

EVALUATION REPORT

Berkeley City College
(Peralta Community College District)
Berkeley, CA 94704

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Berkeley City College in Berkeley, CA
March 9-12, 2015

Renee Martinez
Chair

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

DATE: June 29, 2015

INSTITUTION: Berkeley City College
2050 Center Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

TEAM REPORT: Comprehensive Evaluation Team Report

that This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team
visited Berkeley City College March 9—12, 2015.

SUBJECT: **COMMISSION REVISION TO THE TEAM REPORT**

The Comprehensive Evaluation Team Report (Team Report) for Berkeley City College provides details of the team’s findings with regard to noted Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies. The Team Report should be read carefully and used to understand the team’s findings. Upon a review of the Team Report sent to the College, the Self Evaluation Report, and evidence submitted by the College, the following corrections are noted for the Team Report:¹

Pages 6 and 41: College Recommendation 4 is changed to a recommendation for increased institutional effectiveness.

Page 54: District Recommendation 3 is moved to Standard III.B (page 57).

¹The Team Chair has concurred with this change.

**Berkeley City College
Visiting Team Roster
March 2015**

Renee Martinez (Chair)
President
Los Angeles City College

Dr. Dan Walden (Team Assistant)
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Los Angeles City College

Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal
Vice Chancellor,
Educational Planning and Services
Yuba CCD

Mr. Edralin Maduli
Vice Chancellor,
Administrative Services
West Valley-Mission CCD

Ms. Mayra Cruz
Trustee
San Jose/Evergreen CCD

Mr. Lisa Marchand
Professor, ESL
Cosumnes River College

Mr. Laurence Frank
President
Los Angeles Trade Technical College

Dr. Marie Mestas
Associate Professor, Library
San Bernardino Valley College

Dr. Howard Irvin Jr.
Dean,
Student Development and Matriculation
San Diego Miramar College

Mr. Charles Sasaki
Dean, Arts and Sciences
Kapiolani Community College

Dr. Pamela Kersey
Chief Instructional Officer
Copper Mountain College

Dr. John Sciacca
Dean, Health Science Division
Cypress College

Dr. Linda Lopez Chaparro
Professor, Psychology
Oxnard College

Dr. Dan Wanner
Professor, Music and
Accreditation Co-Chair
Los Angeles City College

Summary of the Evaluation

A 14-member accreditation team visited Berkeley City College from March 9-12, 2015 to evaluate the institution's adherence to the Standards, assess how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, provide recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submit recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the college.

Approximately one month prior to the visit, team members received a copy of the *Berkeley City College 2015 Institutional Self Evaluation of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation*. In preparation for the site visit, visiting team members participated in a training session on February 10, 2015 at the LAX Hilton Hotel in Los Angeles, conducted by ACCJC leadership. The training offered guidance to team members on their responsibilities in reviewing the Self Evaluation, previous recommendations from the 2009 accreditation site visit, and evidence provided by Berkeley City College. Prior to the training session, each team member completed an initial review of the entire Self Evaluation.

During the weeks leading up to the site visit, team members compiled lists of evidence already examined, evidence they wanted to review upon arrival on campus, individuals to interview, and questions and concerns from their initial assessment. Requests for evidence and scheduling of meetings were provided to the Berkeley City College Accreditation Liaison Officer.

The Self Evaluation Report addressed the elements required by the Commission. The lengthy introduction includes the College history and student demographics, the process of writing the Self Evaluation Report, and organizational information. While the College believes it met each Standard, it included five actionable improvement plans in the Self Evaluation Report. The Report was complete with narrative responses for all parts of each of the Standards. Nevertheless, from the time the team first received the Self Evaluation Report one month prior to the visit, it was concerned by the lack of references to evidence in the report. The responses regarding many Standards were limited, especially in relation to distance education, and in general responses fell short of fully describing the institution's practices.

Throughout the site visit, the College provided adequate support, and the team felt that the Berkeley City College community was supportive, forthcoming, and gracious. However, due to the undue lack of sufficient evidence presented with the Self Evaluation Report, the team had to rely on numerous meetings with College stakeholders and frequent emails to the Accreditation Liaison Officer and others to gather important evidence to support the College's claims made in the Self Evaluation Report. For the most part, team requests for additional materials were addressed promptly.

The team met with representative faculty, staff, administrators, students, and board members. Visiting team members met with College representatives and leaders in technology, CTE, SSSP, equity planning, distance education, institutional effectiveness, EOPS/DSPS, transfer, program review, library, associated student government, student services, facilities, learning

community, teaching learning and staff development, fiscal resources, faculty senate, faculty union, classified senate, human resources, curriculum, student clubs, learning outcomes, student ambassadors, and alumni, as well as members from each of the BCC standards subcommittees. Meetings also took place with students from various campus programs and members of the community. The team chair met individually and regularly with the College president during the site visit. The first of two open forums had approximately 75 participants, primarily comprised of students and community members. The second open forum was primarily comprised of faculty and administrators. It was evident at meetings that participants felt free to express their thoughts, and a recurring theme was how well the College is meeting its mission of transforming the lives of its students. The team commends the College for its passion for student success and development of innovative and effective pathways to student success.

The team extends its thanks to Berkeley City College for its hospitality and for its willingness to engage in the peer review accreditation process. The team is confident that BCC will continue its current practice of evaluating and improving its overall educational quality and institutional effectiveness.

Summary of Major Findings of the 2015 Team

A. College Commendations

The following commendations are made as a result of the team's visit from March 9-12, 2015:

Commendation 1

The College is to be commended for developing pathways from high school to BCC to UC Berkeley with full city and non-profit support. BCC, the city of Berkeley, the Berkeley Unified School District, and UC Berkeley have built an enviable set of partnerships framed by the city's 2020 Vision for Berkeley's Children and Youth.

Commendation 2

The College is to be commended for meeting its mission of transforming student lives by effectively utilizing its modern, well-maintained, accessible, and safe facilities and engaging students through programs including the Student Support Program, FYE, Persist, EOPS, TRIO, Ambassador Program, and CARE.

Commendation 3

The College and in particular the Academic Senate and counselors are to be commended for developing a thoughtful process of engagement and trust building resulting in a mutually supported counseling and faculty advisement strategy.

Commendation 4

The College and in particular counseling and the transfer and career information center are to be commended for their commitment to transfer, particularly for students underrepresented in the UC system. Collaborative efforts with internal and external stakeholders have helped make BCC a major transfer institution in the state.

Commendation 5

The College and in particular CTE programs are to be commended for successfully collaborating with industry and community partners to expand resources and opportunities for students.

B. College Recommendations

The following recommendations are made as a result of the team's visit from March 9-12, 2015:

College Recommendation 1

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College, through its governance and decision-making structure, develop and publish a process to review its mission and program review, institutional planning, student learning assessment, and resource allocation processes on a regular basis and revise as necessary (I.A.3, I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.C.1.b, III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d, III.C.2, IV.B.2.b).

College Recommendation 2

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a plan to increase its research capacity in order to better analyze progress towards achieving institutional and strategic goals (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5).

College Recommendation 3

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College reevaluate the established SLO assessment cycles to implement a process that includes more frequent assessment of all courses. The team further recommends that SLOs be included in all course syllabi and match the official course outlines of record (I.B.5, I.B.7, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.A.6).

College Recommendation 4

In order to comply with the ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education and to **increase institutional effectiveness**, the team recommends that the College:

- a) ensure the quality of its distance education courses by comparing data on student achievement and attainment of intended learning outcomes with those found in face-to-face courses
- b) ensure that student support services provided to students in distance education courses are comparable with those provided to students in face-to-face courses (I.B.3, II.A.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, III.C.1).

C. District Commendations

District Commendation 1

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

District Commendation 2

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

D. District Recommendations

Fiscal Management

District Recommendation 1

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

District Recommendation 2

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

Global Planning

District Recommendation 3

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

Institutional Effectiveness

District Recommendation 4

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

District Recommendation 5

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

Governance

District Recommendation 6

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

District Recommendation 7

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

District Recommendation 8

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

Evaluation Report for Berkeley City College

Introduction

Berkeley City College (BCC) is one of four colleges that comprise the Peralta Community College District (PCCD) that serves northern Alameda County. The College's original name of Berkeley Learning Pavilion changed to the Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study in 1974, to Vista College in 1978, and to Berkeley City College in 2006 when it moved into its current building. Accreditation was granted in June 1977.

BCC offers 36 associate degrees (including 14 new associate degrees for transfer), 19 certificates of achievement, and 47 certificates of proficiency. The student population is highly diverse and representative of its designated service area. In recent years, the College has enrolled around 7,000 traditional and online students in each primary semester. The majority of students plan to earn an AA degree and/or transfer though a significant number of students currently attend four-year schools. Student success rates in key metrics—including transfer, degrees, and certificates—continue to increase. The College is particularly noted for its number of transfers to UCs and CSUs and has the highest admission rate to UC Berkeley of any community college. The College has 60 full-time faculty positions, over 200 total faculty positions, nearly 50 classified staff, and 9 administrators.

BCC had its last comprehensive accreditation visit in 2009 and submitted a Midterm Report to its four 2009 college recommendations and one district recommendation in 2012. In addition, the college responded to district recommendations in Follow-Up Reports and visits in 2010, 2011, and 2013.

Responses to Recommendations of the 2009 Evaluation Team

2009 Team College Recommendation 1

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)

Since the last full accreditation visit in 2009, the College has invested significant efforts in developing and refining the integrated planning, assessment, and resource allocation cycle that is currently supported through the Planning and Decision-Making Process. The College integrates action plans into its regular planning cycle by incorporating college plans into an annual goal setting process aligned with District annual goals and plans. Peralta strategic directives are circulated before the beginning of each of the fall semesters. The College then develops its annual plan by establishing college wide goals, implementation plans and activities, timelines, and outcome measures, several of which are institution-set standards for student achievement. Annual planning is reviewed through its operational and governance process; endorsing and finalizing the plan occurs through the College Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting.

2009 Team College Recommendation 2

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)

The College reported it has completed development of 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 and the District Council on Instruction, Planning, and Development for approval. The College has an assessment timeline for all course, program, and institutional SLOs and SLO assessments are incorporated in program review. The College states it is currently in its second round of course-level assessments. Instructional departments are in dialogue about the results of SLO assessments and this is supported by the 2014 Self Evaluation Survey results. The program review process also formally incorporates data provided by the District Office of Institutional Research.

Response to 2009 Team Recommendation 3

Although significant progress has been made since 2003 in its library’s quality and services, the team recommends that in order to improve and broaden upon the progress to date, the

College develop an adequate, equitable, and sustainable library allocation for staffing and library resources. (Standards II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d, and II.C.2)

Library service hours and staff have increased since the 2009 team's visit

- Staffing increased from 3.5 FTE in 2011-12 (2.5 FTE librarians and 1 FTE classified staff) to 3.6 FTE in 2012-13 (2.6 FTE librarians and 1 FTE classified) to 4.5 FTE in 2013-14 (2.9 FTE librarians and 2.6 FTE classified).
- Fifty-two hours of student assistants were also added.
- In conversation with the area dean, it was learned that the college plans on hiring an additional librarian in the fall 2015.
- Library hours of service were increased in fall 2013 by 30 minutes Monday through Thursday, and in spring 2014 an additional two hours were added on Saturdays.
- The library materials budget declined from 2010 to 2013 from a high of \$70,018 to a low of \$14,185. In 2014-15, the figure of \$146,555 was quoted as the library's materials budget in the self-study. However, upon investigation, it was learned that this was not exclusively for library materials (books, print periodicals, databases, textbooks, and other curriculum support materials) alone, but also included the salary of the planned additional librarian. The library does not have a reliable base book budget year to year.

The College has addressed this recommendation and now meets the Standards. The increase in hours and staffing has resulted in time for the librarians to perform necessary tasks away from the reference desk, but it has also been taken up by requests for more library orientations and information competency instruction sessions.

The team strongly suggests that, in order to improve upon and broaden the progress made towards 2009 Recommendation 3, that the College assess and evaluate the depth, variety, and currency of library materials and ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to support the ongoing learning needs of students (II.C.1, II.C.1.a). The College should remain aware that academic library standards do not hold textbooks to be true academic library materials, and that these should not be considered as part of the library's permanent collection. Improvements such as these will allow the library to regularly secure current titles for curriculum support and for reading pleasure and personal development as well as support requests from faculty, staff, and/or students. Finally, following this suggestion will allow the library to grow and develop its spaces, services, and collections to meet the current and ongoing needs of all students and faculty.

Response to 2009 Team College Recommendation 4

The team recommends that Berkeley City College prioritize their college-wide 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)

The resource allocation model was implemented four years ago. This recommendation is no longer relevant. Currently, prioritization of staffing needs occurs through the Planning and Decision-making Process. The college states that its staffing needs and planning have been developed and updated annually. These are imbedded in its program reviews on a three-year cycle or in its annual program updates. Staffing plans were available. Table 47 of the

College's Self Evaluation Report shows the progress in staffing for administrators, faculty, and staff. Permanent headcount for all has increased in 2013/14. The recommendation was resolved within the two year required timeline. The College has implemented this recommendation and met the Standard.

Response to 2009 Commission Recommendation 5

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.*

The July 3, 2013 Commission action letter reported 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." The Commission took action to remove the college from warning and reaffirmed the college's accreditation.

The College receives its funding through the District's Budget Allocation Model, based on SB 361, and independently develops its operating budget to support and improve student learning and services. The College has benefited financially with the implementation of the Budget Allocation Model.

However, the latest audit report of the District dated June 30, 2014 took exception to the District's financial condition. The 2014-001 finding recommended that the "long term planning for the continued financial stability of the District should continue to include attention to obligations that will be coming due in the future." These obligations include OPEB and annual line of credit repayments.

Response to 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.

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 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. These district committees are charged with developing district-wide 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 PBC 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.

Complementing the PBI process, the Chancellor's Cabinet 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 Students Services, General Counsel, the Director of Public Information, Communication and Media, and the four college presidents. 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.

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 association with this recommendation.

Since the fall of 2009, the district administration has been implementing the Planning and Budgeting Integration Model. The district has revisited the district level committee structure to provide clarity on the functions of each unit at the district level. The district has developed the Planning and Budgeting Integration (PBI) process directly linked to the college planning process. The PBI process outlines the decision making process and evaluated every year. Board policy related to establishing clear functional responsibilities and decision making has been revised.

Conclusion:

With the additional structure established, the District has fully implemented the recommendation.

2010 District Recommendation 2:

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends the District evaluate the reporting structure with regard to the inspector general so that the position is properly placed in the hierarchy of the district organization.

Response

The inspector general position has been eliminated.

Conclusion

This recommendation is no longer applicable to the District's organization.

2010 District Recommendation 7:

In order to meet the Standard, the visiting team recommends a change in the reporting relation of the Inspector General from the Board of Trustees to the Chancellor.

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.

The Follow-Up Report dated October 15, 2010 demonstrated the change in the reporting structure of the Inspector General. Furthermore and according to records, the position of Inspector General has been discontinued as of January 2011.

Conclusion

The District has fully implemented the recommendation and recognized the change to discontinue the position.

2010 District Recommendation 3:

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that 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.

Response:

Board policies have been updated to clarify the role of Board members with respect to the work of the district Chancellor. The delegation of responsibilities has been defined through board policy. During an interview with the Chancellor, this standard remains an area of concern as the district must clarify the role of board members with respect to district

managers and operations. In the Special session meeting held on March 9, 2015, the Board discussed the mechanisms for communicating with the Chancellor, methods for board inquiries, delegation of authority issues and role distinction but articulated the challenges operationalizing board policy.

Conclusion

The recommendation has not been implemented.

2010 District Recommendation 4:

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the District provide ongoing and annual training for board and management on roles and functions as it relates to District policy and operations.

Response

Since 2010, a series of board workshops have been provided to the board on critical topics: roles and responsibilities, and financial responsibilities of trustees, discussion on 2010 accreditation recommendations, accreditation issues on governance and leadership, board governance, policies, strategic planning, board- chancellor relations, chancellor's goals, board goals and professional development (June, September, October of 2010, November 2011, October 2012 (2-day session), November 2013, December 2014, February 2015 board meeting agendas). In addition, the Board evaluation tool has been aligned to accreditation standards and district strategic goals.

It is noted that two trustees have completed the CCLC Excellence in Trusteeship program.

Conclusion

The District has implemented the recommendation.

2010 District 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.

Response

The review of the ACCJC October 10, 2010 Follow-up Report highlights the board development activities that have engaged the board in understanding their role as trustees. Over the last five years, trustees have received trainings related to roles and responsibilities, governance and leadership. Most recently the board held a workshop to further develop knowledge and skills as a high performing team. Results of evaluations conducted by the board continue to demonstrate the need for ongoing development. The Board would benefit from evaluating the impact of the development activities as it relates to board effectiveness. It is noted that trustees must pay more attention to the chancellor-board relationships.

Conclusion

The District has implemented the recommendation. However, as reflected in Recommendation 1, below and in new District Recommendation 7 (2015), the District has not resolved the deficiency and does not meet the Standard.

January 2011 District 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 refine and change the roles and charges of the Board Committees so that they also reflect an appropriate role for the Board.

Response

As noted in recommendation 5 (2010) above, the recommendation, the trustees have completed a series of training to address trustees roles and responsibilities and governance. According to information posted on the Board Committees website page, the board of trustees have the following board committees in operation:

- Audit and Finance
- Board Policies
- Chancellors Search Committee
- Public Hearings
- Redistricting Committee
- Resolutions
- Retirement Board

Concerns about the board roles and its relationship to the chancellor are still evident based on information gathered through conversations with chancellor and the board. Evidence on the charge and responsibility of board committees was not found.

Conclusion

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

2010 District Recommendation 8:

In order to meet the Standard, the visiting team recommends a regular review of board roles to assure that the board is relying on the Chancellor to carry out the policy set by the board.

Response

The board workshops conducted annually have been focused the review of the board roles to assure the chancellor is carryout his responsibility to implement board policy.

Conclusion

The District has implemented the recommendation.

2010 District Recommendation 9:

The team recommends the Board of Trustees and District adhere to their appropriate roles. The District must serve the colleges as liaison between the colleges and the Board of Trustees while assuring that the college presidents can operate their institutions effectively. Meanwhile, the Board must not interfere with the operations of the four colleges of the district and allow the Chancellor to take full responsibility and authority for the areas assigned to district oversight.

Response

Over the last 5 years, trustees have received a variety of training to address the way in which they can adhere to their roles. The review of the 2010 ACCJC follow-up report provides the description on how the recommendation has been met.

In recent meetings with the chancellor and the board, it is worth noting that there are areas of concern related to how well trustees are adhering to their roles. Trustees are not evaluating how effective training and development activities are changing behavior and clarifying roles.

