Student Trustee, the District's Budget Director and the VCFA. The BAM Task Force was charged with reviewing the current allocation Model and making recommendations to the PBC to enhance the equitable distribution of resources to all four Colleges. The following goals were established by the Task Force at its initial meeting: 1.) to become conversant with the current Budget Allocation Model; 2.) to possess an understanding of budgeting language; 3.) to determine if the Budget Allocation Model is the right model for the District; 4.) to identify disparities/inequities in the current model; and, 5.) to determine the level of understanding across the District of the BAM [DR8.5].

In addition to establishing the above goals, at its November 2015 meeting, the Task Force examined what was perceived to be inequities in the BAM having to do with the distribution of full-time faculty seniority. Another perceived inequity in the BAM had to do with the high-cost programs such as nursing (and their relation to productivity), non-resident enrollment distribution, and fixed costs [DR8.6].

The Task Force conducted a survey to solicit feedback regarding perceived strengths and shortcomings of the current BAM. Recurrent concerns included the need for: more education (training), CTE dialogue, accountability, alternative funding sources, inclusion of administrative costs, considerations for classified hiring, and the examination of fixed costs. Results were evaluated, further defining the work of the Task Force [DR8.7].

Meeting twice per month, on average, over the past year, the Task Force reported its progress monthly to the PBC, and Task Force minutes were posted on the District's Website [DR8.8].

C. Recommendations of the BAM Task Force

Forums were held in Spring 2016 to allow the College and District constituents to discuss BAM Task Force findings [DR8.9] [DR8.10] [DR8.11].

In August 2016 the BAM Task Force presented its preliminary recommendations to the District during its annual Flex event [DR8.12]. Intended to enhance the equitable distribution of resources within the existing BAM, recommendations included:

1. Removing all full time faculty salary and benefits costs from each College's allocation. The FTF expense, then, will be accounted for "above the line" meaning that salary and benefits will be deducted from the pool of 'available funds' prior to applying the distribution formula and thereby reducing available revenues. Colleges will then be held "harmless" for the seniority of its faculty pool.
2. Maintaining the decentralized allocation of fixed costs and basing future allocations on prior year actuals. Further, centralizing all security costs under the District Office budget so that they are shared more equitably by all Colleges.

3. Making no changes with respect to resource allocations and capped courses. The Task Force concluded that CTE courses have no significant disproportionate impact on College productivity levels.

4. Forming a separate Task Force to review and assess service levels, efficacy, and reasonableness of costs associated with all District Office support services.

5. Allocating the appropriate level of Custodians based on Industry Best Practices and an acceptable standard of facility cleanliness.

A final Task Force Recommendations Report was presented to the District's PBIM Summit in August 2016 [DR8.13]. The Task Force anticipates concluding its work in early Fall 2016 with final recommendations presented to the PBC in November. Upon adoption of the revised BAM, the District's goal is to approve a revised allocation model to be implemented in the development of the 2017-2018 budgets.

III. District Program Review and Resource Allocation Processes

In addition to the BAM, there are four Planning and Budgeting Integration (PBI) resource allocation processes that pertain to the effectiveness of District Services and the operation of the Colleges. These processes are central to Program Review (College and District) and govern the distribution of:

- Faculty Resources
- Staff Resources
- Technology Resources
- Facilities Resources

The resource allocation processes begin with each College's respective governance committee prioritizing its resource needs as part of Program Review. The College resource requests, along with requests from the District Service Centers, are then moved forward to the appropriate District PBIM Committee, typically in the form of prioritized lists and without regard to budget considerations. The final requests are moved to PBC [DR8.14].

IV. Faculty and Staff Resource Allocation

The District Education Committee receives prioritized faculty and staff requests, the District Technology Committee receives prioritized technology requests, and the District Facilities Committee receives prioritized facilities requests from the Colleges. These requests are discussed in their respective PBIM Committees and forwarded to the District's Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) for deliberation and endorsement. The various resource requests, along with PBC recommendations, are then sent to the Cabinet for review and to the Chancellor for final approval.

