EVALUATION REPORT

CHABOT COLLEGE
25555 Hesperian Boulevard
Hayward, CA 94545

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
Chabot College from October 5 through October 8, 2015.

Sunita V. Cooke, Chair

Chabot College
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Team Roster
October 5 – 8, 2015

Dr. Sunita Cooke (Chair)
President
MiraCosta College
1 Barnard Drive
Oceanside, CA 92056

Dr. Mary Benard (Assistant)
Vice President of Instruction
MiraCosta College
1 Barnard Drive
Oceanside, CA 92056

Dr. Anna Badalyan
Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
400 West Washington Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Mr. Randy Beach
Professor, English/Education, Institutional
Program Review & Outcomes
Southwestern College
900 Otay Lakes Road
Chula Vista, CA 91910

Ms. Lisa Campbell
Dean of Counseling & Student
Development
Fullerton College
321 E. Chapman Ave.
Fullerton, CA 92832

Mr. Raymond Hernandez
Dean ofScience, Math, and Technology
Skyline College
3300 College Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066

Ms. Lorrie Hopper
Vice President of Administrative Services
Clovis Community College Center
10309 N. Willow Ave.
Fresno CA 93730

Ms. Susan Kazama
Professor and Head Librarian
Kapiolani Community College
4303 Diamond Head Road, Lama Library
Honolulu HI 96816

Dr. Jeanie Nishime
Vice President of Student & Community
Advancement/ALO
El Camino College
16007 Crenshaw Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90506

Dr. Jennifer Vega La Serna
Vice President of Academic Services
College of the Sequoias
915 South Mooney Blvd
Visalia, CA 93277

Dr. Michael A. White
President
Woodland Community College
2300 East Gibson Road
Woodland, CA 95776

Summary of Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Chabot College

DATE OF VISIT: October 5-8, 2015

TEAM CHAIR: Sunita V. Cooke, Ph.D.
                         Superintendent/President, MiraCosta College

A thirteen-member team visited Chabot College from October 5 – 8, 2015, for the purpose of evaluating the institution's request to reaffirm accreditation. The visit was conducted in conjunction with a visit by a team to Las Positas College. Together the two colleges make up the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD).

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training conducted by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) on September 2, 2015, as well as completing the online course on Accreditation Basics. The team also studied the accreditation materials prepared for the visiting team. Team members read the College's self-evaluation report, which included recommendations from the 2009 visiting team and assessed the various forms of evidence provided by the institution electronically.

This evaluation was conducted based on the Accreditation Standards adopted by the ACCJC in 2002.

Chabot College received its accreditation in 1963 from ACCJC and has maintained continuous accreditation since that time. The College currently serves approximately 13,000 students annually on its 94-acre site in Hesperia with 69 degrees and 59 certificates. The College is designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and offers no off-site degree programs.

The self-evaluation conducted by Chabot College involved considerable and appropriate participation by the college community. The document was generally complete and organized by Accreditation Standards. The team was able to obtain most of the information needed in the self-evaluation, but required additional information, clarity and supporting evidence in interviews, and on-site review.

The College has had relatively stable leadership at the presidential level since 2012. The three vice presidents have been in place for the past one-to-two years. The middle management (dean level) generally has served the College in a long-term capacity, though currently two dean positions are in interim status and reportedly will be filled in spring 2016. Dr. Janette Jackson has been chancellor of the CLPCCD since 2013 and generally, executive leadership across the District have been in their roles for a relatively short period of time.

While the elements of the integrated planning process are present including program review with a tie to resource allocation, there are still opportunities for integration of robust assessment of processes and identification of opportunities for improvement through a

complete cycle. The team verified elements of long-term planning in existence at the College (the Educational Master Plan and the Strategic Plan). The College's Strategic Plan covers the period of 2012-2015 with an extension of one year to coincide with completion of the Educational Master Plan (EMP). The Educational Master Plan covers the period of 2015-2020. The Educational Master Plan communicates the College's vision for advancing student achievement, and is used to guide institutional and program development. The nine goals established in the EMP were the result of a year-long process informed by data analysis conducted by the Chabot Institutional Research Office and input from the community, solicited through various activities and platforms. The EMP works in conjunction with the district wide Strategic Plan, Facility Master Plan, and Technology Plan to meet student need through long-range planning of instructional and student support programs, facilities, and technology.