Conclusion

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

2010 District Recommendation 6:

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends the board consider regular review of the code of ethics to assure thorough understanding and application of its intent.

Response

The district completed the revision of the Board Policy 2710 Conflict of Interest and 2715 Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice. The policies delineate tenants for ethical conduct and conflict of interest. The policies reflect the duty of public officials under Common Law, the Political Reform Act, Government Code 1090 and specific statutory requirements and prohibitions under the Brown Act. Board workshops conducted during the cycle reveal annual training session on ethics, conflict of interest, and open government. The board self-evaluation includes the evaluation of the code of ethics.

Conclusion

The District has implemented the recommendation. Board Policy 2715 Code of Ethics could include statements on behavior contrary to the Code of Ethics as part of the policy.

January 2011 District 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).

Response

The review of policy indicates that Board policy and administrative procedures revisions has been completed and meet the Community College League of California (CCLC) numbering system. The revisions began in 2011.

Conclusion

The District has fully implemented this recommendation.

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.

The review of policy indicates that Board policy and administrative procedures revisions has been completed and meet the Community College League of California (CCLC) numbering system. The revisions began in 2011.

Conclusion

The District has fully implemented this recommendation.

Evaluations of Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

Berkeley City College is authorized by the State of California to operate as an educational institution and to award undergraduate degrees. It operates under authority of the Peralta

Community College District and is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

2. Mission

Combined with the vision and values statements, the BCC mission emphasizes the College's educational purposes, intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. Programs and services align with the mission. The mission statement is published in the biannual catalog, class schedules, and on the College website. The mission was approved by the Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees on April 12, 2005, reviewed and revised by stakeholders in 2014, and reapproved by the Board on October 7, 2014. The mission effectively guides planning and decision-making.

3. Governing Board

The governing Board of Berkeley City College consists of seven community-elected trustees and two student trustees. The community-elected trustees represent the entire District and are elected for four-year staggered terms. The student trustees, elected by the students, serve one-year terms, with a maximum of two years. The trustees are responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the College. The function of the Board is to determine policies, establish rules, regulations, and procedures, and oversee the use of financial and other resources to provide a sound educational program consistent with the mission and goals of the District. The Board of Trustees has adopted a Board policy for ethical conduct, which contains language to address breaches of its code. The Board follows a conflict of interest policy, which requires that financial interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the fiscal integrity of the College. The team confirmed the majority of the members of the governing Board have no employment, family, or personal/financial interest in the College.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The College has a full-time chief executive officer, the College President, appointed by the Board of Trustees who is delegated the authority to lead the College. The College President represents the College to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

5. Administrative Capacity

The nine administrators of Berkeley City College oversee daily operations and support a team that includes directors, coordinators, managers, department chairs, officers, advisors and staff. Together they possess the professional training and experience necessary to effectively support the College's mission and purpose, as well as the appropriate qualifications for their positions. The number of administrators increased from seven in 2009-10 to nine in 2013-14. This is sufficient to support BCC's mission and purpose.

6. Operational Status

BCC has been in continuous operation since 1974. In August 2006 the college moved to its permanent facility and changed its name from Vista Community College to Berkeley City College.

7. Degrees

BCC offers 36 associate degrees including 14 ADT's, and 19 certificates of achievement. These are approved by the California Community Colleges State Chancellors Office (CCCCO). There are also 47 certificates of proficiency (less than 12 units) approved by the local governing board. Information on degrees is available in the BCC catalog.

8. Educational Programs

Educational programs are consistent with its mission, reflecting appropriate fields of study. Length, content, quality, and rigor are appropriate.

9. Academic Credit

The Carnegie Unit is utilized in accordance with the CCC Chancellor's Office requirements under California Code of Regulations and Title 5, Section 55002.5.

10. Student Learning and Achievement

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator (SLOAC) works with faculty and staff to create, and variously evaluate, SLOs at all levels including general education. Program Learning Outcomes are enumerated in the BCC Catalog. Course outlines of record serve for all modes of delivery as do both program and course SLO's. BCC set standards for satisfactory performance of student success student achievement. These standards were determined using an average of prior year performance. The team examined the institutional summary data and found student achievement is on the rise at BCC and demonstrates that the College's programs of study lead to degrees and certificates, including those in career technical education.

11. General Education

General Education is designed for breadth of knowledge and to encourage intellectual questioning. BCC incorporates into all of its degree programs GE requirements reflecting Title 5 of the California Education Code in addition to the PCCD Administrative Process 4100 (Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates). These requirements are published in the BCC catalog. Requirements in natural science, social science, behavioral science, humanities, English composition, mathematics, computer literacy, oral/written communication or literature, and ethnic studies are reviewed by subcommittee of the District Council on Instruction, Planning and Development and subsequently approved by the PCCD Trustees. Those seeking an ADT must follow the CSU General Education pattern or the IGETC.

12. Academic Freedom

Policies at the BCC and PCCD, including Board Policy 4030 (Academic Freedom), and the Peralta Federation of Teachers union contract provide the codified bases for Academic Freedom at Berkeley City College.

13. Faculty

Sixty full-time faculty (including 12 non-instructional) meet the minimum qualifications for service at BCC. An additional four full-time positions are currently unfilled. Qualifications are established by the Board of Governors of the CCC. Article 11 of the PCCD Federation of Teachers Union contract describes faculty duties and responsibilities, as well as evaluation

procedures. Faculty members are also responsible for program reviews every three years, and the development, implementation, and assessment of SLOs.

14. Student Services

Guided by the College's mission, vision, and values, BCC provides student support services appropriate to the learning and development of its students. Included are Admissions and Records, Articulation, Assessment and Orientation, Counseling, DSPS, EOPS/CARE, Financial Aid, Student Life, Transfer/Career information, and Veterans Affairs.

15. Admissions

As a California Community College, BCC is a public institution and complies with California Code of Regulations, Title 5. Accordingly, it is an open access college that admits students having a high school diploma or the equivalent, or those who are eighteen years of age. With permission, selected high school students are allowed concurrent enrollment. Matriculation includes placement assessment to insure that students are appropriately enrolled within its courses and programs. Admissions information is found in the College Catalog, schedule of classes, and College and District websites.

16. Information and Learning Resources

Berkeley City College provides its students, staff, and faculty with access to sufficient informational resources and training, tutoring opportunities, study spaces, and in-person and remote access to materials in order to fulfill the mission of the college and its educational programs.

17. Financial Resources

The District implemented a revenue-driven budget allocation model, based on SB 361. The college is allocated its portion of funds, and the college independently develops its operating budget to support and improve student learning and services. The College has benefited from the implementation of the budget allocation model.

18. Financial Accountability

The District contracts with an external certified public accountant firm to conduct external financial audits of the district and colleges. The College reviews any findings and recommendations in a timely manner. There are no findings carried over from 2013.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The team confirmed that BCC has established an integrated institutional planning process specifically linked to the College's mission, vision, and values, as well as to its strategic priorities. The College's integrated planning process arises from assessment of student learning, and then describes program goals in terms of long-term institutional goals mapped out by BCC's Education Master Plan, Student Success Plan, Basic Skills Plan, Equity Plan, Technology Plan, and Facilities Plan. These are reviewed and updated regularly. The process allows for self-evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, and implementation.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public

The Berkeley City College Catalog is published biannually and is found on the website. An addendum is included on the website which includes any changes that occur after the hard copy catalog was published. The catalog contains information describing its purpose and objectives, admission requirements, rules, and regulations affecting students, programs and courses, degrees and degree requirements, costs and refund policies, grievance procedures, and academic credentials of faculty and administrators. Much of this information is also provided in the schedule of classes printed and posted on the Berkeley City College website each semester. The Public Information Officer assures that information about the college is current and accurate.

21. Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The team confirmed that the College provides assurance of full compliance with the eligibility requirements, Accreditation Standards, and policies of the Commission, demonstrating honesty and integrity in representations to all constituencies and the public and in relationships with the Accreditation Association and other external agencies.

Evaluations of Commission Policies

Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education

PCCD defines Distance Education as education in which the instructor and student are separated, but maintain regular and substantive contact either synchronously or asynchronously. Courses reflect policies that are the same as for face-to-face courses for quality, integrity, effectiveness. They reflect the BCC mission, and are offered for both transfer and career technical education purposes. In addition, policies and procedures of academic honesty, acceptable use of Information Technology Services include the following: penalties for unauthorized use of another student's name and password, cheating on examinations, and other types of academic dishonesty. Students must agree to these the first time they log onto the district learning management system. This educates students instead of giving them punitive measures. Courses go through regular and separate review processes of curriculum approval and review to meet standards, rigor and learning outcomes for regular classes. The department chair and faculty, curriculum committee, and DE coordinator review them. Instructors must have received training and are evaluated regularly. Learning outcomes are the same as for the face-to-face class and are reflected in the outline of record. The chair of the department reviews the DE classes to determine if they will be offered again. In addition, they are evaluated in program review. In 2009, a substantive change proposal for five academic programs in which 50 percent or more of the courses are offered in distance education was submitted by the College and approved by the Commission. These have been regularly reviewed.

Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV

In the Peralta Community College District, all funds are reconciled as required by each state or federal funding source. The District's independent external auditors review federal and state-funded programs as part of the annual audit. Berkeley Community College's current student loan default rate is 15.5 percent, which is within federal guidelines, and lower than the overall Peralta Community College District average of 19 percent. Furthermore, between 2009 and 2011, the College's three-year official cohort default rate decreased by more than 10 percentage points from 25.8 percent for 2009 to 15.5 percent for 2011. The positive trend in the reduction of student default rates is attributed to the stabilization of the College's Financial Aid Office over the last five years beginning with the hiring of a full-time Financial Aid Program Supervisor. The College complies with this ACCJC Policy. The District and College monitor and manage student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets in order to comply with all federal and state mandates.

Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status

The institution provides accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies through its catalog and course schedule. Hard copy versions are published each semester, but online versions are revised frequently for up-to-the-minute accuracy. Catalog content originates with the responsible

service unit supervisor or department chair, and a technician develops the course and room schedule. The Catalog conveys information about BCC's programs and services including institutional and program student learning outcomes. According to the Public Information Officer, this then becomes the source for all other BCC publications because its page format is intentionally designed to lend itself to multiple uses. All advertising and student recruitment materials follow guidelines from the PIO published annually in the memo "Branding Berkeley City College: BCC Marketing Guidelines." Numerous responsible parties, the Public Information Officer, and proofreaders review all documents for accuracy. As stated in its self-evaluation, BCC lists all CTE programs along with their accredited status in the college catalog and on its website.

Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits

The Peralta Community College District Program and Course Approval Process Manual outlines Title 5 requirements regarding awarding units of credit as well as the formula for calculating class time and assignments for courses offered in time frames of less than a full semester. Where courses are to be offered in a reduced time frame less than six weeks, the "...curriculum committee engage the discipline faculty in a review...for...academic integrity and rigor the method for meeting Carnegie units, the ability for students to complete and for faculty to evaluate outside assignments, and the appropriateness of the method of delivery."

Policy on Institutional Integrity and Ethics

Berkeley City College makes decisions using a participatory governance process using participatory governance representing the major college stakeholders in its decision making process. In addition, it follows the board policies of a locally elected board of trustees and follows the educational code of the state of California. Berkeley Community College is also committed to the accreditation process and Standards of ACCJC. Its board of trustees has an established code of ethics which is strictly followed at BCC. The College follows the guidelines of the ACCJC in maintaining public awareness of its accredited status on its college website and in letters and publications from commission deposited in the president's office and college library.

Although the institution-set standards are appropriate, relevant and outcomes are widely communicated across the College, the annual program review does not provide evidence of defined elements and expected measures of performance within instructional programs, nor are these listed as requirements in the Instructional Review Handbook. Because the handbook is currently in revision, the Team strongly suggests that the College follow-up and monitor this process in order to ensure that performance measures are routinely reported as part of the program review process.

The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online. However, student complaint files since the last accreditation visit do not demonstrate that these policies and procedures have been meticulously followed. The team reviewed complaint files dated from fall 2009 to the present and found them to be inconsistently

handled. Although the College conforms to the Commission’s “Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions” in that its procedures are *reasonable* and *well publicized*, the team was unable to ascertain if the complaints had been “fairly administered” because many complaint files were incomplete. Case files did not all include the requisite forms summarizing claim, action, and outcomes. Many of those that were included were not filled out, or incomplete. Case resolution letters or statements were frequently missing. The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but the Team suggests that the College take steps to ensure all complaints are processed in accordance with stated policies and procedures.

Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations

BCC has no contracts with organizations that are not regionally accredited.

Evaluations of Accreditation Standards

Standard I.A – Mission

General Observations

Berkeley City College has an updated and approved mission statement with supporting vision and values statements. The mission and vision statements define the broad educational purposes, student population, and commitment to student learning. The programs and services offered by the institution support the mission, and the mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making. The mission, vision, and values were most recently reviewed and revised in 2013-14 with participation by campus stakeholder groups.

The self evaluation of Standard I.A.3 suffered from a lack of evidence, including analysis of the data that was used to review the most recent revision to the mission and the process by which the mission statement is developed and approved by all stakeholders.

Findings and Evidence

The Berkeley City College mission statement reads: “Berkeley City College’s mission is to promote student success, to provide our diverse community with educational opportunities, and to transform lives.” As such, the College identifies its broad educational purpose as “student success” and its intended student population as a “diverse community.” The vision statement affirms the broad purpose of “academic excellence,” intended “diverse” student population, and commitment to “student-centered learning.” The mission directly aligns with the District mission. The College uses environmental scans to determine its intended population, and these external and internal scans are used in the College’s planning context to inform the Educational Master Plan. There is evidence that the College has used this analysis to create programs in response to community need. A fall 2013 comparison of demographics between BCC’s designated service area and its student body found that the College meets its mission by adequately serving its intended student population in terms of race/ethnicity. A recent institutional effectiveness survey was used to assess how well the institution identified its objectives in the mission and engages in dialogue about student learning. The results indicate that a significant majority of faculty, staff, and students are aware of the mission and are engaging in dialogue to determine if the College is meeting its mission.

Annual program updates require each unit to describe the unit’s unique mission. Resource requests are prioritized in terms of how well the requests support the Educational Master Plan, and by extension, the mission. As part of program review, units align their mission with the College mission and assess and address the needs of students. DE courses align with the mission, are online versions of traditional classes in established programs, are approved through the curriculum process, and are intended to expand opportunities for students studying in the traditional learning mode. Departments consider DE enrollment, retention, and success rates as part of program review, and learning outcomes assessment occurs for all

DE courses in the same manner as traditional courses. DE courses and services are assessed through program review at the local level, and planning also occurs District wide (I.A.1).

The Peralta Board of Trustees approved the mission on April 12, 2005 and reapproved the most recent version on October 7, 2014. The mission, vision, and values statements are published in the biannual catalog, class schedules, and the website, and are posted in numerous visible places throughout the campus (I.A.2).

As part of the March 2009 ACCJC evaluation report, the College was “encouraged to develop a timeline for regular review of its mission and revise it as warranted.” Documentation of the process and timeline by which the institution reviews and revises its mission statement will occur, most likely in the BCC Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting. Despite the lack of documentation on the process for periodic review of the mission and what circumstances prompt changes to the mission (see Recommendation 1), the College does use its governance process to review its mission. In spring 2014, the Standard I.A subcommittee analyzed data as part of a review of the mission. In early 2014, the revised mission was reviewed by governance committees including the BCC Leadership Council, BCC Roundtable, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and ASBCC and at an open town hall (I.A.3).

The mission statement defines the College’s broad educational purposes and the vision and values clarify the mission. The mission drives the generation of strategic goals in the Educational Master Plan and annual goals. The mission is the framework for the Educational Master Plan and the College has a clear process for aligning goals and planning with District goals. The College’s current goals include promoting student success and developing and managing resources to advance the mission. As part of annual program review, units define their own missions in relation to the College mission (I.A.4).

Conclusions

Combined with the vision statement, the mission states the College’s educational purposes, intended student population, and commitment to achieving student learning. Programs and services reflect the broad educational purposes and intended student population identified in the mission statement. The College meets Standard I.A.1.

The mission statement was approved by the Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees on April 12, 2005 and reapproved on October 7, 2014. The mission statement is published in the biannual catalog, class schedules, and website, and is posted throughout the campus. The College meets Standard I.A.2.

The mission statement was recently reviewed through the established governance structure, which allowed for input by all stakeholders. Although the College has not developed a timeline for regular review and revision of its mission, it uses its governance processes to analyze data and review the mission. The College meets Standard I.A.3.

The mission guides institutional planning and decision making. The mission is central to the development of the Educational Master Plan and annual goals, and as part of program review units align their missions and planning to the College mission. The College meets Standard I.A.4.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 1

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College, through its governance and decision-making structure, develop and publish a process to review its mission and program review, institutional planning, student learning assessment, and resource allocation processes on a regular basis and revise as necessary (I.A.3, I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.C.1.b, III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d, III.C.2, IV.B.2.b).

Standard I.B – Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

Berkeley City College (BCC) has an intentional and integrated planning, program review, learning assessment, and resource allocation cycle that informs student learning and success. The College established a planning and decision-making process that includes a committee and reporting structure informed by master planning and program review to systematically integrate planning, resource prioritization, and evaluation and does so in a manner that incorporates broad involvement of appropriate constituencies.

Ongoing self-reflective dialogue is central to BCC's planning and decision-making processes, especially as it relates to learning outcomes. The team found that the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level is ongoing and promotes broad dialogue. Assessments results are subsequently used to improve programs and services. Data-informed program reviews with a focus on improving achievement and learning outcomes for all students are hallmarks of BCC's integrated planning process.

Findings and Evidence

Berkeley City College has a culture of dialogue, collaboration, and the collegial exchange of ideas. The College has embraced the continuous improvement of learning outcomes and the role of assessment and data-informed decision-making in that ongoing process. Self-reflective dialogue occurs regularly and in three main ways: through integrated institutional planning processes; constituency, operational and governance committees; and through ongoing efforts to improve Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the institutional, program, and course level as overseen by the Planning for Institutional Effectiveness Committee (I.B.1).

Beyond these structured opportunities, the College has additional mechanisms for eliciting and responding to input including planning retreats, town hall meetings, Flex Day activities, Brown Bag lunches, and President's Teas. Learning outcomes assessment results,

quantitative outcome data, survey results, and highlights of focused action learning projects are among the broad range of topics presented and openly discussed in these venues (I.B.1).

Instructional departments routinely engage in dialogue about the results of SLO assessments. Results of a recent survey confirm 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.” Further, evidence exists that faculty and staff engage in this dialogue. Over the last five years, the Teaching and Learning Center organized small groups of faculty and staff, within and across disciplines, to translate assessment results into action. More than 100 faculty and staff members in 30 different disciplines/areas participated in these groups. Current projects include Focused Inquiry Groups (FIGs), which do primary and secondary research and make recommendations, and Action Plan Projects for Learning Excellence (APPLEs) that take action on recommendations from prior FIGs and/or findings and create action plans from SLO assessments. Implementation of these action plans is shown to have significant impact on increasing student learning (I.B.1).

