



## F. Responses to Previous Recommendations

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

#### District Recommendations

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

#### Board and District Administration

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

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

#### Response

Central to addressing this recommendation was the implementation in Fall 2009 of the Planning and Budgeting Integration Model (PBIM) and the district level committee structure comprised of the District Technology Committee, the District Facilities Committee, the District Education Committee, and the higher level Planning and Budgeting Council, which reports directly to the Chancellor. Each of these four committees includes the appropriate district office vice chancellor or associate vice chancellor, appropriate district and college administrators, faculty, and staff from the four colleges and district office service centers. What was noted in 2009, and has proven to be true, is that these committees and their membership are able to actively address district services and through well-designed meeting agendas are able to focus on collaboration between the District Office service centers and the colleges, especially in relation to centralized services. This structure has provided clarity regarding district versus college functional responsibilities and a clear process for decision making, with all final decisions being made by the Chancellor. The Chancellor's Cabinet is comprised of the four college presidents and lead district administrators.

As noted previously when this process was implemented five years ago, it was agreed that college planning is the foundation of the Planning and Budgeting Integration (PBI) process since the colleges are closest to and most responsible for the educational needs of the students and it is the colleges that are charged with ensuring student success. The PBI requires the colleges to conduct program reviews every three years, to provide annual program updates, and to develop annual educational and resource planning priorities. These efforts are in alignment with the five district strategic planning goals and the annual institutional objectives/outcomes. The colleges integrate the results of their program reviews



into college planning, in technology committees, curriculum committees, facilities committees, etc. During the annual institutional planning process, the colleges develop plans addressing instructional and student services programs, staffing priorities, fiscal priorities, IT and equipment, facilities, and marketing. It has been established that the planning of the four colleges must drive district planning, which then drives the provision of district services or centralized services.

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

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

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

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

It is clear that the PBI process provides clarity about decision making and addresses functional responsibilities. One can access committee agendas, committee minutes, committee documents, the results of the annual assessment of the [PBI process](#), and other key materials online.

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



hired, this individual would be involved in the Chancellor's Cabinet, as well as the PBI process. The Cabinet has helped to clarify functional responsibilities and processes for decision-making. The Chancellor's Cabinet reviews the work and actions of the PBI Committees and addresses topics which may be sent to the PBI Committees for input and feedback. The ongoing weekly interactions among these Cabinet members facilitate open dialogue regarding all aspects of district planning and district operations.

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

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

\*\*\*

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

**(2010) Recommendation 7:** *In order to meet the Standard, the visiting team recommends a change in the reporting relation of the Inspector General from the Board of Trustees to the Chancellor. (Standard IV.B.1.j)*

### **Response**

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

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

\*\*\*

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



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

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

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

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

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

## **Response**

2010 Recommendations #3, #4, #5, #8, and #9 and 2011 Recommendation #1 addressed the roles and responsibilities of a community college board of trustees. The recommendations stressed that the Board focus on its role as a policy making body and act in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws; that the Board has a means for board development; that it hires the Chancellor and delegates full responsibility and authority to him or her to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference; and that all other personnel, especially the college presidents, report to the Chancellor and not to the Board. Further, it was stated that Board committees, which existed at that time, needed to stay within the scope of work of a board of trustees and not become involved in the operations of the district service centers and the colleges.

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



that it assigns the Chancellor responsibility for the operation of the district and the hiring and evaluation of all administrators.

As the Board updated Board policies, based on an ACCJC recommendation, four specific policies adopted in 2011 and one in 2012 demonstrated the board members' knowledge of their function, purpose, role, and responsibilities. Thus, the Board demonstrated compliance with Accreditation Standard IV.B and full resolution of any previous deficiencies.

Board Policy 2200 (Board Duties and Responsibilities) references Accreditation Standard IV.B.1 and California Education Code section 70902; these policies delineate the responsibilities of the Board, especially that the Board "respect[s] the authority of the Chancellor by providing policy, direction, and guidance only to the Chancellor who is responsible for the management of the district and its employees, and delegate[s] the authority to the Chancellor to issue regulations, and directives to the employees of the district."