The team found that the program review process is being done in all areas of the College. The cycle of review for academic and student services areas appears to be on three-year cycles with annual updates. Similarly, progress has been made toward assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs) for most courses and programs. SLOs do not seem to be clearly communicated to students through the course syllabi or catalog. While the College has devised a survey method of assessing Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs), there does not appear to be broad dialog about assessment results across the College. The team reviewed the annual report submitted to the Commission in October 2015, indicating that the College is at the proficiency level of SLOs with 72.46 percent of courses and 84.3 percent of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes.

The team found the District/College structures and functions are being established given the new leadership across the College and District. Roles and responsibilities as well as the effectiveness of decentralized and centralized functions needs to be assessed to determine effectiveness in helping the College to meet its mission and to improve institutional effectiveness. The District established a new budget allocation model (BAM), which was implemented in the 2013/14 budget year, and the workgroup that recommended the model has initiated a preliminary financial review of the implementation. Additionally, governance structures at the district level have been implemented recently and the District is in the process of developing a communication tool for coordinating decision-making. Assessment of effectiveness will complete the cycle and will be important in ensuring robust dialog and communication in the governance process.

Finally, the team notes that the District's unrestricted financial reserves have been increasing from 6.42 percent in FY 2011/12 ($5,887,199 million), 8.19 percent in FY 2012/13 ($7,564,072 million), 11.47 percent in FY 2013/14 ($10,983,359 million), and 15.98 percent in FY 2014/15 ($16,331,052 million). In FY 2011/12, Board Policy 6300 on financial management and Administrative Procedure 6305 require a minimum of five percent reserve and a new goal is to also establish a one percent reserve at each college in addition to the district reserve.

Commendations of the 2015 Visiting Team

The team found a group of faculty, staff, and administrators with a deep and abiding commitment to Chabot College and its students. The recognition and acceptance of the special role that Chabot has in providing educational opportunity and socioeconomic mobility is evident in the focus on student success and innovative practices apparent throughout the College. The College is to be commended for:

1. A strong institutional focus on student success demonstrated through development of special programs to support students of color, their research supported projects and initiatives including cohort student outcomes, identification of bottlenecks resulting in increased access and success, and grant funded projects.
2. Its participation in regional General Education (GE) reciprocity with other community colleges in Region IV.
3. Developing the Learning Connection, First Year Experience (FYE) program, online workshops designed to prepare students for success in online courses, and basic skills innovations.
4. Demonstrating its community engagement in student learning through the Hayward Promise Neighborhood, Striving Black Brothers, and the Great Debate.
5. Doubling financial aid awards between 2008 and 2014 from 20 percent to 41 percent of students.
6. Use of collaborative building planning and available resources to create sustainable learning environments that are functional and aesthetically pleasing.

Chabot College Recommendations October 2015

1. As was noted by the 2009 evaluation team, in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College expedite the development, assessment, dialogue and improvement plans related to the course and program learning outcomes. The College needs to ensure that student learning outcomes for all courses and programs are clearly, accurately, and consistently available to students and the public in both print and electronic documents, including course syllabi and the catalog. (Standard II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.6, II.A.6.c, ER 10, ER 19)

2. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College should document ongoing Service Area Outcomes (SAO) assessments and the appropriate measures implemented to improve services to students in all areas of the College. (I.B.3, I.B.5, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.b, II.B.3.c, II.B.4)

3. To improve its effectiveness, the College needs to complete, document, and communicate the new shared governance structure and evaluate the effectiveness to make needed improvements. (Standards I.B.I, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, IV.A.I, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.3.g)

4. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College should evaluate its process for prioritization of classified staff positions and make modifications as needed. (III.A.2)

5. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College should adopt a process for prioritization of administrative positions, and evaluate the effectiveness of that process. (III.A.2)

6. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College is urged to update their committee webpages to reflect current information. (Standards IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

7. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College needs to provide ongoing professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators to develop a clear understanding of the relationship between outcome assessment results, program review, and effective utilization of data for improvement of student learning to improve communication, innovation, and integrated planning processes and strengthen institutional effectiveness. (Standard I.B.3,I.B.6, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.A.6.c, III.A.5)