BCC courses delivered via distance education (DE) share common SLOs and assessments with those offered in a face-to-face classroom setting. Dialogue regarding improvements occurs in the same manner as traditional programs. The District Office of Institutional Research provides success and retention rates for DE students, reported at the course and program level as part of the program review process. The team found limited evidence of how these data are analyzed and used to enhance services to DE students and improve coursework delivered via distance education (I.B.1).

BCC set standards for satisfactory performance of student success student achievement. These standards were determined using an average of prior year performance. The team examined the institutional summary data and found student achievement is on the rise at BCC and demonstrates that the College’s programs of study lead to degrees and certificates, including those in career technical education. As an example, over a six year period from 2008-09 to 2013-14 awards in associate degrees increased by 99 percent from 106 to 211. The number of certificate degrees grew by 400 percent. In 2013-14, BCC had the highest admission rate (63 percent of applicants accepted) to the University of California at Berkeley of any community college in California. Taken together, the results of these institution-set standards demonstrate the College is fulfilling its mission (I.B, I.B.1-6).

The College Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting sets annual goals at the beginning of each academic year. The goals are directly linked to the College’s mission, vision, and values; aligned with District goals and data reviews; program reviews and annual program updates; and analyses of assessment and achievement data. For 2013-14, the College established five goals each with measureable outcomes. In fall 2014, BCC used its institution-set standards as outcome measures to assess the accomplishments of college goals two and three respectively: to increase certificate/degree completion and transfers to four-year colleges or universities, and improve career and college-preparation progress and success rates. Further, program and service area reviews and annual updates utilize College goals and objectives in their program assessments and development of action plans. At the conclusion of the academic year, the College Roundtable assesses how well these outcomes

have been met. The results are presented in meetings and planning sessions and published on the College website (I.B.2).

BCC's annual planning is integrated through a Planning and Decision-Making Process that incorporates program review, planning, and resource allocation. The planning cycle is robust and integrated. The Educational Master Plan and Facilities Plan are developed on a ten-year cycle whereas the Equity Plan and Technology Plan are updated every three years coinciding with the comprehensive program review cycle. While several of the plans are slated for approval in spring 2015, the team examined current plans and drafts confirming systematic evaluation of programs and services, improvement planning, data, longitudinal trends, and assessment results are being used to shape long-range planning for the College. The College has chosen to deliberately align these plans with annual planning for the Student Support and Success Program and Basic Skills Initiative (I.B.3).

The College has an ongoing, three-year cycle of comprehensive program and service area reviews with annual updates in the intervening years. A comprehensive plan also guides SLO development and assessment. The College assesses learning outcomes at the institutional, program, and course levels and uses the results of these assessments for continuous improvement in student learning (I.B.3).

DE course approvals are in compliance with State regulations that require a separate curriculum approval process for courses delivered at a distance. Needs for fiscal, technical, and human resources are identified and input into the resource allocation process in two ways: through the program review by academic discipline and in the DE group (Instructional Technology Unit) administrative review (I.B.3).

The Planning and Decision-making Process includes participation by the four main campus constituencies – faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Meaningful participation includes representation from Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Department Chairs' Council, and Associated Students of Berkeley City College. Committee membership lists available online and interviews with BCC personnel confirmed broad-based involvement. It is noteworthy that committee members refer to broad constituency participation with conviction and pride, highlighting this as an institutional strength in overall planning and decision-making (I.B.4).

The College's program review and annual program update templates require that all requests for resource allocation be tied to relevant data including program learning or service area outcomes, followed by a presentation of detailed qualitative and quantitative data. Resources are allocated based upon the prioritization of these requests that filter through the constituency, operational and governance committee structure. Committees use rubrics to ensure that higher prioritization is given to those requests that support College goals (I.B.4).

When fiscal resources needed to fulfill plans are not available, the College, with support from the District Office, proactively seeks alternative funding sources. Over the last six years the College secured a growing number of county, state, and federal grants almost doubling these restricted funds from 2009-10 to 2014-15 from \$3.7 million to \$7 million respectively. These funds provided much-needed and significant support for ensuring the College's ability to

deliver quality programs and services for students (I.B.4).

The College publishes student demographic information and data reports e.g., *Berkeley City College Student Achievement – Access, Equity, and Success* on the website. Institution-set standards are listed on the website and discussed regularly at Flex Day and annual planning retreats. Master planning documents include extensive data on achievement gaps, environmental scans, and enrollment and facilities projections (I.B.5).

The annual integrated cycle for planning, program review, student learning assessment, and resource allocation is well thought out and well deployed. Some examples of modifications to the integrated cycle are evident, e.g., a revision to prioritization of faculty requests, the elimination of the Leadership Council, and the slight change in the charge of the Planning for Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The team did not find evidence of systematic review of the processes themselves, a characteristic of sustainable continuous quality improvement in institutional effectiveness (I.B.6).

To assess effectiveness in instructional programs, the College primarily uses learning outcomes assessments and student achievement measures such as course completion and success, retention, persistence, awards, and transfer rates as evaluation mechanisms. Student services areas review student participation levels in matriculation processes, assessments of Service Area Outcomes, SLOs where appropriate, and student survey results. In addition to locally designed surveys, the College administered the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, a nationally normed instrument, to assess both student and college engagement (I.B.7).

The District Office of Institutional Research Student routinely provides outcome data disaggregated by age, gender, and ethnicity. The College can also request research support, additional data, and cohort-level analyses from the District Office. The *Business Intelligence Tool* further provides personnel the capacity to access ad hoc queries and create visual data dashboards. Despite these resources however, and references made to the use of surveys and other data throughout this section, evidence of data analysis, and how these analyses are used is minimal, especially with regard to assessing the effectiveness of DE. The team suggests that to support data analysis, the College evaluate the need to enhance internal institutional research capacity and thereby increase institutional effectiveness (I.B.7).

Conclusions

The College's goals are consistent with the mission, vision, and values of the institution, are determined through a robust and integrated planning process, contain measureable outcomes for assessing the extent to which the goals are achieved, and are widely published. Ongoing self-reflective dialogue is central to BCC's planning and decision-making processes, especially as it relates to learning outcomes. The team found that the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level is ongoing and promotes broad dialogue on the results of the assessments that are subsequently used to improve programs and services. Data-informed program reviews, and a focus on improving achievement and learning outcomes for all students, are hallmarks of BCC's integrated

planning process. However, the team was unable to find collaborative evidence to support that the College has completed the process of systematically reviewing and re-evaluating all parts of the cycle including program review, student learning outcome assessment, planning, and resource allocation processes to assess their effectiveness in improving programs and services. The College partially meets Standard I.B.

Recommendations

See *College Recommendation 1*

College Recommendation 2

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the College develop a plan to increase its research capacity in order to better analyze progress towards achieving institutional and strategic goals (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5).

Standard II.A – Instructional Programs

General Observations

Berkeley City College offers Associate in Arts (AA) degrees, Associate in Science (AS) degrees, Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T) degrees, Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T) degrees, Certificates of Achievement (CA), and Certificates of Proficiency (CP) in liberal arts, science, occupational fields, or specialized areas of study. BCC offers collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, contract education courses, and online classes. Achievement indicators reveal that BCC students are meeting their goals; however, the team was unable to verify specific data related to DE courses in the evidence. The educational goal that BCC students most commonly cite is transfer to a four-year college or university, but many students also indicate goals related to improving job skills or gaining degrees or certificates. The college has reported increases in transfers and in degrees and certificates awarded. In 2013-2014 211 students received associate degrees and 234 received CTE or non-CTE certificates. This revealed significant growth for the college, and they anticipate that this growth will continue, as the College now has fourteen new Associate Degrees for Transfer, to assure that students seamlessly transfer to colleges in the California State University system. Impressive collaboration with their neighbor University of California at Berkeley (UCB), has been very successful. In 2013-14, BCC had the highest admission rate (63 percent of applicants accepted) to UCB of any community college in California.

Findings and Evidence

The team reviewed the BCC Self-Evaluation Report and evidence, the college website, catalog, class schedule, and BCC Taskstream and CurricUNET sites and found evidence that the college offers a variety of instructional programs of high quality and demand. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. The curriculum at BCC is focused on several important areas that are vital to local economic development and educational needs. Programs and classes in

biotechnology, business, computer information systems, office technology and multimedia and Web design, and social services paraprofessional training, are designed to integrate academics and occupational education with firm business and community partnerships. Courses are offered in a variety of platforms including classrooms on campus and at the UCB campus, hybrid, and online. Transfer courses are offered at convenient times in the evening, online and on weekends so that working students can more easily complete their studies (II.A.1, II.A.4).

BCC's mission, vision, and values provide students with rigorous, high-quality academic courses in an environment conducive to respect for its diverse community, as well as encouragement for personal development and awareness of local and global issues that affect the world determine its courses and programs. The institution ensures that courses meet the stated mission, vision, and values through the curriculum committee and when appropriate, advisory committees such as the District Distance Education Committee guidance and review. The College is also utilizing techniques promoted by the Academy for College Excellence and Experiential Learning Institute from Cabrillo College for determining and working with different learning styles (II.A.1).

The College is currently in its second round of Course-level SLO assessments that are monitored for quality by department chairs or assessment liaisons, Deans, Librarians, and the Planning for Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Program and ILO assessments are also being assessed. Course and Program Assessments are mapped to ILO assessments. Quality is assessed utilizing student learning outcomes and Program Review; however, not all programs and courses have been assessed. The team was not able to find clear evidence that this process is ongoing and has been effectively utilized in decision-making. The College is on the second cycle of assessment based on their plan. The cycle was not complete at the time the Self Evaluation Report was written. Some courses have not yet been assessed. There is not documentation that distance education courses have been assessed in an ongoing manner to determine differences in success or differences in performance against institution-set standards. According to District Administrative Procedure 4210 (Student Learning Outcomes) assessment will be utilized as a tool to improve teaching and learning.

The ILOs that BCC has identified are:

- Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Computational Skills
- Ethics and Personal Responsibility
- Global Awareness and Valuing Diversity
- Information Competency
- Self-Awareness and Interpersonal Skills

A 2014 student survey supports the college's assertion that BCC encourages student intellectual development, BCC encourages their personal growth that BCC encourages appreciation for diversity with an overwhelming majority agreeing (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2).

The District administrative procedure (AP 4020) on program, curriculum, and course development clearly describes the process for course and program proposals, including DE. All course and program proposals must first be approved by the college curriculum committee followed by approval by the Council on Instruction, Planning, and Development, then at the Board of Trustees, and finally, at the State Chancellor's Office. The College utilizes the CurricUNET online platform to work through the approval process for all courses including online courses. AP 4020 further stipulates that "all programs, curriculum, and courses are reviewed on a three-year cycle through Program Review [and that] all programs complete an Annual Program update." The team reviewed documentation of annual program review. These were very detailed and included needs, evidence and planning. The team heard many accounts of the work that is involved in the annual program updates and the success stories of resources that were allocated based on this work. AP 4022 provides specific guidelines for course approval, especially in the case of courses that are not degree-applicable or are "stand-alone" courses (II.A.2).

Although the college has designated course-level, and program level SLOs; has an assessment timeline for all course, program, and institutional SLOs, not all courses have been assessed since the last accreditation visit. At the course level, all course outlines of record include SLOs that are written by the faculty and approved by the Curriculum Committee. There is not apparent dialogue for decision-making about the results of the complete assessment of course SLOs or program outcomes because not all courses have been assessed to date. The institutional dialogue about the results of SLO assessment is also not convincing with a survey showing only 60 percent of the faculty indicating they discuss SLOs in department meetings. Thirty-two percent said these are shared via e-mail distribution lists, and only 17 percent cited special student learning outcomes sessions. Although the college utilizes Taskstream as an assessment platform, discussions with the faculty and staff revealed that they are not all willing to enter their course or program data so the actual progress is not clear. During a discussion with the team it was mentioned that the faculty are hesitant to proceed with assessing each course because of the feeling that it could be directly tied to faculty evaluations. They feel it is more valuable to assess the mastery level courses and map those to programs in order to assess learning and make decisions. Otherwise, there is indication that the college has put many efforts in place to assure that courses are assessed and that they have the tools and training in place to regularly assess course SLOs and institutional outcomes. Also, a formal process for program planning and incorporation of institutional research data into the SLO assessment process has not fully begun. SLO action plans are not evident. A review of the Taskstream site revealed that there is insufficient evidence that the institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees (II.A.2.f).

Programs and courses are assessed in rounds that are three years each with a total of six years to complete the cycle. Courses that were included in round one include "high impact courses" such as some of the communications, English, humanities, history, and psychology courses.

Statistics from Taskstream summarizing the Round 1 Course Assessments:

- There are 373 Participating Areas with access to this requirement within Berkeley City College AMS
- 91% (1031/1138) outcomes were included
- 63% (648/1031) of outcomes included have at least one measure specified
- 36% (373/1031) of outcomes included have measures with findings specified

Statistics summarizing Round 2 Course Assessment:

- There are 374 Participating Areas with access to this requirement within Berkeley City College AMS
- 94% (1073/1136) outcomes were included
- 97% (1036/1073) of outcomes included have at least one measure specified
- 38% (407/1073) of outcomes included have measures with findings specified

The team found that the Round 2 data is inaccurate because not all information has been entered into Taskstream, and there were hard copies turned in but not entered into the system. The team was told that the actual results are that 88 percent of the second round of SLO assessments are now complete.

Overall Statistics Institutional Level Outcomes Assessments Round 1:

- There are 7 participating areas with access to this requirement within Berkeley City College AMS
- 80% (4/5) outcomes were included
- 100% (4/4) of outcomes included have at least one measure specified
- 100% (4/4) of outcomes included have measures with findings specified

Overall Statistics Program Level for year 2013-2014:

- There are 57 Participating Areas with access to this requirement within Berkeley City College AMS
- 96% (26/27) outcomes were included
- 73% (19/26) of outcomes included have at least one measure specified
- 12% (3/26) of outcomes included have measures with findings specified

Procedures are in place to design and identify learning outcomes to approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. Faculty are responsible for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs. Student learning outcomes have been designated for all courses. Assessment of these outcomes has been planned and the results used for continuous quality improvement. Many of the courses are not scheduled to be assessed until 2015. The Curriculum Committee and Planning for Institutional Effectiveness Committee, along with department chairs, deans, and librarians, ensure the quality of courses and programs. Academic programs are assessed utilizing data from the student learning outcomes assessments of mastery level courses. Distance education courses are evaluated in the same manner as the face-to-face courses. During meetings with the teams to discuss program review, it was noted that the college does not consider distance education a separate program so there are no specific policies regarding the creation or evaluation of distance

education and there is no distinction of assessment or initiation of the course. The rationale that was given to the team during a meeting on distance education was that all courses should be treated the same, and therefore, the College does not disaggregate data for distance education classes and thus does not have a clear picture of DE student success. (II.A.2, II.A.2.a., II.A.2.e). See Recommendation 4.

The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. None of the college Career-Technical Education (CTE) programs lead to licensure. BCC CTE programs utilize advisory boards to help ensure that students demonstrate appropriate technical and professional competencies. BCC offers the following CTE programs: American Sign Language, Biotechnology, Business, Computer Information Systems, Multimedia Arts, Public and Human Services, and Spanish Medical Interpreting. Representatives from industry and businesses serve on advisory committees for CTE programs. These representatives help determine student learning outcomes, planning and evaluating courses to meet industry needs and also determine curriculum priorities. Faculty shared with the team that frequent communication and collaboration with industry partners is even more productive than the official advisory committee meetings. They are in frequent communication with employers regarding the curriculum needed to develop and assess the employment competencies that are needed in the field and needs for new program development. Some of the success stories that they shared with the team include a partnership with Pixar in which students have been running animation workshops for the past five years with Pixar. This collaboration started when one of the faculty members approached Pixar to inquire about students being able to complete internships to gain experience in multimedia. Another success story is a career pathways partnership with SAP Software Corporation that provides an opportunity for virtual mentoring along with work experience. The results of a recent CTE Employment Outcomes survey showed that completing CTE studies at BCC is related to positive employment outcomes. The majority of the 101 students that responded to the survey are employed, are working in the same field as their studies or training, and are working full time. They reported a 32.8 percent increase in their hourly wage after completing their studies at BCC and were satisfied with the education and training they received. The team reviewed CTE committee minutes which are located on the website. The CTE faculty utilize annual program updates and program review to determine how the various grants and CTE funds will be allocated (II.A. 2.b, II.A.5).

BCC has a regular cycle in place for the assessment of student progress towards achieving the identified outcomes. The district office of institutional research makes achievement data available to faculty and staff as needed (II.A.2.b).

The curriculum approval and revision process which is initiated by the faculty assure that quality, appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs of instruction. A review of curriculum committee minutes confirms the detailed conversations that go into peer consultation with a goal of producing quality curriculum. Teaching and Learning Center Projects have been in place to support faculty in the process of assessment. The College encourages collaborative problem solving

and learning through activities such as Focused Inquiry Groups (FIGs), Discuss Apply Reflect Tools (DARTs), and Peer Observation Pools (POPs), overseen by the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC). Initially funded by a Title III grant, these approaches helped the College begin the assessment process by developing student learning outcomes (II.A.2.c).

The college has made a commitment to support students regardless of their learning styles and also for any teaching modality. Academy for College Excellence (ACE) approaches from Cabrillo College are used to assess learning styles, specifically, FELI (Faculty Experiential Learning Institute). Training for faculty is provided. Some examples of that commitment include providing tutors and making “Google Hangout” available as a distance education tool that combines a Skype-like environment with sharing of documents via Google docs, so that tutors on campus can work with distance education students and face-to-face students in the same lab setting, using the same methodologies. In addition, the college EOPS and TRIO programs are currently contracting with an outside agency to provide online tutoring to BCC students. A review of syllabi reveals the college utilizes a variety of teaching methodologies and delivery modes. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students. Support in Math is available through the Eureka program (II.A.2.d).

Some programs utilize common test questions that have been developed through faculty meetings, with agreed-upon answers. Assessment of the effectiveness is achieved by measuring student learning outcomes. The College systematically reviews courses and programs through the Curriculum Committee and Council on Instruction Planning & Development (CIPD) and systematically engages in ongoing course and program assessment (II.A.2.g).

District AP 4020 and 4025 confirm that the institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are also consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms (II.A.2.h).