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

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

On November 12, 2013, the Board held a Special Workshop that continued to demonstrate its ability to work within its official role and to work directly with and delegate full responsibility to the Chancellor. The agenda for the Special Workshop covered Strategic Planning, Board/Chancellor Relations, the Chancellor's Goals, and the Board's Goals and professional development. The minutes from this meeting provide insight into how the Board continues to meet and even exceed accreditation Standard IV.B. The Board spoke about "the open lines of communication they have had with the Chancellor and even thanked the Chancellor for bringing leadership and a sense of calmness to the District leadership," noting that they looked "forward to continuing to move in a positive direction." The Chancellor stated that he "appreciates board members calling [him] before board meetings with any questions they have about the board agenda which streamlines board meetings and [fosters] open communication."

At this November 12, 2013 meeting the Board addressed the fact that "accreditation is fundamental to how we operate." In keeping with accreditation standards, board members noted that the focus must be on best practices in the areas of institutional integrity, teaching and learning processes, student support systems, resources, and governance. A trustee alerted his fellow trustees to read through the ACCJC "Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards." This focus on accreditation demonstrated how far the Board has come in its willingness and commitment to meeting and even exceeding standards in an effort to provide for the good of the community and to ensure student success.



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

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

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

\*\*\*

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

### **Response**

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

During the updating of Board policies and administrative procedures, the code of ethics and conflict of interest were reviewed and significantly updated. BP 2715 (Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice) was finalized by the Board at the end of 2012, and AP 2710 (Conflict of Interest Disclosure) was also approved. At the beginning of 2013, the Board finalized BP 2710 (Conflict of Interest) and AP 2712 (Conflict of Interest Code). All four went through a first and second reading at a Board meeting, and it was clear that the Board took these quite seriously.

This recommendation continues to be resolved and the associated accreditation standards are met.

\*\*\*

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



*incumbent to the district to ensure that these efforts continue and are institutionalized within the district.*

## **Response**

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

\*\*\*

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

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

### **(2012) Commission Recommendation 4:**

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

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

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

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

## **Response**

As reported in the March 15, 2013 Follow-Up Reports filed by the four colleges, the District has reviewed and revised all governing board policies and district administrative procedures. The District, under the leadership of the Governing Board and the Chancellor, adopted a comprehensive approach to policy and procedure review through the utilization of the Community College League of California (CCLC) framework for policies and procedures.



This approach involved renumbering and transitioning the existing District Board Policy Manual to the CCLC framework, eliminating any unnecessary policies and procedures, and adopting some new policies and procedures. It should be noted that 68 of the 72 California community college districts use the CCLC approach to board policies and district administrative procedures.

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

This recommendation continues to be resolved; the District has a process for reviewing and updating Board policies and district administrative procedures; the Standards continue to be met.

\*\*\*

## Technology

### **2009 District Recommendation 2: Management Systems**

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

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

## Response

This Management Systems recommendation initially was addressed in the College Follow-Up Reports submitted on March 15, 2010 (the number assigned to the recommendation differed in the college letters) and was further addressed in the District Follow-Up Report submitted October 15, 2010. This clearly was a district level recommendation since the





District Office of Information Technology was and is responsible for the management of the enterprise management system, PeopleSoft.

The PeopleSoft system was purchased in 2004-05, and while various financial modules were implemented in 2005, the student administration system and other non-finance modules were implemented in November 2007. Because of the experience in implementing various financial modules, the District hired RWD Technologies to provide a change management strategy to assist in the move from the legacy system to PeopleSoft. RWD provided a successful approach and a method to address problems experienced by front-end users as the transition was made. As noted in 2010, the move from a “data storage” system to a “process control” system created a major shift for end users.

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

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

The PeopleSoft Resolution Team offers an institutional forum to facilitate discussion and deliberations related to the District’s PeopleSoft database and associated applications. The PRT’s administrative procedures are “an expression of shared governance practices.” (PRT Administrative Procedures). The team also serves as a repository for all of the projects and issues handled by numerous functionality teams.

Users needing technical support now use a [Footprints ticket method](#) for submitting online requests. One can submit, edit, and check on the status of each technical support request. Also, the Help Desk posts a weekly report on completed projects on the webpage.