District and College Recommendations October 2015

1. In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the board establish a regular evaluation cycle of its policies and practices, inclusively revise them as necessary, and make them available to the public. (Standards III.A.3, IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.f)

2. In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the board clearly define and implement improvement outcomes from the established board self-evaluation process as a mechanism for improving board performance. (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g)

3. To increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the District and College regularly evaluate role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the Colleges in meeting educational goals. (Standards III.A.6, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

4. In order to increase effectiveness and ensure the Colleges can meet their missions, the team recommends the District and College regularly assess the budget allocation model (BAM) to ensure its integrity and effectiveness in adequately supporting College operations. (Standards III.D.1, III.D.3, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3 d)

5. To meet the standard, the Colleges and District should update and integrate their long range facilities planning process to reflect the total cost of ownership projections of facilities and equipment (III.B.2.a, ER 19).

Accreditation Evaluation Report for

Chabot College
October 5-8, 2015

Introduction
Chabot College and its sister Las Positas College comprise the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) serving Alameda County, including Castro Valley, Hayward, San Leandro, San Lorenzo, and Union City as well as southern Contra Costa County including the communities of Dublin, Livermore, and Pleasanton.

Voters approved the District, originally named the South County Community College District on January 10, 1961, and Chabot College opened for classes on September 11, 1961, in a small site in San Leandro with an enrollment of 1,132 students. Two years later, the College was first accredited by ACCJC and then two years after that Chabot College opened on its current site.

Slightly more than half of Chabot students are female (53 percent) and most students are part time (67 percent) with less than 12 units. Approximately 55 percent of students are pursuing a transfer to a university as an educational goal while nine percent seek an associate degree at the college, and 12 percent are pursuing a career technical certificate or training. Enrollment trends show a slight increase in total unduplicated student numbers over a three-year period with over 700 new students each fall.

Because over one-third of Chabot students are of Latino descent, the College has been designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) with approximately 37 percent Latino students during the 2014 year, representing the largest demographic group followed by white (18 percent), Asian (16 percent) and African-American (12 percent) of the student population.

Chabot College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

The self-evaluation report was generally organized around the Accreditation Standards and complete. There were items noted as inaccuracies or redundancies as well as grammatical errors or omissions, and the self-evaluation did not contain sufficient evidence to substantiate the written materials, which made the team's work a bit more difficult.

Once the team arrived, the College staff were very helpful in providing and organizing additional information and evidence as requested by the team. The individuals and groups identified for interview were open and honest with information and feedback.

Responses to
Recommendations of Previous Team
DATE 2009

College Recommendations

Recommendation 1:
In order to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline, the team recommends that the College accelerate its efforts to identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporate student learning outcomes assessments into course and program improvements. (I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

While there has been steady progress in the identification and assessment of course, program, and institutional student learning outcomes, there is inconsistency across the College in outcome assessment in courses and programs. The team had to reconcile three sets of numbers related to this recommendation, which were submitted by the College in its annual report to ACCJC, its self-evaluation, and then the current numbers in the outcome management system. After that reconciliation during team interviews, it seems that 100 percent of courses and programs have learning outcomes identified. However, the college has only assessed 72.5 percent of courses and 84.3 percent of programs.

The College uses a survey instrument to assess ISLOs and also disaggregates course level outcomes assessment in distance education courses versus face-to-face courses. Chabot has completed two cycles of ISLO assessment, the first cycle was completed in 2013 with a follow-up assessment in 2015.

Additionally, the College needs to ensure that all program areas have identified outcomes and that they are regularly assessed. Dialog about assessment results need to drive actions to improve services to students through assessment of service area outcomes (SAOs) in all areas of the College.

The team concludes that the College has not fully met this recommendation.

Recommendation 2:
The team recommends that the College develop processes that more clearly and effectively combine the results of program review with unit planning, student learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional planning and budgeting. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, I.C.2)

The team verified the information in the self-evaluation through interviews and determined that the College is integrating the results of program review with unit planning, student learning outcomes, and assessment and institutional planning and budgeting. The comprehensive inclusion of program outcomes and SAOs needs to be strengthened. Through

continued assessment of the processes, professional development, and improved communication across the College, the impacts of this integrated planning in college wide continuous improvement will be more apparent to the college community. The College has also asked for assistance from the California Community College Institutional Effectiveness Initiative Program (IEPI) to more closely tie unit planning with institutional planning and goals. This technical assistance will enhance the College's processes and should begin in spring 2016.