BCC offers a variety of courses including: collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, contract education courses, hybrid and online. Credit awarded is based on students’ achievement of the courses’ stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies, such as AP 4020 (Program Curriculum and Course Development), which reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. Continuing and community education is not offered at the college. Study abroad is not offered at the college. Short-term training, international student, contract education, and distance education courses are guided by the same development and evaluation processes as traditional courses. BCC has a large and successful contract education program with local charter and private high schools. Students are able to complete college level transfer curriculum while at the high school as a result of these agreements. The courses are the same courses offered at the college and are assessed and updated in the same manner. District administrative procedure 4104 addresses contract education (II.A.2, II.A.2.h).

AP 4025 (Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education) guides the institution in awarding degrees based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes (II.A.2.i.).

The college has kept current with changes in general education recommendations and transfer requirements. Student learning outcomes have been designated for these courses including the following areas: humanities, fine arts, natural sciences, social sciences, oral and written communication, information competency, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, ethics, respect for cultural diversity, interpersonal skills, and global awareness. In spring 2012 BCC faculty achieved completion of the general education matrix, which aligns GE requirements for Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), CSU-GE, UC-Transfer Course Agreement (TCA), and the BCC AA/AS degrees, and also aligns all of these requirements with BCC institutional learning outcomes (II.A.3).

A review of the BCC college catalog confirms that all degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. (II.A.4)

AP 4050 (Articulation) and AP 4100 (Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates) detail District wide administrative procedures regarding transfer-of-credit. This information is included in the college catalog and is consistent with Title 5, Matriculation Guidelines, CSU and UC transfer policies, and policies established through the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (II.A.6.a).

The District's Administrative Procedure 4021 (Program Discontinuance/Consolidation) describes the procedure for eliminating a program at the College (II.A.6.b). However, the Team did not see evidence where this had been employed.

The College publishes information to students (current and prospective) in several ways, e.g. brochures, catalog, class schedule, and course syllabi. Policies and practices regarding publications are reviewed and updated each year during the Annual Program Update process and submitted to the Public Information Officer (PIO), who makes necessary changes and produces the updated publications. Electronic representations of the college such as the catalog, policies, and procedures are also reviewed for accuracy annually. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. In off years, the college publishes a catalog addendum in order to keep information current. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, and course requirements. Faculty are expected to include student learning outcomes in the syllabi that are consistent with those in the official course outlines and identified in Taskstream for assessment. The team reviewed syllabi from courses including online and face-to-face courses. Some of the syllabi were not consistent when taught by different professors even in the same semester, some of the syllabi did not include student learning outcomes and a comparison of the student learning outcomes on the course outlines in CurricUNET were not consistent with the syllabi. Not all of the official course outlines matched the student learning outcomes that were listed in the syllabi (II.A.6, II.A.6.c). See Recommendation 3.

In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or world views are posted online at the Peralta website. These policies make clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. Students have to use 2 forms of identity to register. The college catalog and website have clear information. No evidence was found by the team that BCC faculty have engaged in discussions to deepen their understanding of the expectation that faculty must distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline even though the District does have a policy that requires this. Student and peer evaluations of faculty provide opportunities for comments to determine how effectively the faculty are meeting this expectation. DE instructors are evaluated in the same manner as faculty teaching traditional courses. The College does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct for staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or seek to instill specific beliefs or world views (II.A.7.a, II.A.7.c). See Recommendation 4.

An administrative policy on student standards of conduct, including examples of and consequences for dishonesty, is printed in the College catalog and is available online. A description of academic dishonesty; student conduct, discipline, and due process rights; and the full student code of conduct is published online at the "for students" part of the DE website. The DE website also includes FAQs that discuss student privacy. A District Administrative Procedure on student authentication indicates that DE students are given a specific login ID and password to access the Moodle LMS, and that student-instructor interaction contributes to verifying a student's identity. The same policy also references District policies and procedures on academic honesty. Some instructors—and entire departments such as English—require proctored exams. Many traditional and DE instructors use Turnitin. The campus documents all incidents of academic dishonesty (II.A.7.b).

The College does not offer curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals (II.A.8).

Conclusions

In evaluating the response of the previous 2009 recommendation, a large percentage of the courses have yet to be assessed vis-a-vis student learning outcomes. In addition, performance of students in distance education courses is not consistently compared to face-to-face courses. Because of the lack of assessment data, the team was unable to verify that dialogue regarding improvement has occurred for these courses. The College partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 3

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College reevaluate the established SLO assessment cycles to implement a process that includes more frequent assessment of all courses. The team further recommends that SLOs be included in all course syllabi and match the official course outlines of record (I.B.5, I.B.7, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.A.6).

College Recommendation 4

In order to comply with the ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education and to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the College:

- a) ensure the quality of its distance education courses by comparing data on student achievement and attainment of intended learning outcomes with those found in face-to-face courses
- b) ensure that student support services provided to students in distance education courses are comparable with those provided to students in face-to-face courses (I.B.3, II.A.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, III.C.1).

Standard II.B – Student Support Services

General Observations

Berkeley City College Student Services demonstrates its commitment to a level of quality that enhances student learning and achievement. In an effort to support the learning needs of its students, the College offers a wide range of services that are available to students in person, via electronic mail, on the telephone, and on the College's website through the District wide PASSPORT student data system. In addition to the traditional services provided by admissions and records, counseling, financial aid, and assessment, the College has dedicated resources to fund specialized services to veterans, international students, disabled students, and economically disadvantaged and underrepresented students. Overall, student support services are integrated into the fabric of the institution and work collaboratively in support of student success (II.B.1).

Findings and Evidence

The College exhibits a commitment to quality student support services throughout the institution through the alignment of human capital and technology conduits. All services and programs are designed to assist, guide, develop, support, retain, and encourage students in pursuit of their educational and career goals. Student satisfaction surveys are conducted to identify gaps in service provision. The College offers a variety of high quality support services that enhance student learning and achievement. The College makes available a wide range of services to students both in person, via electronic mail, on the telephone, and on the College's website through the District wide student data system. Core services such as counseling, admissions and records, assessment, and orientations fulfill the College's mission

and vision by providing its diverse community with educational opportunities, and to transform lives. The College engages in a substantive process for assessing and reviewing its student services and making recommendations for improvement for the expansion or addition of services as needed to ensure quality. All Student Services Division services and functions have individual missions aligned with the division and institutional missions.

Assessing student needs and measuring Student Services quality and effectiveness are integral parts of the annual planning and budget cycle and the development of college wide plans, including program reviews and annual program updates (APU's) (II.B, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

Berkeley City College provides a clear, accurate, well organized and easily understood catalog for its constituencies with current information concerning all areas. The catalog is published every two years, and a catalog supplement is provided in alternate years to reflect changes in offerings, policy and/or practice. The catalog is made available in both printed and electronic online format for prospective and current students. The printed version is provided for free to students and to the community during registration, college/categorical program orientation, and in counseling classes. All required information including admissions, student fees and other financial obligations, student rights and responsibilities, the grievance process, student code of conduct, sexual harassment prevention, and the Academic Freedom Policy is readily accessible through the printed catalog and on the College website. Translations of policies in the catalog are available in Chinese and Spanish through the District Office. Faculty, staff, and administrators annually review and update the catalog to ensure its accuracy and relevance (II.B.2, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d).

Student needs are identified via data extracted internally from admissions applications, placement test results, focus groups, program review data, enrollment patterns, student surveys, demographics, and other items from registration, as well as from external sources such as the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). This information contributes to program review and ultimately the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) and Student Equity Plan (II.B.3.).

Berkeley City College has made a concerted effort and progress towards extending its services to all students regardless of the location or mode of delivery. Students can access all student services onsite and most student services through the use of technology such as; online applications, online Spanish Language Placement Advisory, e-Counseling, and financial aid applications and announcements of award status, as well as College and District Policies and Procedures. To meet student needs, all services are regularly evaluated through service area outcomes, student learning outcomes assessments, and other evaluation methods (II.B.1, II.B.2, II.B.3).

Berkeley City College's Office of Campus Life encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as personal development through its various program offerings and support for student clubs and programs such as The Student Ambassadors Program, the Safety Aides patrol, the Institute for Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE) and the Civic Engagement Club (CEC), thereby enhancing student learning and success. With the various speaker

series, the displays of artwork throughout the building and the Milvia Street Art and Literary Journal, published annually by students and faculty, the Office of Student Life serves as a hub for student opportunities, addresses current issues, and offers a vibrant intellectual and aesthetic environment for students to address personal and civic responsibilities (II.B.2, II.B.3, II.B.3.b).

The College designs and maintains services and prepares key personnel in order to support student development. In this regard, the College provides comprehensive counseling services that meet a wide variety of student needs in different formats. The Counseling department offers mandatory orientation, assessment, counseling, and follow-up services to all students (II.B.3.c).

The College also designed and implemented distance education and online educational advising services (e-Counseling). However, e-Counseling service is only offered to students “who live too far from the campus” and for students who have a compelling reason for not being able to see a counselor in person at the campus. Printed, online, and interview evidence did not reveal the interpretation of the phrase “too far from campus.” Additionally, due to the high volume of student emails, responses are not immediate (II.B.1, II.B.3.a). See Recommendation 4.

To meet the Student Success Act of 2012 mandate, Berkeley City College has adopted a case management approach by providing proactive, innovative and quality service to its students. One of the evaluation tools is an analysis of the impact of the Student Equity Plan in serving as a road map for students to follow clearly identified academic/career pathways in order to reach their education goal at the College.

Additionally, with the implementation of the Student Success Act of 2012, the District has created a central storage of student education plans (SEP’s) for both abbreviated and comprehensive plans at the four colleges. This process allows counselors at any college in the District to view and update the SEP’s with students. The College, the institutional technology (IT) department, and the District are in the process of creating a system to have the SEP interface with the Student Administration System, affording students the ability to view their SEP’s once they log into their portals.

In response to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) results and local initiatives, at the conclusion of spring 2014, the Academic Senate endorsed a final draft of a counseling and instructional faculty pilot program in which faculty advise discipline-specific areas within the instructional domain. This model is geared towards promoting student success and improving degree completion at the college. This implementation is scheduled for spring 2015.

Counseling professionals meet state minimum qualifications for professional service as counselors in the California community colleges and also receive on-going professional development through participation in statewide conferences and meetings, through on-campus training workshops, and through regularly scheduled bi-monthly, bi-annual and annual meetings (II.B.3.c).

In addition, evaluation of student surveys and program review participation, inclusive of SLO/SAO reporting and evaluation support the institution evaluative process for continuous quality improvement (II.B, II.B.1, II.B.2, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.c, II.B.4).

In alignment with its mission, “to provide our diverse community with educational opportunities,” Berkeley City College’s appreciation for diversity is evident in its design and existence of programs, practices, and services to enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity as evidenced by their general education requirements for all Associate Degrees of at least three units of ethnic studies. Moreover, Berkeley City College has identified one of its institutional learning outcomes as “Global Awareness and Valuing Diversity.”

Berkeley City College offers several clubs that represent the diversity of the College. These include the Black Student Union, the International Students Association, the Gay-Straight Alliance, the Latin American Club, and the Muslim Student Association. The College also offers cultural celebrations to include, Cinco de Mayo, Black History Month, and Lunar New Year. The Office of Student Life, the ASBCC and the student clubs provide great opportunities for students to understand and to appreciate diversity by providing Club Rush once each semester to encourage students to find out about a club that may be of interest to them.

Berkeley City College Dreamers Task Force which collaborates across disciplines, service areas, and departments of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, aims at increasing awareness about the multiple barriers faced by undocumented students. The goal is to develop resources at the College to support this growing population. The District’ Faculty Diversity Internship Program provides intern and mentoring opportunities for talented individuals in an effort to provide high quality learning opportunities, and to enhance the educational needs of the multicultural East Bay community (II.A.3.b, II.B.3.b, II.B.3.d).

Berkeley City College engages in the process of instrument evaluation with validated methods. Admission and records instruments, practices, processes, and procedures are routinely discussed and reviewed at both the college and district level to make certain they are effective, consistent, and unbiased. A set of clearly defined multiple measures have also been created by the college to ensure that all relevant information about a student is taken into consideration before a course placement is recommended. The College uses CCCApply as its primary application process. This online process which was designed with collaboration from other college users and in consultation with the Chancellor’s Office, allows the college to collect and respond to data about individual student needs. The College ensures that its assessment tools and practices are in compliance with the California Community College System Office which approves the Compass diagnostic tool that is maintained by American College Testing (ACT) and used by the institution. Validations of all tests, which are conducted on a six-year cycle, are currently due for its six-year validation renewal during this 2014-2015 academic year (II.B.3.a, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.e, II.B.3.f).

Berkeley City College maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially with appropriate and secure backup of files. The College's governing board policies outline the maintenance and security of student records as mandated by federal and state regulations. The district maintains procedures to ensure that access to student records is restricted only to those individuals permitted such access by law and who require such access to carry on the operation of the district. Permanent student files are in the process of being scanned and archived using the newly implement Electronic Content Management system (ECM). Electronic storage provides a higher level of security by ensuring fireproof, waterproof storage of data that is backed up nightly by Data Protection Services (Cloud Backup) and stored off-site. Records access information is provided to students in the college catalog. Family Educational Rights Privacy Act (FERPA) training is reviewed on a regular basis to with Admissions and Records staff (II.B.2, IIB.3.f).

Student Support Services have Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) and Service Area Outcomes (SAO's) and use them to identify student needs and to measure success towards meeting those needs. Measurements are reported via a complete program review every three years. In between, each campus agency continues to assess its effectiveness as it prepares APU's. Program Reviews and APU's, coupled with dialogue within area wide meetings, contribute to the substance of the Administrative Program Review. This captures program assessment results and carries them forward into the planning and budgeting process.

Conclusions

The College offers a variety of high quality student support services that enhance learning and achievement. A wide range of services is available to students both in person and online. Core services fulfill the College's mission and vision by providing services that enhance student learning. Most student support services have written student learning outcomes (SLO) and service area outcomes (SAO) and are engaged in using assessments to improve their effectiveness. The college partially meets this standard.

Recommendations

See *College Recommendation 3*

See *College Recommendation 4*

Standard II.C – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The library collection contains a collection of 5,900 unique titles and 534 video recordings. The library also subscribes to 30 print periodicals in the forms of magazines and journals. In addition to providing student access to 39 electronic reference databases, the library also offers an electronic book (e-book) collection of over 100,000 books geared to the research and reading interests of the community college student. In addition to the campus library, BCC students also have access to nearby Berkeley Public Library, which has a good

collection to support student research needs and which welcomes BCC students. Although also available, the \$25/per six months fee for students to utilize the libraries at U.C. Berkeley is prohibitive for many students.

In support of student interest, the library has begun to actively collect zines, and the collection is well used. In 2014-15, the process of cataloging a donated collection of graphic novels should be completed, and students will be able to access these materials for in-library use (II.C.1, II.C.1.a).

The BCC library shares a catalog with the three other college libraries in the Peralta district using the Millennium Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC). The colleges also share access to the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC). In addition, the college takes part in the Council of Chief Librarians (CCL) consortium-priced access to databases and e-book collections for California community college students (II.C.1.e).

Study areas in the library are equipped with 12 computers for student research usage; four computers for printing and catalog searching; one scanner; one optic document magnifier; three televisions; two photocopiers; two print stations; four individual study carrels; five group study rooms, each furnished with one table and four to six chairs; and six tables with 42 chairs for study in the library. At the time of the team visit, virtually every space available for students was in use for quiet reading, study, or computer work (II.C.1.a).

A 3M Detection System is in place, with security gates at the library's entrance to monitor and protect materials. Tattle Tape security strips protect the library's print media collection. In addition, two security cameras monitor activities in the library (II.C.1.d).

The BCC Library is currently open 59.5 hours a week, as follows:

- 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

The Learning Resource Center (LRC) Main Campus hours of operations are as follows:

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

Tutorial services are provided in the South Campus during the following hours:

- 1:30-5:30 p.m. Tuesday-Thursday

The BCC Library is open 59.5 hours per week, and students may visit in person, use online instant messaging reference services, or email library faculty members for research assistance during business hours. It sees an average semester headcount ranging from 158-234 patrons per day. For general campus use and at remote sites, the reference databases provide full-text access to journals, magazines, newspapers, and over 100,000 e-books. The online catalog provides access to titles available in the four college libraries in the Peralta district (II.C.1, II.C.1.a).

The library materials budget declined from 2010 to 2013 from a high of \$70,018 to a low of \$14,185. In 2014-15, the figure of \$146,555 was quoted as the library's materials budget in the self-study. However, upon investigation, it was learned that this was not exclusively for library materials (books, print periodicals, databases, textbooks, and other curriculum support materials) alone, but also included the salary of the planned additional librarian. The library does not have a reliable base book budget year to year. The Self Evaluation Report does not report on whether or not the budget will remain at this benchmark, but rather notes that the College is committed to ensuring that sufficient funding is put in place to supply the needs of BCC students, and that librarians are tasked with working with administration to secure a steady base budget for library materials early in the budgeting cycle so that they are able to plan expenditures for current and future collection development (II.C.1).

The library's collection development policy specifies in its collection objectives section that there will be efforts made to provide a collection that contains reference and other materials in a variety of formats (print, electronic, audiovisual) as well as current and retrospective materials at various reading levels to meet the curriculum's needs. Additionally, it lists objectives to provide adequate materials for students' general information needs, for the College's diverse population, and an adequate collection of materials for general reading needs (II.C.1).

The BCC Institutional Learning Outcomes are:

- Communication
- Computational Skills
- Critical Thinking
- Ethics and Personal Responsibility
- Global Awareness and Valuing Diversity
- Information Competency
- Self-Awareness and Interpersonal Skills

Consistent with these and with the Mission, Vision, and Values of the institution, the library faculty and staff focus on providing students with skills in information competency, critical thinking, and lifelong learning in order for them to achieve academic success. In keeping with these goals, the library provides access to necessary resources and its librarians and staff instruct students in information retrieval skills, ethics, and utilization so that they may perform instructor-assigned tasks and research. To these ends, library faculty (often in collaboration with discipline-specific instructors) create LibGuides, subject guides that assist students to locate and use the resources available for particular disciplines and classes, such as databases, print materials, websites, tutorials, and other resources. In fall 2014, the library began offering LIS 85: Introduction to Information Sources, a two-unit transfer-level course in information competency. In fall 2015, the library will offer LIS 80, a one-unit transfer-level course in information competency (II.C.1.b).

The learning resources faculty and staff provide information competency instruction in various forms: one-shot orientations; one-on-one reference support from faculty librarians during all hours the library is open to the public as well as virtually via the library's LibChat

virtual chat reference software; and through one-on-one training and support from student ambassadors. At the request of instructors, the library faculty offer in-class instructional orientations tailored to the course content and providing emphasis on information competency. They also provide one-on-one competency instruction and research assistance at the reference desk during all hours the library is open to the public. Additionally, research assistance is offered through the LibChat virtual chat reference application and LibAnswers, the library's email service. Librarians also serve on campus committees such as the Assessment Committee; Planning for Institutional Effectiveness Committee; and Curriculum Committee, ensuring that information competency outcomes are included in every course outline and syllabus across the curriculum (as appropriate). Finally, the library began in fall 2014 to offer LIS 85, Introduction to Information Literacy, a two-unit transfer-level course in information competency. In fall 2015, the library plans to offer an additional course, LIS 80, a one-unit transfer-level course in information competency (II.C.1.b).