The District Educational Service Committee reviews the prioritized requests for replacement and new faculty hires that are forwarded each year from the Colleges.   This year, the PBC approved the development of a Resource Allocation Task Force for Classified Staffing (RATF-CS) that will prioritize College and District staff requests into a master list for PBC review [DR8.15]. The addition of this Task Force will aim to prioritize replacement and new staffing needs in the same way that new and replacement faculty needs are now currently ranked, i.e., each College creates a prioritized list which are reviewed by the appropriate District PBIM Committee and then forwarded to PBC for discussion and approval (contingent on funding). These resources allocations are explained in more detail in District Recommendation 4.

V. District Technology Resource Allocation

In the past few years, PCCD has not produced an effective technology environment, although the District has had some dedicated IT members. And although there exists an IT Plan to serve the District and the four Colleges, the District has faced unforeseen challenges in executing the IT Plan. Challenges include: turnover of key leadership, insufficient knowledge of Best IT Practices and methodologies, lack of clearly defined business practices and funding models, and the lack of sound priorities. Additional

challenges include the lack of District wide policies and procedures that align College IT support with District IT support, and inadequate human and capital resources to support the ever-changing IT environment.   Nevertheless, the District has had a dedicated IT team doing their best with limited resources.

Because IT Planning has not always been acknowledged as a high priority, PCCD did not always appropriate adequate financial resources, nor display a commitment to assure the quality and continuity for District wide IT support. The four Colleges compensated by having to develop their own IT plans which have not been typically shared with District IT leadership, nor reviewed by District leadership.   College IT related planning information has generally been secured on an "as needed" basis, or whenever the Colleges faced a crisis situation. What's more, much equipment is approaching "end of life" or is at "end of life" condition, which has put additional strain on the limited staff resources and resulting in College projects not being addressed or taking too much time to implement.

In February 2016, the Chancellor recommended a major restructuring and change of leadership in the IT District Service Center owing primarily to security, safety, and student success considerations. A consultant firm had been brought in at the end of 2015, to conduct an IT assessment [DR8.16]. The consultant firm presented a draft five-year Tactical Plan to management, which will be presented to DTC in early Fall 2016. DTC will then make a recommendation to PBC regarding the adoption of the Plan. Furthermore, the Tactical Plan was reviewed and internally vetted by IT Leadership and the VP for Finance and Administration in March 2016. The consultant firm presented highlights of the Tactical Plan at the July Governing Board Retreat [DR8.17].

The change in IT leadership brought about a change in IT goals. Changes included plans to increase IT staffing and supplemental training for existing staff [DR8.18]. In May

2016, an interim Director of IT Services was appointed, an experienced IT Senior Analyst who had served Laney College for over 15 years. The Interim Director hired one new hourly Help Desk Support Technician. It is anticipated that another Help Desk Support Technician will be hired in September 2016. These Technicians will be working alongside IT leadership in the creation of a comprehensive IT Service Center. The Service Center will include: helpdesk ticket prioritization, the upgrading of software, the creation of an Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL), a Service Catalog, configuration management, call scripts, and Service Level Agreements.

In Summer 2016, the consultant firm conducted a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis of IT Staff which is scheduled to be completed in late August. A summary will go to DTC in early Fall. After DTC review, steps will be taken to make changes to the infrastructure and to enhance service-oriented processes [DR8.19]. Currently, the ITIL is being introduced to the IT department as a guide for the creation of processes that follow IT Best Practices [DR8.20]. IT has also contributed significantly to the design of the PCCD TCO Guidelines (See Recommendation 3, TCO Guidelines). Furthermore, PCCD has established an IT Steering Committee that provides oversight for the District Office of IT. This Steering Committee, comprised of Vice Chancellors, and IT Administration and Staff originally met monthly and is now moving to bi-weekly (every other week) meetings to prioritize the project work of IT and to review new IT requests [DR8.21].