The team concludes the College has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 3:
In order to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline, the team recommends that the Library and Learning Connection develop and implement an outcomes assessment process linking their respective planning for resources and services to the evaluation of student needs. Chabot should use the evaluation of services to provide evidence that these services contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes and serve as a basis for improvement of student success. This work should be done in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research. (Standards I.A.1., I.B, I.B.1, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4)

The College Library and the Learning Connection have developed student learning outcomes, program level outcomes, and service area outcomes and assessments. The Library and Learning Connection have also adopted the College's revised program review process. The team visit confirmed that an assessment process is in place and data is being provided and analyzed from the Office of Institutional Research.

The team concludes the College has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 4:
In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop and implement formal processes to more fully integrate institution-wide assessment of planning for campus technology needs into all levels of planning and allocation of resources. (Standards I.A.I, I.B, I.B.I, II.B)

The Chabot Technology Committee and Committee on Online Learning are key committees in determining recommendations for technology at the College. Procedures identify that technology requests are integrated through two mechanisms; program review and a technology request form. Interviews conducted on campus provided further evidence related to this recommendation. In May 2008, a technology plan was developed to establish technology guidelines to help Chabot College with technological planning and enhancement. It was identified that the plan would guide current and future technology and be reviewed every other year. This plan was last updated September of 2015, and is called Technology Plan Update – Bond Activities and Enterprise System.

The team concludes the College has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 5:
In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College develop existing decision-making processes to include outcomes assessment of the campus governance components. (Standards I.B.I, I.B.2, I.B.3, IV.A.I, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.3g)

The College reports assessing its governance process since the mid-term. Committees have reviewed their charge and in 2014 the College engaged in the work of establishing and implementing a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. Fall 2014 shared governance retreat recommendations were distributed to College constituent groups, councils, and committees. The College's Program Review and Budget Committee (PRBC) then began the work of a college governance redesign, which included reducing the number of committees, committee composition, and charge statements. The Faculty Senate crafted its own draft recommendations during spring 2015, while PRBC solicited and received possible revisions to their proposal. College Actionable Improvement Plan 1 commits the College to "completing the work on the shared governance structure and document in the 2015-2016 Academic Year" and College leadership anticipates a spring 2016 completion.

The team concludes the College has met this recommendation.

District and College Recommendation

Recommendation 6:
In order to improve, the team recommends that the board establish and formally adopt a clearly delineated orientation program for board members. (Standard IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.f)

The board has several vehicles for board orientation and development, which begins with new member orientation and ongoing participation in workshops, conferences, and study sessions. Members of the board have attended conferences sponsored by Community College League of California (CCLC), California Community College Trustees (CCCT), Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) and Governance Institute for Student Success (GISS). New board members and rotating board chairs may participate in appropriate training offered by CCLC. The student trustee also is provided with an orientation and a student trustee packet. Board Policy 2740 addresses new board member orientation, including the student trustee, and District commitment to ongoing board training and professional development. Board development and new member training includes ethics and compliance with the Brown Act.

The team concludes the College and District have met this recommendation.

District and College

Recommendation 1:
To meet the standards, the team recommends that the District and the College maintain an updated functional map and that the District and the College engage in a program of systematic evaluation to assess both the effectiveness of District and College functional relationships and the effectiveness of services that support the institution. (Standard III.A.6, IV.B.3)

The College has taken action to address the recommendation. The District and College collaborated to create its District Functional Map in 2012, and then revised it in the fall of 2014. At that time, a separate task map was also created to better illustrate the department functions that were assigned to the District and the Colleges. While a functional map now exists and has been revised, continuous assessment of its effectiveness will be critical to ensure an effective relationship exists between district and college services that support the institution.

The team concludes the District and College have met this recommendation.

Recommendation 2:
To meet the standards, the team recommends that the District and the College complete the evaluation of the resource allocation process in time for budget development for the 2010-2011 academic year, ensuring transparency and assessing the effectiveness of resource allocations in supporting operations. (Standard III.D.1, III.D.3, IV.B.3).