Apart from the library, the Computer Commons assists students in developing information competency as well, as does the Adaptive Technology Lab, which was designed to assist disabled students to access information in books and journals in print and electronically. The Welcome Center is staffed with student ambassadors to provide one-on-one training and support to other students as they increase their information competency (II.C.1.b).

A 3M Security Detection security gate protects the entrance to the LRC. This area of the building is open during business hours and locked at other times. In addition, Security personnel monitor the areas via computerized security systems and in person during walk-throughs (II.C.1.d).

Learning support services for distance education (DE) were piloted during fall 2014 through two simultaneous projects. The first project takes place in the South Campus lab and utilizes Google Hangout to create a distance education tool that combines a Skype-like environment with sharing of documents via Google docs, so that current tutors can work with distance education students and face-to-face students in the same lab setting, using the same methodologies. The second project to provide learning support services for DE students is through a combined EOPS and TRiO effort to contract with an outside agency to provide online tutoring to BCC students. These projects will be assessed during spring 2015 (II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d).

Findings and Evidence

Surveys and questionnaires have been used to evaluate the effectiveness of library orientations and reference services. The general library survey, in conjunction with individual orientation surveys, has been used to evaluate services as recently as spring 2014; these indicated that students and faculty are satisfied with the services of the library. The survey was identical to one taken in 2008 and showed remarkable improvement in user satisfaction with the library. For example, in 2008, only 71 percent out of 130 students responded that the library was extremely or very important to them; in 2014, that number increased to 90 percent out of 85 student respondents. The 2012 library survey resulted in increased hours and the hiring of an additional librarian (II.C.2).

Library staff have also participated in Focused Inquiry Groups (FIGs) and Action Plan Projects for Learning Excellence (APPLEs) in order to explore ways to improve services. Improvements have already been made. For example, a FIG looking into basic skills students' experience with academic databases discovered that although students are learning some competency skills from "one-shot" orientations, they rely on additional hands-on experience and knowledge to become truly information competent students. The result is that two new LIS courses aimed at meeting these needs were created, one debuting in fall 2014 and the second coming in fall 2015 (II.C.1.b, II.C.2).

The spring 2014 aggregate of library orientations asked students to rank three statements about the orientations on a Likert Scale from 1-5, with 5 being Strongly Agree and 1 being Strongly Disagree. The statements (The librarian was prepared and well-organized; the librarians explained and demonstrated search strategies; the library has resources [books, databases, articles, and/or physical space] that will be useful for my research needs; that were relevant to my research needs) demonstrate that students believe that the librarians were prepared and that students are aware of the materials and resources available to them. A final three questions asked students to name one thing they had learned, name one thing that was still confusing, and how the orientation could be improved (II.C.1.b).

The results of the orientation evaluations show that students ranked the librarians highly for preparation (91 percent) and demonstration (90 percent) as well as ranking the library highly for having resources suitable for their research needs (91 percent). The library orientation course assessment analysis shows that the material collected from the open-ended responses would be used in several ways ranging from encouraging attendance at workshops, consulting with other librarians and instructors about teaching methods, and providing on-line tutorials for students. In addition, the librarians have also begun to create Libguides to assist remote patrons in finding the resources they need (II.C.1.b, II.C.2).

The Millennium Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC) and Community College Library Consortium (CCL) contract for research databases and e-book collection provide BCC students with shared access to print and electronic materials in the three other libraries in the college district as well as to world-wide library holdings through Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OCLC). The contract tutoring services will be evaluated this spring to assess their usage by and value to BCC students (II.C.1.e).

Circulation statistics show a regular increase in usage up through 2014:

- in 2007—5,174 items circulated (with 2,038 of these Reserve materials)
- in 2013—19,975 items circulated (with 15,991 of these Reserve materials)
- a projection for 2014 based on previous numbers is 22,990 items (of which Reserve materials make up 21,068 of these)

As current textbooks in the Reserve collection make up the heaviest number of circulated items, and because of the popularity and need for these items, the circulation statistics are not reflective of true use of curriculum support materials in the library as it is composed of only 5,900 unique titles (II.C.2).

Tutoring services for the campus are fulfilled in the LRC and the South Campus Tutoring Center. In-class tutoring in all basic skills English and some math courses is available, and in the LRC tutoring in math, English, chemistry, physics, biology, computer science, American Sign Language, and Spanish is available for students (II.C.1.b). Through the use of a pilot program for DE students using Google Hangout, current tutors can work with DE students and also with F2F students all in the same setting. In addition, EOPS and TRIO are supplying funds to provide outside contract tutoring for BCC students; the program will be assessed in spring 2015 (II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.1.e).

The LRC is equipped with whiteboards and group study tables sufficient to accommodate 32 students at one time. It is staffed with student tutors and instructional aides, and was without a LRC Coordinator since the position has been vacant due to a retirement; however, upon investigation, it was found that the position had been filled and the new coordinator had begun to work on the second day of the site visit. BCC also maintains an English writing lab (Room 313) containing 31 computers (PCs and MACs), two projectors, two DVD/VHS players, a scanner, and a printer, as well as various books related to English composition. The lab is used primarily for English and ESL writing lab classes, where tutors assist students as they work through a six-part writing process on essays from across the curriculum. Writing workshops are held on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b).

BCC's Adaptive Technology Lab (Room 262) is equipped with ten computer stations with software and accessories accessible by students with low vision, mobility needs, learning disabilities, and other health-related conditions. This software includes Scientific Notebook, OmniPage Pro 15, Text Aloud MP3, Easy Creator 7, Easy Reader, ZoomText, Jaws, Kurzweil 3000 and 1000, Openbook, Dragon Naturally Speaking, Read Please, MathTalk, and Window Eyes. The workstations are equipped with electronically adjustable desks, adjustable chairs, ergonomic keyboards, CCTVs, a 21" monitor, Parrot headsets, a Braille embosser, and scanners for use with the Kurzweil software. The lab is staffed 10 hours per week with a classified assistant who provides training in Kurzweil 3000 and Zoom text, while the alternate media specialist provides training in Jaws, Kurzweil, Dragon Naturally Speaking, Openbook, and various other software applications (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b).

Although there are security gates to monitor the movement of library materials through them, students are allowed to take reserve collection materials, such as textbooks, outside of the library area of the building for use in the classroom and labs and study areas. Due to the small size of the collection and the limited budget provided for library materials, this could be an area of concern. There are no security gates at the front or rear exits from the building, so if a student checks out materials s/he can walk out the door with it (II.C.1.d).

Conclusions

The faculty librarians take a lead in ensuring that students develop true information competency to enable them to succeed in their coursework at BCC as well as becoming successful as they transfer or utilize those skills to take advantage of lifelong learning

opportunities. The library and learning support services faculty and staff fully embrace their mission to provide learning support services to all students, regardless of location, and innovatively utilize technology to create a facsimile of face-to-face learning engagement. The inventive use of Google Hangout and online tutoring support display meaningful efforts to serve students away from the main campus. The library, LRC, South Campus Tutoring Center, and Adaptive Technology Lab provide library materials in the form of research databases and an e-book collection of over 100,000 books geared to the research needs of the community college student. Information competency instruction and services are provided for all students regardless of location and abilities. The college meets this Standard.

Recommendations

None

Standard III.A – Human Resources

General Observations

Board policies and administrative procedures guide the District's employment procedures, evaluations of its employees, ethical conduct, and treatment of its employees. Decisions for prioritizing hiring requests are made through a college wide process. Human resources is centralized. All personnel files are held in confidence and are filed in the District office. Evaluation process, criteria, and evaluation schedules are contained in the collective bargaining agreements and board policies and procedures. Faculty, including librarians and counselors are required to identify in their self-evaluation how they have addressed student learning as a result of SLO assessment processes.

Findings and Evidence

Evidence suggests that the college hires appropriately qualified personnel. District board policies and procedures provide clear direction in identifying and hiring qualified faculty and staff (III.A.1).

The college follows district processes for posting job descriptions, screening and selecting candidates. Job descriptions for classified staff and managers are created based on the needs of the college and are reviewed by district human resources. Employment announcements include the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities for the position. For faculty, college needs are based on program reviews and annual program updates. The department chairs council ranks faculty hiring requests using the faculty prioritization rubric, and culminating with a recommendation from the college's roundtable for planning and budgeting. As the full-time faculty obligation is a district function, it's not clear how the District prioritizes the faculty hiring so that the ratios among the four colleges are equitable. Faculty job announcements clearly state minimum qualifications, emphasizing the importance of disciplinary knowledge, current pedagogy, and commitment to student learning. Minimum qualifications are outlined in "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in

California Community Colleges.” Desirable qualifications may also be stated. A determination of equivalency may also be requested by the applicant. In such a case, the District Academic President appoints an Equivalency Committee to make its determination. Initial screening of applicant materials begins at the District Office. HR reviews the applications to ensure candidates meet the minimum qualifications and hold degrees from an institution accredited by a U.S. Department of Education-recognized accrediting agency. Transcripts from other countries than the U. S. must be evaluated by an agency of the National Association of Credentials Evaluation Service. After screening, files of eligible candidates are sent to a selection committee, that interviews the candidates and determines the list of recommendations for final interviews. Following the final interviews the hiring manager conducts reference checks. The college president makes the recommendation for hiring to the chancellor. For faculty, the interview process includes a skills portion, such as a teaching demonstration (III.A.1.a).

Evaluation process, criteria, and evaluation schedules are contained in the collective bargaining agreements and district board policies and procedures. Full-time contract faculty are evaluated every three years. Part-time faculty are evaluated in their first year of employment and then every six semesters. Tenure track faculty are evaluated yearly for their first four years of employment. Classified staff are evaluated during a probationary period and then annually in the month of hire by the first level manager. Managers are evaluated annually. New managers are evaluated after six months. Faculty evaluation cycles are determined and managed by the college. The College provided the status of part-time faculty evaluations. Human Resources starts the notification of evaluations for classified staff and managers. As the data for 2013/14 was not available, it’s not clear whether all evaluations have been conducted for the year (III.A.1.b).

The College states (but examination of evidence did not support) that faculty address SLOs and SLO assessment in a number of ways. Faculty are required to include SLOs in their course syllabi. However, the Team found that not all syllabi at BCC include the SLOs and some others that did list SLOs were not the same SLOs listed in the course outline of record. (See Recommendation 3.) Further assessment of SLOs is addressed and considered in program reviews and in annual program updates. Further, faculty including counselors and librarians are required to identify in their self-evaluation how they have addressed student learning as a result of SLO assessment processes. The College provided the team with the “Evaluee’s Self Evaluation Report Form” for classroom instructors, counselors, and librarians (III.A.1.c).

District board policies and procedures provide a written code of professional ethics for all its personnel and the procedures for upholding it. Further, the district has implemented policies and procedures to allow individuals to anonymously report allegations of fraud (III.A.1.d).

It appears the College has sufficient staffing to support its mission and purposes. Table 47 of the College’s Self Evaluation Report shows the growth of personnel in administration (from 7 to 9), classified staff (from 39 to 48), and faculty (from 45 to 56) from 2009/10 to 2013/14 (III.A.2).

All board policies and procedures are posted in the District's website. New or revisions to discipline and resolving conflicts and grievances (III.A.3).

Established Board policies and procedures ensure fairness in employment procedures for all classifications of employment (III.A.3.a).

Personnel files are held in confidence and are filed in the District office. Only Human Resources (HR) staff may access these personnel files. Any employee may make a request to review his/her personnel file in the presence of HR staff. All employees have secure, password protected online access to pay and workload information through the PROMT/PeopleSoft system. At BCC employee evaluation records are held in locked cabinets in the office of instruction. Any employee may make a request to review his/her evaluation records in the presence of designated Office of Instruction staff (III.A.3.b).

The College demonstrates an understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity. The self-evaluation survey shows 86 percent of faculty, staff, and students responded positively to the survey statement: "BCC fosters appreciation for diversity." The College's mission also reflects its commitment to diversity. Board policy 7100 states the District's commitment to diversity (III.A.4).

The College supports its diverse personnel with flex day programs, workshops and collaborative inquiry and action projects. The College's professional development committee and the teaching and learning center conducts surveys, performance evaluations, program updates, and SLO assessments to develop appropriate programs and services to support its diverse personnel (III.A.4.a).

The College regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission. Table 48 of the college's self-evaluation of its ethnic and gender demographics among administration, faculty, and classified staff show that, while demographics among faculty members have not changed significantly, there had been an increase in diversity among both administration and classified staff (III.A.4.b).

District policies and procedures assure integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students. Administrative Procedure 7380 delineates the standard by which management, classified staff, and faculty are to be treated and how they are to conduct themselves during the course and scope of the performance of their duties. Administrative procedure 5500 addresses the treatment of staff and students and defines general expectations of student conduct. Other policies that address related student issues include the policy prohibiting discrimination and discrimination complaint procedures, sexual assault policy and procedures, student grievance procedures, student conduct, discipline and due process rights, and student right to know policies (III.A.4.c).

The professional development committee and teaching and learning center (TLC) provide opportunities for professional development. The District office provides funding for professional development. The College also provides opportunities for professional growth through its teaching and learning center. All of the activities of the TLC focus on

strengthening faculty development. The President's innovation fund supports faculty and staff in developing projects that further the College's mission, Administrative personnel receive in service training. Though classified staff do not have professional development obligations, the College has funded training for classified staff development, focused on customer service, diversity awareness and appreciation, student services operations, and personnel development (III.A.5.a).

Results of evaluations of professional development are analyzed and guide development of future activities. Teaching and learning needs are identified through survey results, performance evaluations, student learning outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes assessment. Participants evaluate all programs and activities. The results are used in planning future activities (III.A.5.b).

Decisions for prioritizing hiring requests are made through a college wide process. This is then integrated into the District's planning and budgeting integration model. The College's hiring needs are identified in program reviews and annual program updates. Requests are ultimately reviewed by the College roundtable for planning and budgeting, which are then forwarded to the college president, then to the District planning and budgeting council and then the Chancellor for approval (III.A.6).

Conclusions

Board policies and administrative procedures provide clear direction in identifying and hiring qualified faculty and staff. The College has sufficient staffing to support its mission. The professional development committee and the teaching and learning center provide opportunities for professional development. The College supports its diverse personnel with flex day programs, workshops, and collaborative inquiry and action projects. The College partially meets the standard.

Recommendations

District Recommendation 4

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

District Recommendation 5

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

Standard III.B – Physical Resources

General Observations

BCC's physical resources support a full range of instructional programs and student support services within the Institution's crowded urban setting. BCC's main campus is an environmentally sound, LEED Certified, six story, 165,000 square foot building. It encompasses a 250-seat auditorium, 30 classrooms, seven computer labs, five science labs, a Multi-Arts Center, a Learning Resource Center, a library, and other facilities. In addition, BCC currently leases 8,000 square feet to the south of the main building for classrooms, faculty offices and instructional support. In the evenings, UC Berkeley makes up to six classrooms available to BCC each semester.

The effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services is augmented in part, by its proximity to community facilities and amenities. BCC offers no classes between 12:15 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. Not only does this permit time for meetings, it allows students and staff to avail themselves of neighboring athletic facilities and food service establishments. The College does not need to own and maintain parking facilities because of adjacent garages and public transportation.

The College plans, acquires, maintains, upgrades and replaces physical resources to support programs and services. There is clear integration between the College's physical resource planning and institutional planning.

Findings and Evidence

A significant increase in student headcount is projected through the year 2022. In light of the concomitant need to increase usable space at BCC, the institution opted to purchase a 25,000 square foot property and has nearly completed the transaction. Additionally, BCC continues to plan for other physical resources needed to meet projected student growth.

In awareness of need to expand usable space for BCC, the institution is in the final process of purchasing a property that, in its current configuration measures 25,000 square feet. With modifications, this building will actually be able to provide a total of 30,000 square feet for BCC's use. The Facilities Master Plan is in the process of being updated, evidence that BCC continues to plan for the physical resources needed to meet projected student growth (III.B.1, III. B.1.a).

The existing College facilities are accessible and provide a healthy learning environment. This is supported by student, faculty, staff and administrator responses to the 2014 Self-Evaluation Survey. Specifically, 66 percent of faculty members (n=82), 76 percent of staff (n=22), 100 percent of administrators (n=5), and 88 percent of students (n=320) agreed or strongly agreed that the facilities at BCC were accessible. Furthermore, approximately 73 percent of faculty, 71 percent of staff, 100 percent of administrators, and 85 percent of students responding to the survey agreed or strongly agreed that the facilities at BCC provided a healthy learning environment (II.B.1.b).

Routine maintenance of BCC's Main Campus is coordinated by the College's Business Office and conducted on a regular schedule. Maintenance is also performed off-schedule when staff identifies problems such as damaged, unsafe or unclean areas. In contrast, preventative maintenance is performed as budget and manpower allow, and is prioritized by immediacy of the need as resources become available. The leased space south of the main campus is maintained by the property owner, and UC Berkeley classrooms are maintained by their personnel. The team observed well-maintained facilities and noted that employees and students take considerable pride in the College's facilities (II.B.1.b).

Safety is assured by structural features, a minimum of two contracted security guards, and liaison with City of Berkeley law enforcement. Liability insurance providers conduct annual reviews of facility risk conditions. Third party reviews of risk conditions are reviewed at the District level to ensure that unsafe conditions are addressed and appropriate follow-up is conducted. The layout of the building contributes to its safety. For example, lighting throughout the structure is programmed to come on when someone enters, so there are no dark spaces at any time. Classrooms and labs are equipped with telephones linked to campus safety and can be used to contact City Police (II.B.1.b).

Evidence shows that there is a college-wide commitment to maintaining a safe, healthful learning environment. The parameters for space use/allocation follow standards detailed by the California Code of Regulations, Title 5. Beyond this, participatory governance has a clear focus on these concerns. The BCC Health and Safety Committee meets monthly during the fall and spring semesters. Meeting agendas and minutes reveal that the Committee is active in facilitating campus trainings including hazardous waste management and emergency response drills. Another activity of the group is to review campus injury and crisis management reports. Staff Development provides trainings in CPR and use of defibrillators. The College has also taken efforts to ensure that all facilities are compliant with federal and safety regulations. For example, ADA requirements are met or exceeded in all facilities. The Team found that physical resources are maintained to assure access, safety and a healthful learning and working environment; and that altogether, BCC provides a safe, secure learning environment that supports student learning and success (III.B.1, III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b.).