The District Technology Committee (DTC) is the central body that reviews and recommends various IT Projects for the Colleges. At times, the DTC was hindered by lack of leadership which affected morale resulting in weakened oversight to the District and Colleges. Nevertheless, the DTC worked in collaboration with District General Services to develop the TCO Guidelines and to adopt better practices for addressing deferred maintenance and security needs. Finally, the DTC worked to complete a room scheduling software project, completion of a master map of IT infrastructure, and

continues to make progress on other goals [DR8.22]. The DTC will be evaluating its 2015-2016 goals at its September 2016 meeting [DR8.23].

VI. District General Services (DGS) Resource Allocation

The District General Service Center addresses the following prioritized requests: Daily Work order requests (to include emergencies), routine maintenance requests, deferred maintenance requests, and preventive maintenance requests. Since October 2015, the DFC has met with all the Colleges to determine their needs regarding the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Guidelines that are being crafted by the District. These Guidelines were presented to the DFC and PBC at their May meeting, revised in Summer 2016, and presented at the District August 2016 Flex and District PBIM August 2016 Summit for discussion.

In Spring 2016, the number of outstanding facilities and maintenance requests has been significantly reduced and safety conditions addressed. In July 2016, a Director of Capital Projects was hired to address Bond projects such as new construction. A Staff Services Specialist, Project Manager for Maintenance and Operations, a Director of Facilities and Operations, among other staff, are expected to be hired by October 2016. The hiring of additional staff has enabled the Vice Chancellor of General Services to more effectively utilize his time to address critical facilities and maintenance operation needs (See Recommendation 3 for an extended discussion of DGS provided services for the Colleges and the revision and implementation of TCO Guidelines).

VII. Human Resources Staffing Plan

As described in District Recommendation 5, in May 2016, the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources presented PCCD's Staffing Plan to the Presidents Council, Cabinet, and PBC [DR8.24]. This comprehensive Plan addresses the allocation of staffing resources and

includes a new component, Resource Allocation Task Force-Classified Staffing (RATF-CS) wherein new staffing requests that are not addressed in Program Review will be included. (See Section IV. Faculty and Staff Resource Allocation).

During the District August 2016 Flex, the Staffing Plan was presented at a "Q and A" session [DR8.25]. College forums may be held in Fall 2016 to respond to questions and to elicit further suggestions. The Staffing Plan will be assessed in April 2017. (See Recommendation 5 for an extended discussion of Human Resources Services).

VIII. Conclusion

PCCD has a variety of resource allocation mechanisms in place that were revised this year. The 2015-2016 year was focused on revising and implementing plans to review and enhance the equitable distribution of resources. Most importantly, changes such as the revision of the BAM, the creation of a comprehensive Human Resources Staffing Plan, the creation of TCO Guidelines, the revision of the IT Plan, the refinement of Program Review, and the addition of much needed staffing in DGS, promise that the District will continue to ensure the sufficiency and effectiveness of District-provided services in supporting effective operations of the Colleges and continue to meet Standards IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.h. The continued evaluation of District support for the effective operations of the Colleges in 2016-2017, will serve to measure the District's revised planning efforts.

RECOMMENDATION 8: DISTRICT RESPONSES	
Evidence	Title of Evidence Document
DR8.1	PCCD 2015-2016 Strategic Goals and Institutional Objectives
DR8.2	PBC Meeting Minutes May 20, 2011 BAM Model
DR8.3	PBC Meeting Minutes, Dec. 12, 2014
DR8.4	BAM Power Point Presentation, Nov. 17, 2014
DR8.5	BAM Task Force Minutes, Oct. 16, 2015
DR8.6	BAM Task Force Minutes, Nov. 19, 2015 Inequities
DR8.7	BAM Opinion Survey Results
DR8.8	Screen Shot BAM Task Force Report of Progress to PBC