The District approved a new budget allocation model (BAM) recommended by a study group for fiscal year 2013/14. In this simpler model, set District expenses are taken from the aggregated revenue, allocations are made to the District Office and Maintenance and Operations according to set percentages, and the remainder is shared between the two Colleges based upon FTES targets. There has been a preliminary financial review of the district wide budget model and a comprehensive evaluation of the budget allocation process has yet to be completed.

The team concludes the District and College have met this recommendation.

Eligibility Requirements

1. **Authority**

   The College meets this requirement. Chabot College is approved under regulations of the California State Department of Education and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The College's programs are also accredited by the Council on Dental Education, American Dental Association, Committee on Allied Health Education Programs, American Hospital Health Information Management Association, and the American Medical Assisting Association. The nursing program is accredited by the California Board of Registered Nursing.

2. **Mission**

   The College meets this requirement. The mission of Chabot College was approved by the governing board in 2014 and published in the College catalog.

3. **Governing Board**

   The College meets this requirement. Chabot College is one of two colleges in the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District. The District is governed by a publicly-elected seven-member Board of Trustees, joined by a nonvoting student trustee from each College. The Board of Trustees functions as an independent policy-making body, capable of reflecting constituent and public interest in board activities and decisions, and is sufficient in size to fulfill its responsibilities. The College reports the board members have no employment, family, or personal financial interest in the institution.

4. **Chief Executive Officer**

   The College meets this requirement. Chabot College has a chief executive officer whose full-time responsibility is to the institution. The president is appointed by the Board of Trustees and reports to the chancellor.

5. **Administrative Capacity**

   The College meets this requirement. There are currently two dean positions filled in an interim capacity as of fall 2015. Appropriate education and experience are addressed as part of the evaluation process.

6. **Operational Status**

   The College meets this requirement. Approximately 12,774 students are currently enrolled in the degree programs and courses offered by the College, which has been in operation since 1961.

7. **Degrees**

   The College meets this requirement. Chabot College offers 43 Associate of Arts, 24 Associate of Science, 11 Associate of Arts for transfer, and four Associate of Science transfer degrees. The College also offers 41 certificates of achievement and 26 certificates of proficiency.

8. **Educational Programs**

   The College meets this requirement. All degree programs are congruent with its mission.

9. **Academic Credit**

   The College meets this requirement. Credits are awarded in accordance with the California Education Code and California Code of Regulations Title 5.

10. **Student Learning and Achievement**

    The College does not fully meet this requirement. There has been progress in the identification and assessment of course, program, and institutional student learning outcomes. There is inconsistency across the College in outcome assessment in courses and programs. Review of evidence indicates that 100 percent of courses and programs have learning outcomes identified. However, the College has only partially completed the SLO assessments, with assessment of 72.5 percent of courses and 84.3 percent of programs. The College assesses institutional learning outcomes and college-wide learning goals (CWLG) and disaggregates course level outcomes assessment in distance education courses versus face-to-face courses. Chabot has completed two cycles of CWLG assessment. Course, program, and institutional outcomes for general education programs are defined, assessed, and documented in program review.

11. **General Education**

    The College meets this requirement. Board Policy 4025 Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education as well of California Code of Regulations, Title 5.

12. Academic Freedom

The College meets this requirement. Board Policy 4030 codifies academic freedom within CLPCCD and it is published in the catalog. Academic Freedom is defined in the CLPCCD Academic Freedom Statement and included in section 26D of the faculty collective bargaining agreement.

13. Faculty

Chabot College has a full-time faculty of 165 and part-time faculty numbering 295 as of fall 2014. Degree attainment and length of college employment of the full-time faculty are listed in the College catalog.

14. Student Services

The College meets this requirement. A rich array of student support services is available and special services exist to meet the needs of selected target populations. These services and programs for students are consistent with the student characteristics and the College's mission.

15. Admissions

Chabot College meets this requirement. Admissions policies are appropriate for a public community college and published in the catalog and website.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The College meets this requirement. Appropriate learning support is available to all students regardless of modality in support of the educational programs and College mission.

17. Financial Resources

The College meets this requirement. As a California community college, most resources for the College come from the state as well as some from grants and federal funds. The District currently maintains a Board of Trustees-mandated reserve minimum in the amount of five percent. The district has reported a reserve of 15.98 percent in 2014/15 (unaudited).