The Facilities Master Plan is in the process of being updated which confirms that BCC evaluates and plans the physical resources needed to support instructional needs. The coordination of the Facilities Master Plan with the College's Educational Master Plan is a good example of how BCC helps assure the alignment of college facilities with student learning. At the time of the team visit, projected resource needs include classroom space, additional multi-media space, Bio-Science Technology program space and equipment. Evaluation of parking capacity showed that incentivizing use of public transportation and bicycle use was a feasible option for resolving the need noticed in 2009 for more parking near the college. Bus transit costs for students are now included in mandatory student fees (III.B.1, III.B.2).

The College has a process for determining how equipment and facilities funds are prioritized to support programs and services. Each program conducts either a complete program review or an annual program update that includes identification of physical resource needs. Analysis of program reviews conducted by administrators, faculty and staff lead to prioritized recommendations for physical resources. Participatory governance committees such as the BCC Facilities Committee, receive these recommendations and scrutinize requests. Rubrics are used to determine the extent to which resource requests are aligned with the BCC mission, vision and values, and goals.

During annual planning, recommendations from the Facilities Committee are forwarded to the BCC Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting. These are then sent to the President's Cabinet. Physical Resource Plans are integrated with the institutions planning process to arrive at budget decisions, then move to the District where the "Planning and Budget Integration Model" ensures that each college has opportunity to participate in budget allocation decisions (III.B.2.b).

The Model includes input from District and College administrators, faculty, and staff in the District Technology Committee, the District Education Committee and the District Facilities Committee. The Planning and Budget Integration Model delineates district versus college decision-making responsibilities.

The BCC 2015 Institutional Self-Evaluation Report did not address how long-range plans reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. It was not clear how the College projects the total cost of ownership. (III.B.2, III.B.2.a)

Conclusions

The College's physical resources support its current learning programs and services while providing safety, security, accommodation and access for all. The Team concludes that the College partially meets Standard III.B.

Recommendations

District Recommendation 3

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

See *District Recommendation 4*

Standard III.C – Technology Resources

General Observations

The team finds that the College is an active user of technology on campus and for distance education. Training for technology is provided at an appropriate level. The District and College work together to provide appropriate levels of support for technology and responsibilities for technology are well articulated in the matrix for college/district technology responsibilities.

The Planning and Budgeting Integration Model (PBIM) has been implemented for technology with a whole complement of committees, scoring rubrics, and decision-making structures to guide the process.

The College does not appear to meaningfully assess the effectiveness of its technology.

Findings and Evidence

The team finds that technology is used widely at the College to serve employees and students. Information Technology (IT) staff at the District and the College work in tandem to support institutional needs. Not all college offices, e.g. Counseling, Financial Aid, etc. provide support services to distance education (DE) students that are comparable to those which are provided to face-to-face students. (III.C.1)

The College Technology Committee (CTC) includes membership from across the College and meets regularly during the academic year to formulate recommendations to the administration regarding access, instructional technology, campus computing, network infrastructure, technology support, and human and fiscal resources. Some CTC members are also representatives to the District Technology Committee. The District Technology Committee (DTC) serves as one of three key bodies which, as part of the Planning and Budgeting Integration Model, reports to the District wide Planning and Budgeting Council (III.C.1.a).

As verified from evidence posted on the College website, Annual Program Updates link program SLOs assessment to technology planning. The Moodle learning management system is supported by district personnel and is used effectively at the College in support of both on-campus and distance education (DE) instruction and student services. The DE program is further supported by a college DE coordinator, who provides direct support services to college personnel and collaborates with other PCCD campus DE coordinators (III.C.1.a).

Sample Annual Program Updates (APU) provided prior to the visit confirm that the APU provides a general overview of the status of each academic program. The APU is logically linked to the identification of resource needs, including technology. The CTC reviews these needs, and the team commends the CTC for utilizing a rubric to evaluate the merits and communicate the results of each request. College technology needs are forwarded for

consideration to the DTC that also applies a rubric and forwards a prioritized list to the district Chancellor (III.C.1.a).

The district IT website establishes and communicates standards for desktop computers, laptop computers, and technology accessories such as monitors and DVD burners. The district houses most servers, manages the contract for Internet access, and supports the voice network and PeopleSoft enterprise resource management system in partnership with the College. Plans for backup and recovery are in place, and IT systems are sufficiently redundant. Technology services related to the BCC website as well as front-end user support are primarily provided by the College (III.C.1.a).

As was reported in the Self Evaluation Report and verified through a review of survey results, 85 percent of respondents felt satisfied that they had access to sufficient technology to meet institutional goals. In contrast, when the Team conducted its onsite interviews, some interviewees claimed no knowledge that the college systematically conducts surveys for students and employees regarding the use of technology (III.C.1.a).

The district has devised and regularly updated a Matrix that clearly delineates responsibility for various aspects of technology management between the district and colleges. IT at BCC assumes responsibility for most front-end user support, help desk, college website, and local network issues. The district provides primary leadership for PeopleSoft, distance education, VoIP phones, and network management (III.C.1.b).

The College received a Title III grant that funded the creation of the TLC. The Center is led by a College-funded 0.3 FTE coordinator and serves as a central hub for training related to all aspects of teaching and learning. As was confirmed during a meeting with DE, TLC, and staff development leads, workshops for technology-related subjects are provided including smart classroom usage, Moodle, and about software such as Turnitin, Prezi, and Voicethread. Faculty are further encouraged to participate in Merritt College's 6-course Educational Technology certificate program in online teaching (III.C.1.b).

During the visit, the team learned that the College library offers credit courses for students that include units on information literacy. Students may also participate in basic technology training workshops offered by the Berkeley Public Library adjacent to the College. During the visit, the team further learned that online tutoring is provided to TRIO students and that peers are hired to provide basic technology training to students in the computer lab and at workstations in the College atrium. Staff support for DE at the College and District is strong. The team commends the institution for providing DE students with comprehensive, useful, and relevant resources on the district open-source WordPress DE website including self-assessment tools, an online orientation to DE and Moodle, and various self-service modules for students (III.C.1.b).

It is not clear how training topics for staff and students are identified. While individuals who have participated in TLC activities cited a number of improvements that have resulted from TLC trainings, the effectiveness and impact of such trainings has not been systematically assessed (III.C.1.b).

The period covered by the five-year College Technology Plan ended in 2014. During the course of the visit, however, a draft Technology Plan for the period 2015-2018 was provided. The team finds that the new Plan provides an apt evaluation of the current state of College technology and sets forth a plan for the future including planning for acquisition, maintenance, upgrade, and replacement of technology on a predictable cycle. This new version of the Technology Plan will be vetted and approved by the institution (III.C.1.c).

Key stakeholders, the Self Evaluation Report, and communication from the district Associate Vice Chancellor of IT confirm that the CTC advances its prioritized requests to the DTC which, in turn, provides a list of needs to the district Planning and Budgeting Council (III.C.1.d).

Recommendations from the Council regarding requests from the four colleges are forwarded to the Chancellor for allocation consideration. Ironically, the team finds that the PBIM is the most developed planning and budgeting process for technology and yet no technology projects have ever been funded through this process. Other mechanisms to secure funding for technology projects are considerably less clear (III.C.1.d).

The College and District have worked to ensure a robust technology infrastructure that is reliable for on-campus and DE learners and faculty. Over 100 servers are located at the district office with sufficient redundancy, and plans are in place for network recovery. The district Technology Strategy seeks to establish a “portfolio of projects” which will help the district and College to “achieve strategic goals” (III.C.1.d).

The District has created an Information Technology Strategy document that provides a general framework for the District’s approach to technology from 2012-2015. Other guiding documents related to College technology resources are in need of updating. The period covered by the College’s most recent Technology Plan ended in 2014. A draft Technology Plan for the period 2015-2018 was provided to the team during the visit. This new Plan reflects on the current state of technology, including DE, at the College and establishes clear priorities for future projects. As was explained during team meetings with IT and DE staff, the new Plan is organized around a three-year window of time (rather than five years as in the previous version) to accommodate the dynamic nature of technology and technology planning (III.C.2).

The approach to budgeting for technology projects is inconsistent. Throughout the Self Evaluation Report, repeated reference was made to results from the 2014 Self Evaluation Survey which indicated that a high level of respondents felt that they possessed sufficient technology to accomplish institutional goals. The team finds that the institution, however, has little evidence that it consistently assesses the effectiveness of its technology and results of such assessments are not, therefore, being used to inform technology decisions in a systematic way (III.C.2).

Conclusions

Technology resources are used to support instruction, services to students, and the institution. The district and the College have delineated responsibility for key aspects of technology. The district has fully implemented PeopleSoft, supports network technology services, and has advanced a plan for technology. The College provides suitable training for students and faculty but is not systematically assessing its front-end technology needs and has not assessed the efficacy of its technology purchases or training. A draft three-year Technology Plan holds great promise but has not been approved or implemented. The College does not consistently use assessment results to measure the impact of technology purchases or training. The College does not meet this Standard. See College Recommendations 1 and 4. Also, see District Recommendation 4.

Recommendations

See *College Recommendation 1*

See *College Recommendation 4*

See *District Recommendation 4*

Standard III.D – Financial Resources

General Observations

On May 20, 2011 the Planning and Budgeting Council adopted the District's Budget Allocation Model, based on SB 361. This model was implemented in July 2011 after approval by the Chancellor. The College has benefited financially over the last two years with the implementation of this new methodology. The College's unrestricted general fund has increased from \$12,754,649 in 2012-13 to \$15,684,256 in 2014-15. Similarly, the College's FTES has increased from 3,883 to 4,492 during this same period.

The College has also increased its restricted funds by proactively pursuing grants and special allocations. The College's restricted general fund has also increased to over \$7 million in 2014-15.

The allocation and planning for financial resources is integrated into the planning process and shared governance structure. The College's program review and annual program update process is the vehicle for resource allocation requests. The requests are then prioritized using an established rubric in College committees, such as the Technology Committee. The recommendations are then reviewed by the College roundtable and submitted to the College president for approval.

Findings and Evidence

The College's mission, vision, values, and goals are the foundation for financial planning, which is integrated with and supports all institutional planning on campus. The College's mission, vision, and values were revised and adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 7, 2014. The College's goals are routinely reviewed annually as part of the annual planning and budgeting cycle. The College's goals are the outgrowth of the mission-based program review and annual program update (III.D.1).

Financial planning at BCC is integrated with the College's participatory governance and planning process. The recommendations from the program review and annual program update process are sent to the appropriate participatory governance committees and ultimately, to the College's roundtable for planning and budgeting. After roundtable review, a consolidated list of recommendations is submitted to the President and President's cabinet. After College review, priorities are forwarded to the three District participatory governance committees (Education, Technology, and Facilities) and the District Planning and Budgeting Council. After Council review the recommendations are submitted to the Chancellor for approval (III.D .1.a).

The College continually assesses the availability of its overall financial resources to support its budgetary goals. It is proactive in pursuing new sources of funding to supplement its budget and meet any funding gaps or fund new initiatives that support student learning. For example, the College developed the Student Services Support Program (SSSP) program plan and program budget and ensured that the funding for Basic Skills Initiative complemented rather than overlapped with SSSP. Further, Measure B, a special parcel tax approved by the voters in July 2012 produces local revenue for the District's colleges. The additional revenue also allows the District to increase its reserves (III.D.1.b).

The District has primary responsibility for identifying and planning payment of liabilities and future obligations. The latest actuarial report identifies the Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability as \$174,703.920. A more recent actuarial report (March 2015 draft) was not available. The District's total OPEB bond obligation is \$218.0 million. The District's financial statement findings and recommendations for the year ended June 30, 2014 states: "the District has \$215.0 million of investments related to the OPEB obligation ... these investments are not in an irrevocable trust." Thus, these assets may not be used to offset the District's obligation. Further, the audit report identified the District's Self-Insurance Fund has a deficit fund balance of \$1,644,808 (III.D.1.c).

BCC has primary responsibility for defining and overseeing the guidelines and process for financial planning and budget development at the College. As all planning and budgeting at BCC is integrated with District wide planning, there are many opportunities for the College's faculty, staff, administrators, and students to participate in the planning processes at the District. These opportunities were validated in interviews with members of the participatory governance committees at the College level as well as their involvement in participatory governance committees at the District level (III.D.1.d).

The financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and generates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. For example, appropriate controls are in place for purchasing, and the district wide financial management system prevents spending where funds are not available. In addition to monthly reports provided by the College business office, both administrators and managers can get current financial information on their assigned budgets through the District wide financial management system (III.D.2).

The integrity of the financial operations of the College and the District is ensured by an annual audit that is performed by independent Certified Public Accountants with experience in auditing California community colleges. A review of the findings and recommendations for the audit period ending June 30, 2014 indicates that the College did not have any open findings and recommendations from the previous year's audit (III.D.2.a).

The College responds promptly and takes appropriate action to address deficiencies to external audit findings. BCC has had no external audit findings in the previous two years. The audit findings and recommendations for the period ending June 30, 2014, indicates the College had one finding related to enrollment reporting (III.D.2.b).

Financial information is disseminated in a timely manner and readily throughout the College. The College fiscal office provides monthly reports. Also, managers can download current financial reports from the District database (III.D.2.c).

The College uses its financial resources with integrity and in a manner that is consistent with the intended purpose of the funding. A review of external audit reports confirmed the College is spending its resources within its parameters. However, there is a District audit finding (2014-010) related to the District using State Educational Protection Account on un-allowed expenditures (III.D.2.d).

The College assesses its internal controls on an ongoing basis and use the results of those assessments to revise procedures as needed. College level controls include ongoing monitoring of its budget, College responses to external audit findings, internal audits of critical areas such as financial aid, and reconciliation of all College fund accounts to ensure fiscal integrity (III.D.2.e).

The College adheres to District policies and procedures that ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. (III.D.3)

The District has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. Board Policy 6250 mandates unrestricted reserves shall be no less than 5 percent. For year ending 2013-14, the District's ending balance (not the College) exceeds 12 percent. For 2013-14 and 2014-15, the District's cash flow has been sufficient, and no fund transfers were sought or needed. For property and liability coverage, the District contracts with the Alliance of Schools for Cooperative Insurance Program Joint Powers Authority. Settled claims have not exceeded this commercial coverage in any of the past

three years. However, the District's Self-Insurance Fund has a deficit fund balance of \$1,644,808 (III.D.3.a.).

There is sufficient oversight at the College and District to ensure proper management of all finances, including financial aid, grants and externally funded programs and auxiliary services. The annual external audit is a reflection of the fiscal integrity of these programs. The College has not had a repeat finding since 2012 (III.D.3.b).

The District's financial statement findings and recommendations for the period ending June 30, 2014 recommended "long term planning for the continued financial stability of the District should continue to include attention to obligations that will be coming due in the future, such as the OPEB and the annual line of credit repayments." In 2012 the District negotiated collective bargaining agreements related to medical and dental benefits, saving the District approximately \$500,000 (III.D.3.c).

With the new actuarial study available to the District, the future value of the OPEB liability is more current. The District is committed to determine the amount of funds to transfer from the investment portfolio to an irrevocable trust (III.D.3.c).

The District contracted with Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) to conduct an actuarial study to determine the District's OPEB liability. For the year beginning November 1, 2012, the OPEB liability is \$174,703,920. A draft actuarial report that has just been completed was not available (III.D.3.d).

Any locally incurred debt is assessed and resources allocated through the District's annual budget and planning process (III.D.3.e).

The College's current student loan default rate is 15.5 percent, which is well within federal guidelines (III.D.3.f).

Board policies and procedures clearly define all contracting requirements and articulate the processes to be followed (III.D.3.g).

The Planning and Budgeting Council and external auditors annually evaluate financial management processes. The results are the catalyst for improvement (III.D.3.h).

The College has implemented an ongoing, systematic process that integrates planning, budgeting, and resource allocation and includes assessment of the effective use of financial resources and the utilization of the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement. Interviews with college members of the Standard IID committee cited numerous examples of this system's effectiveness, such as the embedded tutoring program previously described in Standard II C. (III.D.4)

Conclusions

The District/College partially meets the Standard. Consequently, there are a number of fiscal issues that the District should address to ensure the District's fiscal stability. Primarily, the District should follow the 2014 audit recommendation and develop a corrective action plan to properly deal with the OPEB liability. Further, the District should develop a long-term plan for payment of the Debt service associated with OPEB. Regarding expenditures associated with the Education Protection Account, the District should actively monitor all expenditures to ensure purchases fall within the guidelines of the allowable cost. Further, regarding the District's Self Insurance Fund, the District should address the deficit fund balance. See District Recommendations 1, 2, 4, and 8.

Recommendations

District Recommendation 1

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

District Recommendation 2

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

See District Recommendation 3

District Recommendation 8

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

Standard IV.A – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The College has a conventional governance system as practiced by many collegiate institutions. Board policies and the Berkeley City College Shared Governance Manual (fall 2014) clarifies that faculty and staff participate in various committees charged with the formulation and development of campus policies and that their opinions be given meaningful consideration in making recommendations to the College president. Students, faculty, and staff have specific groups that represent their voices in all college-related matters. The highest-level body is the College Roundtable on Planning and Budget (College Roundtable) which meets twice a month and is fully representative of the campus stakeholders. A number of the participatory governance committees on campus that track to the College Roundtable also have appropriate representation on the Peralta District participatory governance committees, including the District's highest level participatory governance committee, the

Planning and Budget Council.

In addition to well-developed committee structures with stakeholder participation, there are numerous initiatives that provide voice to individuals and groups. Two recent important changes for the College have been the implementation of a new Budget Allocation Model (BAM) throughout the District and the emergence of new sources of revenue, such as the Peralta Accountability for Student Success (PASS) allocation process for local Measure B funds, the state's new Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), and the Equity Plan, which will help sustain and grow the College's programs and services. These collective changes have created an opportunity for the College to revisit and reassess its planning processes and its participatory governance model in order to further ensure strong and broad stakeholder engagement. In interviews, administrators, staff, and students reported that campus leadership and governance venues and opportunities are serving the College fairly well and are allowing them to respond more flexibly to student or programmatic needs to improve student learning. It is clear that the College constituencies strive by-and-large to promote a culture of collaboration and foster an environment in which all stakeholders engage with one another to advance teaching and learning, ultimately supporting student success.