DR8.9	BAM Task Force Forum, Feb 29, 2016
DR8.10	Laney College BAM Forum
DR8.11	BCC BAM and Budget Forum
DR8.12	District Flex Agenda and Meeting Notice
DR8.13	PBIM Summit Agenda and BAM Task Force Recommendations
DR8.14	PBC Meeting Minutes, Dec. 18, 2015: College/District Resource Requests
DR8.15	PBC Meeting Minutes, Mar.18, 2016: Ad Hoc Committee-Classified Staffing
DR8.16	IT Assessment
DR8.17	July 12, 2016 Board Retreat agenda
DR8.18	IT Goals
DR8.19	SWOT Analysis Handout
DR8.20	ITIL Presentation & Service Training
DR8.21	IT Steering Committee Notes, Aug. 3, 2016
DR8.22	PCCD IT PMO Dashboard
DR8.23	DTC Goals and Objectives
DR8.24	PBC Meeting Minutes, May 27, 2016
DR8.25	District's Human Resource Staffing Plan

INDEX OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

A&R	Admissions and Records
ACCJC	Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
ADA	American Disabilities Act
AP	Administrative Policy
APPA	Association of Physical Plant Administrators
APU	Annual Program Update
BAM	Budget Allocation Model
BAMTF	Budget Allocation Model Task Force
BCC	Berkeley City College
BEST	Building Environmental Sustainability for Tomorrow
BLVD	Boulevard
BP	Board Policy
C	Chancellor
C-DIRECT	Chancellor's Direct Communication

C-GRAM	Weekly report from Chancellor keep the Governing Board informed of important District activities
CAP	Compliance Assurance Program
CARS	Convertible Auction Rate Securities
CCCCO	California Community College Chancellor's Office
CCLC	Community College League of California
COA	College of Alameda
COD	Common Origination and Disbursement
CTE	Career Technical Education
DAC	District Administrative Center
DAS	District Academic Senate
DE	Distance Education
DEC	District Education Committee
DFC	District wide Facilities Committee
DGS	District General Services
DR	District Response
DSP	Disabled Service
DTC	District Technology Committee
DW	District Wide
EMP	Education Master Plan
EVC	Executive Vice Chancellor
FCA	Facility Conditions Assessment
FF&E	Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment
FTEF	Full Time Equivalent Faculty
FTES	Full Time Equivalent Student
FUSION	Facilities Utilization Space Inventory Options Net
FY	Fiscal Year
GASB	Governmental Accounting Standards Board

GAT	Grants Administration Team
HR	Human Resources
HVAC	Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning
IPB	Institutional Planning Budget
IR	Institutional Research
IT	Information Technology
ITIL	Information Technology Infrastructure Library
JD	Job Description
JPA	Joint Powers Agreement
LAO	Legislative Analyst Office
LC	Laney College
LED	Light Emitting Diode
LOC	Letter of Credit
LRC	Learning Resource Center
M&O	Maintenance and Operations
MEP	Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing
MIS	Management Information Systems
MLDAP	Management Leadership Development Academy Peralta
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
OPEB	Other Post-Employment Benefits
PBC	Planning and Budgeting Council
PBC	Planning Budget Committee
PBI	Planning and Budgeting Integration
PBIM	Planning and Budgeting Implementation Model
PCCD	Peralta Community College District
PFT	Peralta Federation of Teachers
PMO	Project Management Office

R2T4	Return to Title IV
RATF-CS	Resource Allocation Task Force—Classified Staff
RBC	Royal Bank of Canada
RBOA	Retirement Board of Authority
RFP	Request for Proposal
RFQ	Request for Qualifications
SAS	School Account Statement
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TCO	Total Cost of Ownership
VC	Vice Chancellor
VCFA	Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration
VOIP	Voice Over IP
WAN	Wide Area Network
WDCE	Workforce Development and Continuing Education
WSCH	Weekly Student Contact Hours