The District has increased staffing to assist with PeopleSoft modules and PeopleSoft issues, including a Director of Enterprise Services; two Application Software Analysts; two Senior Application Software Analysts; one Senior PeopleSoft Database Administrator; one Enterprise Resource Planning Project Manager; and five analysts in specific areas who



review specific PeopleSoft modules (Research, Student Finance, Curriculum, Financial Aid, and Admissions & Records).

During 2013-14, a consultant aided the District in moving from the financial aid module in the legacy system to the financial aid module in the PeopleSoft system. This project included active involvement of appropriate financial aid staff. The PeopleSoft financial aid module was implemented successfully, and ongoing review and training will be provided.

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

\*\*\*

## Human Resources

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

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

## Response

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

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

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

Board Policy 7120 (Recruitment and Hiring)  
Board Policy 7210 (Academic Employees)



Board Policy 7230 (Classified Employees)  
Board Policy 7240 (Confidential Employees)  
Board Policy 7250 (Academic Administrators)  
Board Policy 7260 (Classified Managers)  
Administrative Procedure 7121 (Faculty Hiring)  
Administrative Procedure 7123 (Hiring Procedures for Regular Academic Administrators and Classified Managers)  
Administrative Procedure 7125 (Hiring Acting and Interim Academic and Non-Academic Administrators)

This recommendation remains resolved and the Standards are met.

\*\*\*

## Financial Resources

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

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

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

## Response

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

The District continues to upgrade and support the modules within PeopleSoft to allow for accurate and timely financial reporting. During the last fiscal year, the human resources and student finance module were upgraded and the Student Financial Aid Module was implemented. The full implementation of the Student Financial Aid module was completed in August 2014. Another improvement to the PeopleSoft system is the use of the electronic



personnel action request since it provides for position control and electronic oversight of the financial transactions associated with the requested position. The Electronic Content Management feature is being implemented and is important to the work of Accounts Payable. Trust and agency funds have been moved from the Legacy system to the PeopleSoft system, which provides a better method of oversight and management of these funds.

The colleges have the ability to access and run all of their financial information, as all of the college business managers have the capacity to run their financial statements at any time during the fiscal year. The college business managers have access to the General Ledger to allow for inquiry and report processing as needed. The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, the college business managers, and the Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology meet on the first Thursday of every month for ongoing assessment of the PeopleSoft financial management functions, providing for an ongoing discussion of how to improve the system and continue the dialogue regarding effective electronic budget management. These monthly meetings will be important as the District moves to upgrade the financial management modules to PeopleSoft Version 9.0 during the 2014-15 academic year. It should be noted that this upgrade is a priority in the District Information Technology Strategy plan.

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

\*\*\*

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

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

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

## **Response**

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



The [special financial report](#), which was filed with ACCJC on April 1, 2013, provided details from the [OPEB Substantive Plan](#) of December 2012, updated in September 2014.

Taken together, these documents provide full details demonstrating that the District has been addressing and continues to address OPEB obligations and liabilities and District OPEB Bonds. The OPEB Substantive Plan fully addresses the issues that were cited by ACCJC. [The District Retirement Board](#) meets regularly to provide oversight of OPEB bonds and planning and to review investment portfolio updates.

Beginning in 2011-12, the District made substantial and critical changes in 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 an OPEB charge that brought new revenue into the OPEB trust, changed the investment policy statement so that it matches the targeted rate of return with the OPEB liability, and restructured the program oversight to one that provides additional transparency and accountability. As a direct result of these accomplishments the actuarial value of the OPEB liabilities had decreased \$39 million by April 2013, trust assets had increased by \$50 million, and related debt service had been held to approximately five percent of the Unrestricted General Fund. It was determined that over time all debt service would be funded out of trust assets that are in excess of the actuarial liabilities. The current actuarial determined liability is \$174,703,920 million compared to trust assets of \$218,549,849 million. A new actuarial study will begin in November 2014 and will be completed by March 2015. Over time, as the difference between the liabilities and trust assets widens, the assets in excess of the liabilities will be used to fund partially or fully the related debt service. As the evidence to date suggests, the District's plans have been successful and over the next 25 years are projected to fully fund all associated liabilities. Please refer to Standard III.D.1.c. and III.D.1d. for additional information.