Findings and Evidence

The College's commitment to student success and educational excellence is at the center of its Mission, which reads, "to promote student success, to provide our diverse community with educational opportunities, and to transform lives." The College further guarantees the quality and effectiveness of its educational programs and services by using its Mission, as well as its Mission-based goals, as the foundation for annual resource planning and allocation. Additionally, a conscientious effort is made to align and communicate its Mission, vision, values, and goals through its participatory governance process, Faculty and Staff Development Days, town hall meetings, college-wide forums, and the new Budget Allocation Model. As a result of these efforts, interviews with several staff members conducted during the site visit revealed that they were well aware of the College's mission, vision, values, and goals and a number of interviewees were even able to articulate portions of them. Through conversations with students, faculty, staff, and administrators it is also clear that they participate in the discussion of College-wide issues and the development of solutions. In fact, most staff and students interviewed felt they did play a meaningful role in helping the College achieve its goals (IV.A.1).

The institution tracks seven different types of college-level indicators, including college wide data pertaining to persistence and successful course completion rates, as well as data for specific Basic Skills and ESL courses. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators have access to the District's Business Intelligence Tool, which allows them to view student success rates by individual class, program, discipline, or the College as a whole. The information is easily accessible through the Peralta Community College District institutional research website. It accounts for an integral part of the College's program review process and is used to make recommendations about program updates, new programs, staffing levels, technology and equipment requests, and facility-related needs. Course and program data, completion rates,

and enrollment trends are also analyzed and discussed by the participatory governance groups and the wider College community as part the annual goal-setting process. Additional data collection and analysis also occur as part of the development and implementation of grants and special initiatives, or as required, to respond to state budget cuts and/or mandates. The College's goals and achievements for the prior five years are available for all to view on the website. This information as well as other topics of interest are also presented at the town hall meetings held at least twice during the semester, based on a review of the evidence, and open to the entire college community (IV.A.1).

The College's goals are reviewed each fall as part of an annual planning effort. Other venues include the institutional planning cycle that for the 2013-14 fiscal year began at the annual Faculty and Staff Development Days in August 2013 with a College-wide review of the previous year's goals, achievements, and student achievement outcome data and group discussions about the priorities for the upcoming year. The various participatory governance groups engaged in conversation mapping sessions to make sure that the proposed goals for the year were aligned with the College's Mission, Vision, and Value statements, the new state-mandated SSSP standards, ACCJC requirements and recommendations, as well as U.S. Department of Education guidelines. A similar planning process was followed in 2014-15 (IV.A.1).

Students, faculty and staff participate and contribute to improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved by using the College's formal participatory governance structure. This participation is facilitated by College Hour; classes are not scheduled between 12:15 p.m. and 1:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. Students, faculty, and staff are requested to write ideas for the suggestion box located at the front entrance, and these ideas are publicly vetted at various College-wide events. The President also has an open door policy, where all stakeholders are welcomed to meet with the president to discuss concerns and/or propose ideas and solutions to benefit the College. The President also holds either Brown Bag Lunches or Afternoon Teas to garner input (e.g., 1st Week in Review, Shared Governance Process Map Draft, First Year Experience, 40th Anniversary Brainstorming), share information on current topics (e.g., State Chancellor's ARCC Scorecard, the California Dream Act, Meet New Faculty, New Classified Prioritization Process, BCC's Learning Communities), or simply to celebrate an upcoming holiday. Based on a review of the announcements, these events take place approximately every other month and are intentionally informal in nature but without evidence of outcomes or self-evaluation (IV.A.1).

A more formal process for dialogue engagement is the Faculty and Staff Development Days each fall semester. Furthermore, larger town hall meetings on specific topics are held often twice a semester. Finally, the College recently completed two surveys designed to provide additional opportunities for information about stakeholder engagement. All students, faculty, staff, and administrators were invited to participate; survey results were posted on the College's website and reviewed both in participatory governance groups and college wide forums. The success of these various initiatives is evidenced through interviews with faculty and staff who seem to take a genuine interest in the success of their students and their institution (IV.A.1).

Through interviews with the elected leaders of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, faculty union, classified union, and the Associated Students, the College's key constituencies appear to have engaged leaders working together to improve the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. The rights and responsibilities of the different constituencies are outlined in the College's Shared Governance Manual. Each constituency has representative groups that address the concerns of its members. The primary avenue for participation is the College's formal participatory governance structure. These groups provide a venue for College wide initiatives and a means of communication with the College community. When ideas for improvement, such as SSSP, Student Equity Plans, or use of their Measure B funds have policy or significant institution-wide implications, these systematic participatory processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation (IV.A.1).

Faculty and staff do not have prescribed roles in decision-making and governance, other than the expectations stated in the board policies and the BCC Shared Governance Manual that they be provided opportunities to participate in the formulation and development of policies, that their opinions be given meaningful consideration, and that the Academic Senates assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards. The Self Evaluation Report indicates that the College engages in ongoing assessment and evaluation of its participatory governance processes and their effectiveness. The College provided evidence of 2012 and 2014 revisions of the BCC Shared Governance Manual with College Roundtable minutes approving these revisions. Minutes from the main governance committees were reviewed during the visit and although the attendees are listed, the names do not include the connections to the various constituency groups. Such designation would bring some clarity to the delegated nature of the participatory governance process, at least to the less informed (IV.A.2.a).

The College relies primarily on the faculty and the Academic Senate with regards to academic matters. The policy to support this is stated in Board Policy (BP) 2510 (Participation in Local Decision Making) and also in the Administrative Procedure (AP) 2511 (Role of Academic Senates in District and College Governance). Specifically, AP 2511 states: "The Board, Chancellor, and College Presidents and their Management Teams shall 'consult collegially' and 'rely primarily' on the DAS and the College Academic Senates in the above cited 'academic and professional matters' areas," referring to AB 1725's ten plus one subjects of concern. The College's Shared Governance Manual also includes key sections from Title 5 and the California Administrative Code, which define faculty participation in general and academic senate involvement in particular (IV.A.2.b).

Although these policies and administrative procedures do not call out specific roles for the various constituencies other than to clarify participation on various committees, they do delineate the responsibilities of the District and College Academic Senates with regard to academic and professional matters (IV.A.3).

According to a campus wide 2014 Self Evaluation Survey, 62 percent of the respondents (54 of 82 faculty, 18 of 22 staff, and 5 of 5 administrators), strongly agreed or agreed that they

understood their role in helping BCC achieve its goals. During interviews conducted with staff members during the site visit, it became apparent that they are largely aware of their roles, and the constituency group leaders do share leadership roles in participating in the different committees. More importantly, minutes from the different committees revealed that members dialogue collegially about institutional improvements and, according to the California MIS Data Mart, their efforts have resulted in increased completion awards from 118 in 2009 to 458 in 2014 (IV.A.3).

The College's main forums for the discussion of ideas and effective communication among faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students are the participatory governance committees, other standing and ad hoc committees, the College's website, the President's Bulletin and other College-wide gatherings. Interviews with the staff and some students revealed there is a general level of satisfaction with the College's existing communication channels and most believe that information is largely understood and current. Because distance education classes are reportedly evaluated just like in-person classes and DE students are apparently not questioned as to their unique needs, it has not been clearly determined whether the unique needs of DE students have been taken into account. It has been determined, however, that completion rates for BCC's DE classes are similar to the completion rates for their related in-person classes (IV.A.3).

The College offers various venues to inform faculty and staff about its institutional efforts to improve student learning, such as in-house retreats focusing on SLO assessment and curriculum development, faculty orientations, professional development days, and a full roster of other professional development activities through its Teaching and Learning Center. These activities facilitate faculty development and research about pedagogy and student learning. As a result, faculty and staff interviews revealed that most of them were aware of the institutional efforts the College is undertaking to improve student learning (IV.A.3).

The College appears committed to demonstrating honesty, integrity, and transparency in its relationship with external agencies, including the Commission and the U.S. Department of Education. Nonetheless, results of past accreditation site visits have posed continuous challenges in meeting some of the requirements. More specifically, the College/District have had difficulty addressing issues relating to ER3 Governing Board, ER17 Financial Resources and ER18 Financial Accountability. After reviewing the evidence, the team agrees that the College has completely addressed compliance issues with the Commission's Eligibility Requirements (IV.A.4).

The College tracks student learning outcomes and assessments, program learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional learning outcomes and assessments on a system called TaskStream. This information is not available to the public through Taskstream and not always easily accessible to the campus staff given the complexity and quirks of the system. Peralta Community College District's Business Intelligence Tool, on the other hand, is a remarkable tool with tremendous capacity for transparency but it is intranet-based and not available to the public. The College's institution-set standards are readily available to the public and understandable (IV.A.4).

The College maintains a positive track record in working with the U.S. Department of Education on large multi-year grants (Title III, TRIO) and on federal financial aid. The Peralta Community College District conducts annual audits by an independent, external auditor, the results of which are reported to the U.S. Department of Education (IV.A.4).

The College's governance and decision-making structures are discussed as part of the annual institutional planning process. Also, other structured discussions take place during the Faculty and Staff Development Days and forums, workshops, leadership retreats, and participatory governance committee meetings, especially the College Roundtable. Evaluation measures include review of District structures and policies that impact the College, Annual Plan Update (APU) effectiveness review, Shared Governance Manual review, and surveys of student and faculty/staff satisfaction and engagement. The results of these evaluations are discussed at the College Roundtable, the Senates, and the Department Chairs' Council and discussed through the participatory governance committees as appropriate. Institutional decisions and changes are communicated to the wider College community and the general public through the College's established communication networks (IV.A.5).

Examples of recent changes made in response to ongoing institutional dialogue and assessment include: the streamlining of the participatory governance decision-making cycle to avoid duplication of efforts by overlapping groups (2012-14), creation of an Education Committee (2012), creation of a revised committee dedicated to Student Learning Outcomes, now known as the Planning for Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee (2014), and modification to the College's Shared Governance Manual (2014). In spring 2014, the College also introduced a series of forums for faculty, staff, and administrators to ensure transparency in the planning and budgeting process, given the new sources of revenue expected over the next year (IV.A.5).

Conclusions

Within an apparent culture of evidence, the College is making a concerted effort to offer opportunities for participation in its leadership and governance processes. Interviews with students, staff, faculty, administrators, and community partners reveal a high level of satisfaction with the venues used to engage stakeholders in participation. These individuals largely agree that these avenues are open and available to all. Overall, the College's established decision-making processes and venues for participation are functional, effectively utilized, and largely embraced. The College meets Standard IV.A.

Recommendations

None

Standard IV.B – Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The Peralta Community College District was officially formed in 1964 and has served residents of the cities of Oakland, Berkeley, Piedmont, Alameda, Emeryville, and Albany. A seven-member Board of Trustees and two student trustees govern the four-college District. The individuals are elected through a general election to a four-year term. The members represent the diversity of the community. The Board acts as an independent body taking actions that benefit the communities served and the colleges. The Governing Board sets policies and oversees the chancellor for the effective operation of the institution.

The previous accreditation of Berkeley City College included a series of recommendations related to Board and administrative organization. Actions have been described or were taken by the Board and the leadership to address these recommendations, after a series of follow-up reports and visits to address the recommendations.

The Standard IV.B section of the 2015 Self Evaluation is comprehensive but lacks evidence from multiple sources. The team made requests in order to conduct an effective evaluation prior to the site visit. Each sub section of the Standard has been reviewed to evaluate what has been in place. It is worth noting that the District has conducted the revision of Board policies and is undergoing the revision of administrative policies.

Findings and Evidence

Board Policy 2220 establishes the Board's role and responsibility for selecting and evaluating the chancellor. Since September 2011, the District has revised Board Policy and it is undergoing the revision of administrative procedures to meet the Community College League of California (CCLC) numbering system. The Board Policy 1200 Mission and Board Policy 3250 Institutional Planning are statements about academic quality and institutional effectiveness including the mission and vision statements. The mission of the community colleges within the district is "*to empower our students to achieve their highest aspirations. We develop leaders who create opportunities and transform lives.*" Board Policy 2431 and 2435, Selection and Evaluation of the Chancellor describe the processes for the selection and evaluation of the chancellor.

Documentation reviewed on the chancellor's search website link reflects the implementation of Board Policy 2413 Chancellor's selection. According to the Board Policy 2435 Chancellor's evaluation, the chancellor must be evaluated at least once a year. Close session agendas for the past two years indicate sessions dedicated to the chancellor's evaluation (IV.B.1).

Board policy 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities and 2210 Officers describe trustees' roles and responsibilities as an independent policy-making body. The governing board is appropriately representing the public interest and engenders public confidence in decision-making as reflected by Board Policy 2710 Conflict of Interest, Board Policy 2715 Code of

Ethics and Standards of Practice, Administrative Procedures 2710 & 2712 Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Conflict of Interest Code. In reviewing the biographies of the board of trustees, the members reflect the diversity of the communities served. Individual board members have community knowledge and a set of skills to represent public interest. The record of board meeting minutes from January 2011 to the present reflect discussion and decision making on issues relevant to the institution and public interest. The Board Policy 2715 Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice includes the tenet of the Board Acting as a Whole. “Board members recognize that legal and effective functioning is by the board as a whole. District matters are not governed by individual actions of Board members. When acting as Board members, trustees speak and act on behalf of the District, not as individuals. Board members are careful not to misrepresent their individual opinions or actions as those of the Board. Although trustees abide by Board direction, they retain the right to advocate changes at board meetings” (IV.B.1.a).

The mission statement as reflected in Board Policy 1200 articulates the District commitments to quality, integrity, and improvement. The District board policies on the District website, recently revised, describe the expectations for academic excellence and institutional effectiveness. Recently, the District developed and approved Strategic Goals in 2011 as reflected by documents reviewed on the District website, with annualized institutional objectives/outcomes in 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and for this current academic year.

The District established the following goals:

1. Advance student access, equity and success
2. Engage and leverage partners
3. Build programs of distinction
4. Strengthen accountability, innovation and collaboration
5. Develop and manage resources to advance the mission

The development of the Planning and Budgeting Integration Model (PBIM) developed and implemented in 2009 establishes “an effective District-wide committee structure and to streamline and clarify the District wide process for developing recommendations leading to decision-making.” As a result of the interview with the District chancellor, the effectiveness of the PBIM needs to be evaluated (IV.B.1.b).

As reflected on Board Policy 2200 Board roles and responsibilities, among others, to “assure fiscal health and stability” and to “monitor institutional performance and educational quality.” The Board Policy 2315, established the legal parameters for closed session. In the review of meeting agendas, it is noted that information regarding closed session and close session topics are posted as required. Board policies and the college catalog reflect the adopted policies related to educational quality. Board meeting minutes reflect that the Board of Trustees receives and reviews audited financial statements and discusses concerns. The board reviews financial reports and enrollment reports on a regular basis (IV.B.1.c).

The board policies are published on the District website. Board policies 2010 Board Membership, 2105 Student Members, 2200 Board Roles and Responsibilities, 2010 Board Officers, 2220 Committee of the Whole, 2310 Regular Meetings of the Board are a sample of

policies that govern the District. The District also has published administrative procedures. Board policies and administrative procedures have been recently revised (IV.B.1.d).

The review of a sample of Board meeting minutes reflects that Board actions are consistent with policies. During the revision, it is noted that during 2011 policies review began using the Community College League of California (CCLC) numbering system and content. The review of policies substantiates the adoption of a schedule/cycle of policy review in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014. A sampling of Board meeting agendas and minutes located on the District website was reviewed to verify the revision of policies on a regular basis.

The team found that the chancellor-board relations have been strained by what appeared to be a lack of clear communication processes and protocols and a limited understanding on the Board's role as a policy making a body and the delegation of authority to the chancellor to implement those policies. In that regard, the Board of Trustees' roles and responsibilities appear dissimilar to adopted board policy. For example, the team found evidence that seemed to indicate that some trustees hold meetings with constituency groups and provide input to those groups that should more appropriately be coming from the chancellor.

The team believes that the Board of Trustees should more closely monitor the Board's processes and performance on a regular basis. In addition, the team concluded there needs to be more clearly delineated roles and responsibilities in regard to those of the Board and those of the chancellor (IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.j).

Board Policy 2740 Board Education establishes the expectation for trustee's education, the orientation of new members and a new Board President. Since 2010 a series of workshops has been offered to orient new members and deepen the trustees' knowledge related to roles and responsibilities, ethics, Accreditation Standards, accreditation issues on governance and leadership, strategic planning and board-chancellor relations. Most recently (February 24, 2015) the Board held a workshop which included five foundations for a high performing team, a leadership engagement agreement, discussion on shared purpose establishing guiding principles, communications, trustees roles and responsibilities, engaging with resistance, and about institutional measurable outcomes. At Board meetings and under Board Communications, trustees provide information on development opportunities in which they have participated. The July 15, 2014 board meeting addressed Accreditation Standards and expectations.

Under the Board website, Miscellaneous Documents, there are links to CCLC Materials for Trustee Candidates and include materials useful in trustee development such as Trusteeship Tasks Knowledge & Skills, Trustee Handbook, and a Learning Guide for New Community College Trustees. The Board meetings are televised and present opportunities for Board development through study sessions and presentations. Peralta News-Board Spotlight is a great tool to inform stakeholders on the Board's work. The Board Policy 2100 Board Election provides a method for continuing board membership and staggered terms of office (IV.B.1.f).

Board Policy 2745 Board Evaluation states the trustees' commitment to improving their functioning. According to policy the self-evaluation is to be conducted annually in November and December. The board evaluation instrument evaluates the board's organization and leadership and it is aligned to Accreditation Standards. The board tool has recently undergone a review to more effectively address Accreditation Standards and integrating District strategic goals and objectives. According to the information reviewed, board evaluations have been conducted during this accreditation cycle. Board evaluation results from 2009 to 2014 examined demonstrate that the board has an effective tool for the review of its performance. The December 9, 2014 Board Workshop agenda included a discussion on board evaluation based on accreditation Standard IV and the strategic goals. The January 24, 2012 meeting minutes reflect that the board self-evaluation was based upon accreditation Standards. Trustees use the results of the evaluation to engage in dialogue and discussion on what has worked as a body and what requires continuous improvement. It is noted that there is a two-year gap where the board did not complete a self-evaluation. The team suggests that the board publishes the results of the board evaluation and action plans (IV.B.1.g).

Trustees are expected to maintain a highest Standard of conduct and ethical behavior. Board Policy 2715 Code of Ethics and Standards of Practices defines the standards of ethical conduct. The process for dealing with Board behavior that is unethical is not included as part of the policy. It is suggested that the policy includes a section on dealing with board behavior that is unethical (IV.B.1.h).

A VoteLog search on minutes and Board agendas and workshops reflecting the information and training provided to the board about its accreditation process and the Accreditation Standards, confirm that trustees are knowledgeable, informed and involved in the accreditation process. The Board has had ample opportunities to review and discuss the District ACCJC follow-up reports completed within the period of 2010-2013. The District accreditation home page provides documents directly related to accreditation efforts and the progression of communication with ACCJC.

As evidenced in a random sample of meeting notes, the Board studies information related to improving and supporting student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness.