REPORT CONTRIBUTORS

Recommendation 1 Team

Ron Little, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, PCCD (Lead)

Joanna Bowes, Financial Advisor, KNN

Judith Boyette, District RBOA Counsel, Hanson & Bridgett

John Palmer, Bond Counsel, Orrick

Tom Wong, Internal Auditor

Ericka Curls-Bartling, Interim General Counsel, PCCD

Recommendation 2 Team

Ron Little, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (Lead)

Adela Esquivel-Swinson, Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Services

David Yang, Director of Fiscal Services

Tom Wong, Internal Auditor

Dave Nguyen, Director of Financial Aid

Recommendation 3 Team

Sadiq B. Ikharo, Vice Chancellor of General Services (Lead)
Rosemary Vazquez, Executive Assistant General Services
Jamille Teer, Senior Secretary, DGS Recorder
Jeff Cook, Facilities Project Coordinator
Atheria Smith, Director of Facilities Planning and Development
Kirk Schuler, Chief Stationary Engineer
Chan Eng, Facilities Project Coordinator
Bruce Shapiro, Director of Facilities

Recommendation 4 Team

Michael Orkin, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services (Lead)
Ron Little, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration

Sadiq Bello Ikharo, Vice Chancellor of General Services
Joseph Bielanski, Berkeley City College faculty

Recommendation 5 Team
Trudy Largent, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources & Employee Relations, (Lead)

Chanelle Whittaker, Director for Employee Relations and Diversity Programs

Cody Pelletier, Senior Human Resource Analyst

Socorro Taylor, Executive Assistant Human Resources & Employee Relations

Venesse Metcalf, Interim Director for Human Resources

Recommendation 6 Team

Michael Orkin, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services (Lead)

Karen Engel, Director of Workforce and Economic Development

Joseph Bielanski, Berkeley City College faculty

Fabian Banga, Chair: Department of Modern Languages, Berkeley City College

Sean Brooke, Director, Office of International Education.

Heads of District Service Centers: Trudy Largent, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources & Employee Relations; Ron Little, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration; Norma Ambriz-Galabriz, Vice Chancellor, Student Services; Sadiq B. Ikharo, Vice Chancellor, General Services

Recommendation 7 Team

Jowel C. Laguerre, Chancellor (Lead)

Yashica Crawford, Chief of Staff

Brenda Martinez, Assistant to the Chancellor and Board Clerk

William C. Riley, Governing Board President

Julina Bonilla, Governing Board Vice President

Recommendation 8 Team

Ron Little, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration (Lead)

Antoine Mehouelly, Interim Director of Instructional Technology

Deborah Bennett, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor/Chief Information Officer, Ferrilli

Sue Taylor, Interim Director of Enterprise Services, Ferrilli

Stephanie Gillen, Technology Consultant, Ferrilli

Chioma Ndubuisi, Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Project Manager

Hayat Guessoum, Staff Services Specialist/IT

Also Special Thanks to:

Antoine Mehouelly, Interim Director of Instructional Technology

Alex Hernandez, Helpdesk Support Technician II

Stephanie Gillen, Technology Consultant, Ferrilli

Elnora Webb, Executive Vice Chancellor, Strategic Partnerships and Advancement

Melvinia King, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor Workforce Development and Continuing Education

Luis Pedraja, Interim Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Cleavon Smith, District Academic Senate President

Tim Brice, District Classified Senate President

Ed Jaramillo, President PFT/AFT

Miriam Zamora-Kantor, Staff Development Officer

Yashica Crawford, Chief of Staff

Aaron Harbour, Interim Web Content Developer

Jeff Heyman, Executive Director Department of Public Information, Communications & Media Peralta Community College District

Rosemary Vasquez, Executive Assistant General Services

Socorro Taylor, Executive Assistant Human Resources and Employee Relations

Brenda Martinez, Assistant to the Chancellor and Board Clerk

Peralta Community College District Governing Board

Chancellor Jowel C. Laguerre