18. Financial Accountability

The College meets this requirement. The District audit reports for 2013 and 2014 were unqualified and had no adverse opinion. The audit report for 2012 received qualified opinions on federal and state awards. There were five internal control findings, and 14 compliance findings for this three year period. The District reports

that most of these findings have or will be resolved and the subsequent audit will document these corrections.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The College does not meet this requirement. The institution has not made public the assessment of student outcomes and has not completed the cycle of systematically evaluating student learning outcomes. The elements of planning and evaluation are being used and the process involves appropriate consultation. The College continues to work through its planning processes to integrate planning with measurable outcomes tied to short-term and long-term goals as well as resource allocation. The College and District have not yet agreed upon a definition of the total cost of ownership of facilities and equipment to be used in long-range planning processes and budget development.

20. Public Information

The College meets this requirement. All required information is published in the biannual catalog and class schedules, which are available to students and the general public on the College website.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The College meets this requirement. The status of accreditation is accurately presented on the College website and in the College catalog. All reports and subsequent commission actions are made publicly available.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with
Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards; there may be other evaluation items under ACCJC standards which address the same or similar subject matter. External evaluation teams will evaluate the institution's compliance with standards as well as the specific Checklist elements from federal regulations and related Commission policies noted here.

General Instructions: The form should contain narrative as well as the "check-off."
   a. The team should place a check mark next to each evaluation item when it has been evaluated.
   b. For each subject category (e.g., "Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment"), the team should also complete the conclusion check-off.
   c. The narrative will cite to the evidence reviewed and team findings related to each of the evaluation items. If some content is discussed in detail elsewhere in the team report, the page(s) of the team report can be cited instead of repeating that portion of the narrative.
   d. Any areas of deficiency from the Checklist leading to noncompliance, or areas needing improvement, should be included in the evaluation conclusions section of the team report along with any recommendations.

This Checklist will become part of the external evaluation team report. Institutions may also use this form as a guide for preparing documentation for team review. It is found as an appendix in the team and institutional self-evaluation manuals.

Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:
   ✓ 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 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 College announced the Public Forums to the community through invitations sent by the Office of Development to the following community partners and agencies:
All local chambers of commerce, NAACP, League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women (AAUW), Latin and Asian Business Alliances, the four unified school districts, three mayors, the county supervisor, and state legislators. Additionally, the College solicited input by posting an announcement on the College homepage (www.chabotcollege.edu) and sent an all-campus email to employees of the College.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:
- ✓ 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 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 team verified with the institutional researcher that the institution has established standards of performance that include course completion, all certificates, transfer, job placement, and licensure examination passage. Institution-set standards are reported but there does not seem to be broad understanding across the college and it is not clear how the standards are being used for improvement.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:
- ✓ 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 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 district has procedures for assigning credit hours and degree program lengths ensuring they maintain good practice in higher education. The curriculum handbook and curriculum management system ensure accuracy and reliability of assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths across programs, lecture, lab, Distance Education courses and clinical practice. As a California Community College, the college charges unit fees consistently across all courses and programs. The College does not currently have any

clock hour based programs. The District addresses conversion of clock to credit hour per the Department of Education in Board Policy 4020.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:
✓ 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 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:
Transfer credit policies and procedures are communicated online and in the catalog including transfer in or out of the institution.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:
✓ 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 offerings.

✓ 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 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:
Board policy and administrative procedure (AP) 4105 addresses distance education. The AP defines distance education and includes regular and effective contact, authentication and verification of student identity, and the course approval process. The Curriculum handbook 2014/15 daft and article 10.F.3.b address distance education.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:
  ✓ 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 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 team examined student complaint files and did not identify any issues that indicate institutional non-compliance with accreditation standards. The College website provides information on licensing agencies for dental hygiene, medical assisting, nursing, and the College.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:
- ✓ 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 <u>Student Complaints</u>.

  [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 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 and timely information on its webpage, which are available to students and the public, about its programs, locations, policies, and procedures for handling student complaints.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:
- ✓ 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 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:
There was one finding for the year ending June 30, 2014 regarding Return of Title IV calculations. The Financial Aid Office states they have implemented the external auditors' recommendation, however as of the date of this report, the auditors have not issued the June 30, 2015, audit report that would show that the recommendation has been implemented. The USDE has not raised any issues regarding financial responsibility requirements, record-keeping, etc. The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. The College showed evidence of the library management system contractual and consortium agreements.