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

\*\*\*

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

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



reports for years 2008, 2009, and future audit reports issued after the date of this recommendation.

**(2012) Commission Recommendation 2:**

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

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

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

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

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

## Response

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

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



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

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

Details regarding independent audits showing that “responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately” can be found in Standard III.D.2.a and Standard III.D.2.b of this Institutional Self Evaluation. [Independent audit reports](#) and the most current [corrective action matrix](#) (September 21, 2014) can be found online. At the time of the March 2015 site visit, the 2014 independent audit report will be available, as well as an updated Corrective Action Matrix.

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

\*\*\*

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

**(2012) Commission Recommendation 3:**

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



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

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

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

## **Response**

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

The 2013 reports emphasized various strategies that were key to fiscal stability, and these continue to be foundational to ongoing fiscal stability:

- The District negotiated with all three collective bargaining units a variable rate cost cap on district paid medical and health care benefits.
- The District has in place a monthly financial reporting process through which monthly financial reports are disseminated and thus provide the District with the capability to continuously monitor and assess its fiscal capacity. In fact, since March 2013, each college has been able to run its own financial reports and monitor funds.
- The District implemented new Board policies and district administrative procedures that establish minimum standards and accountability for budget preparation and funding.
- The District has a revised district Budget Allocation Model (BAM) that was initially implemented in 2012-13, continued to be reviewed and addressed in 2013-14, and will be monitored again in 2014-15.
- The District had voter support to pass the Measure B Parcel Tax, which provides additional revenue for eight years -- \$7,682,155 in 2012-13, \$8,053,384 in 2013-14, and \$8,055,785 budgeted for 2014-15.
- The District continues to build a strong reserve, which was at 12.36 percent at the beginning of 2014-15 and will offset the expiration of the Parcel Tax. In 2012-13, \$2.8 million was added and in 2013-14, \$1.3 million.

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

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





## Berkeley City College Responses to 2009 ACCJC Recommendations

BCC responded to the following ACCJC recommendations in the March 15, 2012 Midterm Report. The responses below provide an update since that time.

**2009 Team Recommendation 1: Streamline action plans and develop implementation plan.** *In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that Berkeley City College clarify, streamline, and prioritize its many actions plans, action items, and initiatives and develop a comprehensive implementation plan complete with performance measures. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, and I.B.7)*

### Response

The Berkeley City College (BCC) Self Study Report to the ACCJC Commission in Spring 2009 included twenty-two action plans and initiatives. To clarify, streamline, and prioritize these plans, the College combined the redundant and overlapping plans into a total of 17 action plans. With implementation assigned by category and accompanied with performance measures, the College fully resolved all action plans in Spring 2012 and reported to the Commission through its 2012 Mid-term Report.

The College currently utilizes a process to integrate action plans into its regular planning cycle by incorporating college plans into an annual goal-setting process aligned with District annual goals and strategic plans. BCC's planning process has continued on a regular basis since 2009-10. Peralta strategic directives are circulated before the beginning of each of the fall semesters. The College then develops its annual plan by establishing collegewide goals, implementation plans and activities, timelines and outcome measures/institutional set standards; reviewing and revising the annual planning through its shared governance process; and endorsing and finalizing the plan through the College Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting. In 2013-14, to meet the statewide Student Success Initiative mandate, BCC integrated the [Student Success Support Program](#) (SSSP) initiatives with its collegewide goals and outcome measures. Throughout the year, during various committee meetings, BCC regularly reviews the status of outcome measures/institutional set standards, further refines strategies to reach its annual goals, and summarizes its accomplishments against the pre-set goals toward the end of the year. Final collegewide goals and accomplishments are widely communicated online and during shared governance meetings.

BCC intends to align its student success plan, equity plan, and education master plan, as well as its human resources plan, technology plan, facilities plan, and financial plan. As a result of the development, updating, and implementation of various plans, BCC continues to arrive at integrated, actionable conclusions about its institutional effectiveness. This integrated comprehensive plan is accompanied by action plans, action items, and performance measures, with timelines that coincide with the reporting dates identified and/or mandated for each plan.