Board Policy 2431 Chancellor Selection establishes a comprehensive search process to select the Chancellor. The Chancellor Search Committee webpage provides information for conducting a search, the selection processes, and the most recent chancellor's search in 2012. The current Chancellor has been serving in his capacity since July of 2012. Board Policy 2430, Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor and the Administrative Procedure 2430 Delegation of Authority of the Chancellor's Staff delineates clearly the delegation of authority. The District organizational chart is another example of this delegation.

The board has been involved in the revision of policy and focusing on its fiduciary responsibility, trustee roles, and responsibilities to ensure academic excellence and institutional effectiveness and improvement. The board has established a mechanism for evaluating the chancellor's performance and setting clear expectations. The Chancellor's

annual goals progress reports documents how the Chancellor is fulfilling the responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Since the president's arrival in January 2013, the president has brought institutional and academic leadership to the College. The College president is responsible for the organization and administration of the College. The College president works with governance groups to ensure faculty and staff participation in decision-making. The College's Shared Governance Manual on the website was reviewed to gain a better understanding of the president's leadership and shared governance. The Administrative Procedure 2430 Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor's Staff clearly identifies the duties and responsibilities to "administer compliance of all their assigned College personnel with all Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. The President shall provide leadership to their campus community shared governance process in a systematic annual review of the Board of Trustees Policies, District Administrative Procedures, and College operating procedures with the expectation that recommendations for improvement will be made." The governance decision-making flow chart found in the Governance Manual provides the process to achieve the College's mission (IV.B.2).

During the accreditation cycle, the College has had one president and an interim president. The interim president was appointed in June 2012, and the new president was hired in January of 2013. Past presidents have addressed recommendations of the 2010 cycle as documented on the College accreditation website.

Governing Board policies in seven chapters delineate how the College is staffed and organized. The organizational chart reviewed in 2014 denotes that there are three primary areas ultimately overseen by the College president: Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services. The organizational chart reflects the reporting structure.

Governance is the integrated process for planning and decision making. The active participation of constituency groups in academic effectiveness and institutional quality is reflected in the participatory governance processes. Participatory governance groups are committed to a set of values and guiding principles to guide growth and development.

The participatory governance site of the website documents the goals, structures and decision making that is part of participatory governance. Within the structure is the College Roundtable, chaired by the College president who communicates institutional values, goals, and priorities. The College Roundtable is charged: (a) to address the College strategic missions; (b) to advise the administration on planning and budget issues by offering opportunities for College wide participation and collecting recommendations; and (c) to ensure budget and planning integration and data-based decision making. The College Roundtable makes recommendations to the President. The President is responsible for informing decisions and College wide communication (IV.B.2.a).

Under the leadership of the president, the College affirmed the mission statement, vision and values, and communicated with the College campus through the President's Bulletin in

October 2014. The strategic goals and measurable outcomes were established in 2013. These are:

- Manage BCC FTES to meet PCCD goal (18,830)
- Increase transfer to 4-year institutions
- Increase degree and certificate completion
- Increase transferability

The Roundtable Conversation Map of September 11, 2013 served as the space to finalize goals and priorities and the opportunity for the SWOT analysis. The goals were reviewed and approved by participatory governance groups and approved by the College Roundtable in October 2013. The College has established a set of strategic goals and priorities aligned to District goals. Measurable outcomes are established to evaluate student achievement and address continuous improvement.

The president communicates institutional values, goals, and direction through President's Bulletin, town halls, and campus newsletters. The College catalog includes a comprehensive list of District and College policies and procedures. The office of the president home page meeting schedules includes town halls for this academic year, spring quarter only. The president works with participatory governance to address strategic goals and objectives. The strategic goals and objectives are presented to the College Roundtable for recommendation to the President's Cabinet. The president communicates the importance of a culture of evidence and the focus on student learning.

The institutional research page provides links to 2014 student achievement data and reports. The 2012-15 program review data is also provided. The Vision 2014 link provides the process for the education master plan development beginning on August of 2014. The results of the process and next steps were provided at the January 2015 flex day activity. The College goals and accomplishments for this cycle are described on the BCC Roundtable for Planning and Budget home page. The District has created a Planning and Budgeting Integration Model (PBIM) the College is utilizing in its planning and deliberations. The model began to be implemented in 2011. The Research Office is housed at the District level. The District Institutional Planning office provides data and reports necessary for decision making. According to the Institutional Research page at the District level, "the Peralta Office of Institutional Research is responsible for the analysis and delivery of data for planning and reporting purposes. In the course of these activities, Institutional Research generates reports and statistical analyses that inform management, faculty, staff, government agencies, and the general public, about Peralta's academic programs, students, personnel, and services. The Office serves as the District liaison to Colleges and government agencies involved in issues of educational research."

Interviews with the president, faculty, and staff revealed that the College has research expertise internally complementary of District institutional research services. The College leadership and committees have access to the District researcher and the research office to meet College needs. Most recently, the District and College leadership have recognized the need for a College/campus researcher. New state initiatives and requirements have created a higher demand for the local management of data to ensure data-driven decisions are made

within the process of integrated planning and resource allocation. The Chancellor has provided leadership in support of the College president to institutionalize the research function at the College level (IV.B.2).

The implementation of status, regulations, and Board policies are published and communicated in the College catalog, supplemental catalogs, and class schedules. The president holds regular meeting with the president's cabinet, and The College Roundtable advises the administration in planning and budget issues. The president participates in regular meetings with the Chancellor's Cabinet. The College president participates actively in the integrated planning and budget development calendar as reflected on the 2013-14 and 2014-15 calendars. Board Policy 2430 Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor, gives the chancellor executive responsibility of administering the policies adopted by the board. The president may delegate any powers of duties entrusted to the president's office by the Board (IV.B.2.c).

The president manages fiscal resources under the supervision of the Chancellor. With the Business and Administrative Services unit, the College administrative personnel develop the College budget. The budget process includes the implementation of the Budget Allocation Model. Priorities are established through institutional planning, beginning with the institutional goals. The president engages in additional planning and evaluations of her needs through not only the education master plan, but the facilities master plan and the program review process. The College budget and planning process is described in the Planning and Budgeting Integration Model (PBIM) reviewed in sections above. As evidenced but documentation reviewed, the president works with the share governance groups to determine to determine resource allocation according to planning. BCC has implemented the business intelligence model and uses PeopleSoft for financial management. The review of the financial reports indicate that since 2009/10 to 2013/14, the College has experienced a decrease in FTES and consequently a decrease in revenue compounded by the impact of the District unfunded liabilities and debt. The District created a funding plan in 2012 to address OPEB obligations. In 2014-15, the College financial projections are favorable to grow faculty positions and to fund needed services. In 2014-15, an additional 323 FTES is projected a potential revenue allocation to the College by .93 percent. The financial reports review reveals that the College is in good standing. The College has addressed prior concerns related to budget (IV.B.2.d).

The president communicates with the internal communities served through town halls afternoon teas, brown bag lunch meetings and bulletins. Information such as *Envision Berkeley City College*, *Facts about Berkeley City College*, *Goals and Accomplishments*, *History of Berkeley City College*, *Mission, Vision, and Values* can be found on the District homepage. The *Support Berkeley City College* home page is a vehicle for connecting with internal and external communities on ways they can become friends of the College and invest. The 2015 Self-Evaluation webpage includes a series of student stories that exemplifies the mission of the College and are heartwarming. The College president is actively involved with community groups, organizations, and businesses (IV.B.2.e).

The District delineates and communicates responsibilities and functions, and provides services to support the College and a fair distribution of resources. The Chancellor gives full authority to the president to implement board/systems policies. The District acts as the liaison between the College and the board. The areas of concern relate to the District effectively controlling expenditures and the regular systems evaluation to ensure integrity and effectiveness, communicating the results of the evaluation, and use of the evaluation results to make institutional improvements (IV.B.3).

Board policies provide written delineation of responsibilities. The Board policy 2430 Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor delegates the authority to the Chancellor as the executive to carry our Board policies. Administrative Procedure 2430 is the procedure that delegates authority to the Chancellor's staff, Presidents, the Vice Chancellors of Finance and Administration, Educational Services, Human Resources and General Services, and General Counsel. The PCCD functional map illustrates how the College and the District manage the responsibilities. The functional map integrates the Accreditation Standards. The team observed evidence that the Chancellor is a supportive administrator and provides guidance for the president to run the College. The College president works collaboratively with the chancellor through weekly chancellor cabinet meetings and bi-weekly one-on-one meetings with College presidents. (IV.B.3.a)

The District is the hub of support for the College, and it includes the District Academic Senate, District services areas, educational services, general services, and institutional research. The District organizational chart reflects the direct reporting structure between the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors for Information Technology, Finance and Administration, General Services, Human Resources and Educational Services, General Counsel, and the executive director of risk management, and public information, communications and media. It is noted that the organization chart reflects the position of Deputy Chancellor/Chief operating office, a vacant position. The District could benefit from planning and allocating resources to increase the College's research capacity to analyze progress toward achieving the institutional and strategic goals including improvement in student achievement and student learning (IV.B.3.b).

The District has developed a budget allocation model. The implementation began in 2011 to encourage and support collaboration between the College and the District. The formula-based allocation is modeled after SB361. The base allocation, the credit of FTES and non- credit FTES, which are 70 percent of the District revenues, are the drivers of the allocation model. The district wide planning and budgeting integration model (PBI), implemented in August of 2009 establishes clear guidelines and resource distribution processes to support operations. The PBI District wide advisory committee functions as the body to receive input from the College and makes recommendation. The adopted budgets for the last three years are comprehensive and communicate the method for the distribution of resources focused on strategic goals and priorities (IV.B.3.c).

The District has been working on creating systems that effectively work to control its expenditures. In reviewing the audited financial statements dated June 2010, findings revealed a number of deficiencies and noncompliance related to finances. In 2013, the

auditing findings were mostly cleared. The District developed and implemented a plan to meet the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) obligations. In the June 2014 report, a number of financial findings were reported on the District financial condition, reporting compliance, strengthening policies and procedures on direct loan reconciliation, reporting, and record keeping. In addition, Measure A General Funds findings revealed the need for a more prudent management of these financial resources and improved meeting calendar of the Citizen's Oversight Committee. The District has hired an internal auditor whose primary responsibility is to address audit findings. The District has created corrective action plans to address all 2014 audit and financial findings. The current finance and administration leadership is in transition. The District does not meet the Standard (IV.B.3.d).

The Chancellor and the President work collaboratively on establishing and meeting shared institutional goals. The 2014-2015 District and Berkeley City College strategic goals are a sample of these shared responsibilities. The Peralta Community College District function map also delineates the responsibilities for academic excellent and institutional effectiveness and improvement (IV.B.3.e).

The Chancellor serves as the District executive officer and is positioned to be a liaison between the College and the Governing Board. The District and the College use methods of communication and exchange of information through electronic communications, leadership cabinet meetings, and Board meetings. A number of printed documents including reports and initiatives by District areas, are posted on the District website. The District public information page provides information relevant to internal and external communities.

The District Planning and Budget Council is comprised of technology, education and facilities committees. The committee has representation of participatory governance groups and established roles for the delivery of information. This responsibility is defined in the District Planning and Budgeting Integration Model. This body has the responsibility for communicating information on an ongoing basis.

The review of the Board agendas demonstrates the exchange of information provided by the Chancellor, the President, and members of the executive cabinets for both the District and the College community. The Board agenda and minutes inform the College community on Governing Board actions and interests that impact the College's operation, educational quality and ability to provide excellence in education (IV.B.3.f).

Board policy 2510 Participation in Local Decision Making provides a direction for different constituency groups to participate in the development of policies and administrative procedures. The Planning and Budgeting Integration Model provides the process for decision making applicable to this Standard. The review of evidence does provide the process or methods the District uses to evaluating role delineation, governance and decision-making structures and processes. District and campus committees evaluate their structures internally. The approach needs to be more systematic, campus and District wide (IV.B.3.g).

Conclusions

The Peralta Community College District is governed by an independent board elected by the community. As a result of the review of this Standard, the College and District leadership have indicated clear designated responsibilities. However, the team has concerns regarding the delineation of roles as they are implemented regarding the role of the Board in the everyday affairs of the work of the Chancellor and the College. There is a need to put into practice appropriate behaviors as outlined in Board policy regarding the delegation of authority between the Board and Chancellor and appropriate Board roles and responsibilities. Even though the Board has completed the review of Board Policy within this accreditation cycle, the team did not find evidence to support that the Board practices its policy regarding its role and the role of the Chancellor.

Furthermore, there is no regular and systematic evaluation of the District's functions, governance, decision-making structure, and communication. In addition, the College's systems and organizational roles can be better aligned with the District. More local control within the institutional research function would enable the College to design and develop a more robust system of evaluation of academic excellence and institutional effectiveness. The team concluded that the College/District does not fully meet Standard IV.B.

Recommendations

See College Recommendation 1

See District Recommendation 4

District Recommendation 6

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

District Recommendation 7

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

See District Recommendation 8

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment

- The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
- The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment.

Regulation citation: 602.23(b).

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

BCC has elicited third party comment. Prior to the current comprehensive evaluation team visit, two paid research programs evaluated BCC students: the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), in 2013 delivered key findings on student engagement and benchmarks of effective educational practice, and the 2013 Survey of Entering Student Engagement revealed that BCC students made early connections, entered with high expectations and aspirations and had clear academic plans and pathways. Career Technology Advisory groups also provided third party input. The ESL Advisory Meetings were held on May 2, 2014; January 22, 2014; and November 20, 2014. The Computer Science and Math Advisory group met May 14, 2014 and the Public and Human Service Program Advisory convened in September 2011. During the current site visit, Tuesday March 10, 2015, the team received summaries of input from Focus Groups and Community members including Principal, Sheila Quintana, Berkeley Technology Academy- program on Career Technology; Sbeydeh Viveros, Senior Aide to Mayor Tom Bates, City of Berkeley; Marsha Jaegar- Executive Director, Center for Educational Partnerships; UCB transfer alliance program for BCC students to Cal Berkeley Audi Huang; Academic Programs Manager; YMCA OPGE Teen Center representative Ellin O'Leary; and Youth Radio on digital media, broadcast journalism, media production, and digital technology. The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.
- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.
- The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
- The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

Regulation citations: 602. 16(a)(1)(i); 602. 17(f); 602. 19 (a-e).

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

Although the institution-set standards are appropriate, relevant and outcomes are widely communicated across the College, the annual program review does not provide evidence of defined elements and expected measures of performance within instructional programs, nor are these listed as requirements in the Instructional Review Handbook. Because the handbook is currently in revision, the team recommends a follow-up to ascertain performance measures are routinely reported as part of the program review process.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).

The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).

Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice

The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.

Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602. 16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The Peralta Community College District Program and Course Approval Process Manual outlines Title 5 requirements regarding awarding units of credit as well as the formula for calculating class time and assignments for courses offered in time frames of less than a full semester. Where courses are to be offered in a reduced time frame less than six weeks, the "...curriculum committee engage the discipline faculty in a review...for...academic integrity and rigor the method for meeting Carnegie units, the ability for students to complete and for faculty to evaluate outside assignments, and the appropriateness of the method of delivery."

Transfer Policies

Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.

Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.

The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*.

Regulation citations: 602. 16(a) (1) (viii); 602. 17(a) (3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a) (ii).

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

As mandated by the Student Success Act of 2012, orientation, assessment, and counseling is offered to all first-time students seeking degrees or transfer. During orientation, students are provided with information regarding the College's programs and services. Students learn about programs and majors, degree, certificate and transfer requirements. Transfer policies are available on the College's website, in the College's catalog and in the College class schedule.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

- The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
- There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).
- The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected
- The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offering
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education.

Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

PCCD defines Distance Education as education in which the instructor and student are separated, but maintain regular and substantive contact either synchronously or asynchronously. Courses reflect policies which are the same as those for regular courses for quality, integrity, effectiveness. They reflect the BCC mission, and are offered for transfer and career technical education purposes. They meet the federal regulatory requirements for Distance Education. In addition, policies and procedures of academic honesty, acceptable use of Information Technology Services include the following: penalties for unauthorized use of another student's name and password, cheating on examinations, and other types of academic dishonesty. Students must agree to these the first time they log onto the district LMS system. This educates students instead of punitive measures. Courses go through the regular and separate review processes of curriculum approval and review to meet standards, rigor and learning outcomes for regular classes. They are reviewed by the department chair with the faculty, curriculum Committee, DE coordinator. Instructors must have received training and are evaluated regularly. Learning outcomes are the same as for the face to face class and are reflected in the outline of record. The chair of the department reviews to determine if they will be offered again. In addition, they are evaluated in Program Review. In 2009, a substantive change proposal for five academic programs in which 50% or more of the courses are offered in distance education was submitted. The Commission approved. These have been regularly reviewed.

Student Complaints

- The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
- The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
- The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
- The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

Regulation citations: 602. 16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online. However, student complaint files since the last accreditation visit do not demonstrate that these policies and procedures have been meticulously followed. The team reviewed complaint files dated from fall 2009 to the present and found them to be inconsistently handled. Although the College conforms to the Commission's "Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions" in that its procedures are *reasonable* and *well publicized*, the team was unable to ascertain if the complaints had been "fairly administered" because many complaint files were incomplete. Case files did not all include the requisite forms summarizing claim, action, and outcomes. Many of those that were included were not filled out, or incomplete. Case resolution letters or statements were frequently missing. The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.

The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.

The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.

Regulation citations: 602. 16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The institution provides accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies through its catalog and course schedule. Hard copy versions are published each semester, but online versions are revised frequently for up-to-the-minute accuracy. Catalog content originates with the responsible service unit supervisor or department chair, and a technician develops the course and room schedule. The Catalog conveys information about BCC's programs and services including institutional and program student learning outcomes. According to the Public Information Officer, this then becomes the source for all other BCC publications because its page format is intentionally designed to lend itself to multiple uses. All advertising and student recruitment materials follow guidelines from the PIO published annually in the memo "Branding Berkeley City College: BCC Marketing Guidelines." Numerous responsible parties, the Public Information Officer, and proofreaders review all documents for accuracy.

Title IV Compliance

- The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
- The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
- The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
- Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.

Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.

Conclusion Check-Off:

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

In the Peralta Community College District, all funds are reconciled as required by each state or federal funding source. The District's independent external auditor's review federal and state-funded programs as part of the annual audit. Berkeley Community College's current student loan default rate is 15.5%, which is within federal guidelines, and lower than the overall Peralta Community College District average of 19%. Furthermore, between 2009 and 2011, the College's three-year official cohort default rate decreased by more than 10 percentage points from 25.8% for 2009 to 15.5% for 2011. The positive trend in the reduction of student default rates is attributed to the stabilization of the College's Financial Aid Office over the last five years beginning with the hiring of a full-time Financial Aid Program Supervisor. The College complies with this ACCJC Policy. The District and College monitor and manage student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets in order to comply with all federal and state mandates.