Standard I – Institutional Mission Effectiveness
Standard I.A – Mission

General Observations

Chabot College has a comprehensive mission statement that was last revised by the College and approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2014. The statement defines its broad education purposes and the mission, vision, and values statements articulate the College's commitment to student learning and achievement. This is fostered throughout the institution by the ongoing development and refinement of curriculum, programs, and services to the needs of the student population and local economy. The College's Vision, Mission, and Values statements are published and displayed for students and the community.

Findings and Evidence

Chabot College identifies its intended student population as transfer students, career basic skills, and lifelong learners and offers a wide array of programs that are consistent with their needs. This includes general education curriculum, associate degree programs, career and technical education programs, remedial and basic skills instruction, and transfer courses in supporting the mission. (Standard I.A.1)

The newly approved mission statement is the basis for the *Strategic Plan Goal* as well as the *Educational Master Plan*, which is currently undergoing the review and approval process. The mission statement's commitment to "support students' achievement of their education goals" is the central basis for the current *Strategic Plan*, which consists of one key objective: to increase the number of students that achieve their educational goal in a reasonable timeframe. This connection is central to institutional planning and decision making. As a result of the connection between the mission and strategic plan goal, many initiatives have been identified and implemented to support the mission of the College. An example is the scaling up of the First Year Experience (FYE) programs and pathways. (Standard I.A.4)

The College effectively uses the District's governance and decision-making process to review its mission statement on a regular basis and revise it as necessary. The Planning, Review, and Budget Council (PRBC) facilitated a task group to review and revise the mission statement from 2012 to 2013. This process involved the appropriate governance and decision-making process. The current Chabot College mission statement was approved in March 2014 by the Chabot Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) Board. The mission statement is published on the College website, College catalog, and permeates planning processes. (Standard I.A.2, I.A.3)

Conclusion
The College meets the Standard.

Standard: I.B – Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The College has made great strides in integrating the results of program review with learning outcomes assessments, unit and institutional planning, and budgeting to inform its resource allocations and institutional effectiveness initiatives. This has resulted in revisions of some institutional processes and delivery of services, resulting in multiple innovative programs.

The College has made progress on the definition and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course, program, and college level in academic programs, and program outcomes have been developed and assessed in student services. The College established a three-year assessment and program review cycle. In spring 2015, Chabot College completed its second assessment cycle for instructional services with documented assessments for 72.5 percent of active courses and 84.3 percent of instructional programs. Administrative services programs have not yet systematically engaged outcomes development or assessment. The assessments are embedded into the Program Review (PR) process and tied to planning and request for resources. The College collects qualitative and quantitative data, generates reports, and provides analysis to inform decision-making.

Findings and Evidence

Chabot College structured its dialogue though its College committees, College-wide forums, discipline and division meetings, College webpages, program review process, and publications. There is limited documentation that dialogs about course, department, and college-level assessment that has occurred. At the same time, there is evidence that some of this dialogue has contributed to the development and/or modification of programs and services at the College. A review of various agendas and minutes, however, indicates that the nature and value of the opportunities for dialogue could be strengthened by changing the nature of the agendas so they include more interaction and less information dissemination.

Program review is the central organizing mechanism to dialogue around student learning, reflection on assessment results, and review of programs, which tie together program development and needs, including resource requests. The College allocates time during Flex Days to discuss program results (Evidence I-26). Completed program review documents get submitted to the PRBC and the appropriate administrator. The administrators prepare a program review summary for the division or service area. Both the program review and the summary documents are posted on the College website.

Based on the provided evidence, in spring 2014, the College Council determined that a review and revision of the shared governance policy should be undertaken. The College has committed to completing the work on the shared governance committees structure and

documents during the 2015/16 academic year, College Actionable Improvement Plan 1. (Standard I.B.1)

The College's long and short-range goals are outlined in various planning documents, including the Educational Master Plan and the Strategic Plan for 2012-2015. Chabot's strategic goal plan aligns with the College's mission statement, which concludes with a commitment to student learning. The College goal aligns with the California Community College Chancellor's Office System Strategic Plan and the California State Scorecard.