**2009 Team Recommendation 2: Complete all SLOs and integrate assessment and data with planning.** *Significant progress has been made in meeting the standards for Student Learning Outcomes. In order to meet the “proficiency” level as prescribed in the ACCJC/WASC rubric by 2012, the team recommends that the college complete all service, course-level and program level SLO’s; have an assessment timeline for all courses, programs, and institutional SLO’s; be in dialogue about the results of the assessment of the SLO’s and use the dialogue for decision-making purposes. Additionally, to integrate assessment results with continuous review and improvement, the team recommends that the SLO Action Plan be integrated with the Unit Action Plan. It is further recommended that the program planning and SLO assessment process formally incorporate the data analysis by institutional research and planning. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.h, II.A.6, and II.B.1)*

### Response

The College has completed all service, course-level and program-level SLOs; new courses or programs must be submitted with SLOs, which are approved by the SLO Assessment Coordinator before moving to the College’s Curriculum Committee. The College has an assessment timeline for all course, program, and institutional SLOs. Instructional departments are in dialogue about the results of SLO assessments, as indicated by the 2014 Self Evaluation Survey results, which show that 71 percent of faculty agree or strongly agree with the statement, “at BCC, there is dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes,” while 16 percent somewhat agree, and only 10 percent disagree. Among administrators, faculty, and staff combined, 70 percent agree or strongly agree, 19 percent somewhat agree, and only eight percent disagree that “BCC engages in dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.” In addition, 60 percent of faculty indicated that they discuss SLO results at department meetings, 17 percent that they discuss these results at “special student learning outcomes sessions,” and 32 percent that they discuss them on e-mail distribution lists. The College’s Assessment Committee and Teaching and Learning Center have been particularly instrumental in providing additional forums for dialogue and ensuring that assessment findings lead to meaningful action plans, which are then put into action. Several examples are in Section G of this report. SLO action plans, as well as data analysis by institutional research and planning, are integrated into BCC program reviews and annual program updates.

Berkeley City College received a Title III grant in fall 2009, bringing \$400,000 per year to the College for five years. One of the two major thrusts of the grant was to enhance outcomes for basic skills students. The other was to create a culture of assessment at BCC. This funding resulted in the implementation of key activities which have had a significant impact on SLO assessment:

- Reassigned time for departmental leads to help develop course-level student learning outcomes and student service area outcomes, which has led to the requirement that all new courses and programs have learning outcomes in place before being accepted at the Curriculum Committee (2009-10)



- Reassigned time for a Title III Activity Coordinator to provide training and support for departments to complete student learning outcomes and service area outcomes in the initial stages (2009-Spring 2011)
- Funding for collegewide and department-specific training with outside experts on outcomes assessment (2009-10)
- Support for the SLO Assessment Coordinator to participate in the WASC Assessment Leadership Institute (2010-11)
- Reassigned time for a Teaching and Learning Center Coordinator, which has led to the development of activities central to assessment and the implementation of resulting action plans and has been institutionalized by the College (2010 to present)
- Creation of a website on the Berkeley City College home page to centralize information on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, including access to the assessment management system (Taskstream) and instructions for its use, information on the Assessment Committee, an overview of the SLO/Assessment cycle, a filmed example of a department deliberating on a rubric, sample SLOs, and classroom assessment techniques (2011-present)
- Support for in-depth departmental projects related to assessment, such as student portfolio assessment, which has been institutionalized by the College (ongoing)
- Support for hourly assistants to input assessment work into Taskstream (ongoing)

The College also implemented procedures to institutionalize approaches to assessment. These have included the following:

- Requiring that outcomes be in place before any course or program can be adopted or revised through the curriculum committee process (Fall 2010-present)
- Establishing a standing Assessment Committee, with the Assessment Coordinator serving as chair or co-chair (2010), which has been updated as the Planning for Institutional Effectiveness Committee (Spring 2014-present)
- Requiring that existing programs complete program outcomes for inclusion in the College Catalog Supplement by Summer 2012; requiring that program revisions or new program proposals include program outcomes (Spring 2011)
- Adopting revised program review and annual program update forms with sections for program assessment updates and provision for goals and resource requests coming from assessment findings (Fall 2011)
- Creating a process, with common rubrics and a timeline, for institutional learning outcomes assessment (Fall 2011) and implementation of three institutional learning outcomes assessments
- Including, within the charge of the College Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting, an evaluation each year of college assessment and planning activities (Spring 2012)
- Hiring a permanent, full time Curriculum and SLO Assessment Specialist, who ensures accurate and appropriate recording of information relating to curriculum and SLO assessment at BCC (Fall 2014)



Additionally, the program planning process formally incorporates data analysis by the District Office of Institutional Research.

The College has addressed all aspects of Recommendation 2 by completing all service, course-level, and program level SLOs; having an assessment timeline for all course, program, and institutional SLOs; maintaining dialogue about the results of SLO assessments and using the results of the dialogue for continuous improvement; and integrating information from the Office of Institutional Research as a significant aspect of program review and annual unit plan updates.

**2009 Team Recommendation 3: Library Staffing and Resources** *Although significant progress has been made since 2003 in its library's quality and services, the team recommends that in order to improve and broaden upon the progress to date, the college develop an adequate, equitable, and sustainable library allocation for staffing and library resources. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d, and II.C.2)*

### **Response**

In June 2011, Berkeley City College received the Evaluation Report of the two-member accreditation team indicating that "Berkeley City College meets the requirements of this recommendation in that it has improved the quantity and quality of its library collection. The college has developed partnerships with nearby libraries to enhance services to students and, through its program review process, identified staffing and facility space needs for future growth."

In order to maintain and sustain its library quality and services, BCC has continued to increase library allocations for staffing and resources through program review, annual program updates, and the integrated planning and budget development at both the college and the district levels.

### Library Staffing

Total faculty and staff in the BCC Library have increased significantly over the last three years. Staffing FTE increased from 3.5 (2.5 FTE librarians and 1 FTE classified staff) in 2011-12, to 3.6 (2.6 FTE librarians and 1 FTE classified) in 2012-13, to 4.5 (2.9 FTE librarians and 2.6 FTE classified) in 2013-14. Moreover, in 2013-14, the BCC Library received additional funds to hire student assistants working 52 hours per week throughout the year.

As a result, the BCC library is able to extend its services during weekday evenings and on Saturdays. In both 2011-12 and 2012-13, library hours were Mondays through Thursdays 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m., and on Fridays 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. Starting Fall 2013, a half hour has been added to Monday through Thursday evenings, to extend the hours until 8 p.m. Services were also added on Saturdays from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Starting Spring 2014, the BCC Library stays open on Saturdays from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Thus, the Library is currently open during the following hours:



- 8:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday–Thursday
- 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Friday
- 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Saturday

### Library Supplies, Books, and Materials Resources

From 2010-11 to 2014-15, the Library’s total budget for books, periodicals, subscriptions, and technological software and equipment significantly increased. In 2010-11, the Library’s budget totaled \$9,984 for these resources. However, in the current year (2014-15), the Library’s total budget reached an all-time high of \$146,555 for books, periodicals, subscriptions, and technological software and equipment. As costs continue to rise for library research and reading materials, the College is committed to ensuring funds are available for the Library to fulfill the needs of BCC students.

In addition, as of Fall 2010, the District funds the BCC Library \$25,000 per fiscal year for databases. The Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Committee (TTAC) and the Council of Chief Librarians (CCL) have been working diligently to leverage the system’s purchasing power in order to provide common electronic library resources for all California community college campuses. A contract for electronic information resources for California Community Colleges (CCC) libraries also provides a general periodical, newspaper, history, and business database to every student in the entire CCC system, including students attending BCC.

While library resources are being increased at the College, BCC students continue to have access to nearby Berkeley Public Library and to U.C. Berkeley’s world-class libraries at no cost or at a discounted rate.

**Response to 2009 Team Recommendation 4: Prioritize staffing plans for implementation of resource allocation model.** *The team recommends that Berkeley City College prioritize their collegewide staffing plans in anticipation of the implementation of the new resource allocation model. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, and III.A. 2)*

### **Response**

Berkeley City College’s staffing needs and planning have been developed and updated annually, embedded in its program reviews on a three-year cycle or in its annual program updates (APUs). Prioritization of full time faculty and classified staff hiring needs have been a regular part of the College’s program review process. With the implementation of an active, districtwide governance structure beginning in Fall 2009, the prioritization of college staffing has been a vital part of an annual planning cycle linked to College and District resource allocation.

The District implemented a budget allocation model, based on SB 361, in Spring 2012. District Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 6200 (Budget Management) affirm the District’s commitment to use the districtwide Budget Allocation Model (BAM) in annual funding cycles. Its implementation assures adequate funding to BCC and links funding to



planning. The implementation of the BAM ensures the College's long-term financial stability, including staffing capacity. Critical to the successful implementation of the resource allocation model has been the achievement of parity in staffing across the four Peralta colleges. With the realization of additional full-time instructors and permanent classified staff, BCC's annual budget has begun to reflect funding at a level equitable with the budget levels of the other Peralta colleges.

Meanwhile, the Peralta District Office of Human Resources has developed and implemented a districtwide staffing plan by completing an inventory of staff positions across the District and identifying which positions were currently funded and filled. For permanent faculty and classified staffing, Berkeley City College and the other three Peralta colleges have been asked to submit hiring needs each spring to the District Education Committee for discussion and recommendation, to be submitted to the District Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC).

BCC develops and updates its annual staffing plan at the program/unit level through Program Review and/or APU processes and prioritizes needs through a shared governance process, which culminates at the College Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting for presentation to the District Education Committee and PBC. At the end of this districtwide process, the Chancellor authorizes the number of new faculty and classified positions to be allocated for hiring at the college level. Furthermore, BCC leverages grants and additional funding sources to hire new personnel and maintain their employment in order to address student success throughout the duration of the funding.

Over the last year, BCC's staff sufficiency improved significantly in all employee categories. Both the number of administrators (nine) and tenured/tenure track faculty (56) reached an all-time high in 2013-14. The number of permanent classified positions is expected to top the peak figure of 46 in 2014-15.

### **Response to Commission Recommendation 5 (2011 and 2012)**

**2011:** *While evidence identifies progress, the District/Colleges have not achieved compliance with Standard III.D and Eligibility Requirements #5 and #17. Specifically the District/Colleges do not demonstrate the fiscal capacity to adequately support quality student learning programs and services. Therefore, in order to meet Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the District/Colleges must evaluate the impact of financial decisions on the educational quality and implement actions to resolve any deficiencies.*

**2012:** *In reviewing the reports, the Commission noted that Berkeley City College has not fully evaluated the impact of recent District financial decisions on the college's ability to sustain educational programs and services. The College did describe the principles and practices around fiscal decisions at the District and the colleges; yet, it was unclear to the Commission what specific impact the reductions or changes had and what the future impact of those reductions and changes would be at each college. The College response should include an analysis of staff sufficiency and the quality of educational programs and services before and after budget reductions with sufficient detail and evidence to evaluate the impact*



*of these reductions on the overall educational quality of the colleges. The college should also describe how it intends to deal with any resulting negative impact.*

## **Response**

Berkeley City College responded to the original 2011 recommendation in the College Midterm Report (March 2012) and provided a more detailed response in a Follow-Up Report (March 2013), as required by the 2012 follow-up recommendation.

The April 2013 ACCJC Visiting Team, in its Follow-Up Report, stated that, “Berkeley City College meets Standard III.D and Eligibility Requirements #5 and #17.” In the July 3, 2013 Commission Action Letter, Dr. Barbara A. Beno, President of ACCJC, reported that the Commission took action to remove the College from Warning and reaffirmed the College’s accreditation. The Commission letter noted that

The District has tackled its significant budget problems seriously and intently, resulting in a financial condition that meets Accreditation Standards... Berkeley City College has maintained the educational quality of its programs and services. Any negative impacts resulting from past budget reductions have been minimized so that the College remains focused on its Mission.