In developing the strategic plan, the College set the goals to help support its mission and move forward its educational programs and services. The College is using the educational goals and unit load groups to monitor progress on the strategic plan. To set the goals, PRBC also reviewed internal and external environmental scan data, program review submissions, and student and staff surveys. In addition to setting the goals, the PRBC identified nine strategies and mapped initiatives across the College for meeting the goals. (Standard I.B.2)

The institution has made efforts to strengthen its ability to engage in a systematic cycle of evaluation, planning, and resource allocation. The PRBC monitors progress on initiatives through regular reporting by the leaders of the initiatives. At the beginning of each year, the highest priority initiatives are selected by the membership, and at the end of each year, PRBC lists the initiatives that have been accomplished.

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) uses educational goal groups to track progress on the overall goal. The OIR periodically prepares and presents strategic goal progress reports. The presentations trigger discussions on which groups of students need the most support and activities required to increased numbers. For example, these efforts lead to Chabot's First Year Experience program (FYE), a grant to support pathway development, and the alignment of student support programs and projects across campus.

Program review and assessment are both on a three-year cycle. Each program is on a sequential timeline and completes appropriate program review documents annually. Completed program review documents are submitted to the PRBC and the appropriate administrator. The administrators prepare a program review summary for the division or service area. PRBC makes recommendations to the relevant shared governance committees. Those committees use the strategic plan goals and the PRBC recommendations to prioritize resource allocation. In addition, each year, the PRBC evaluates the process from the previous year and makes recommendations for improvement in the program review processes.

The need for a new shared governance policy/procedure document has been highlighted in three different retreats and discussed in both the PRBC and College Council. While individual shared governance committees have updated their charges as directed by the PRBC and the College Council, issues around overall decision making flow, memberships, representation by different college groups, and the efficiency of the current governance processes are still seen by the College as needing revision. (Standard I.B.3)

The program review and shared governance processes ensure that participation occurs at the program, division, area, and institutional levels. In addition, faculty and staff are encouraged to provide input during Convocation and Flex Day sessions, focus group discussions, and college governance committees. Shared governance committees include representatives from all constituency groups: administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students. At the same time, the College recognizes the need to improve mechanisms for ensuring the participation of all constituencies and promised that this issue will be addressed in the new shared governance committee structure, College Actionable Improvement Plan 1.

Survey results as well as conducted interviews revealed less understanding of College planning and budgeting, especially how the two are related, which suggests that participation and communication between the PRBC and the Chabot community may need improvement. (Standard I.B.4)

The College communicates the collected assessment data both internally and externally to appropriate constituencies in the form of reports, summaries, data tables and graphs, handouts, presentations, email, newsletters, and the OIR website. The OIR regularly generates and publishes student characteristics and outcomes data, student and staff survey results, cohort data analyses, and compilations of state data. Based on evidence provided by the College and the ACCJC annual report, Chabot has identified and reported Institutional-Set Standards (ISS) for five indictors: successful course completion, degrees, all certificates, gainful employment certificates, and transfer. At the February 26, 2014, PRBC meeting the ACCJC annual report was shared together with information on the ISS. In addition, the OIR published the report on their website highlighting the established standards and the College's progress in meeting them. During the visit, the ACCJC annual reports were reviewed with the College researcher, vice president of instruction, deans, and some faculty. During that meeting, the team was told there were errors in the reported numbers and that a letter addressed to ACCJC was being prepared to correct these. It was evident the College was engaged in data dialog to set and monitor progress on their strategies to fulfill their strategic plan, and are beginning to communicate about ISS. However, based on the interviews and provided evidence the ISS were not broadly communicated and analyzed by the campus community. (Standard I.B.5)

Each year, the PRBC reviews and seeks to improve the planning and resource allocation processes. To assess whether its planning processes are effective, the council reviews how information is flowing from disciplines and programs to the deans and to the appropriate shared governance committees. The PRBC also examines how that information is used by PRBC. Throughout this process, feedback is provided by the deans, faculty, staff, and members of other committees. The survey and interviews highlighted that although there have been increases in participation, there are opportunities for broadening the understanding of links between planning and resource allocation processes, or the roles of the various committees. (Standard I.B.6)

Program review is used to evaluate instructional and services programs. Faculty working together within disciplines use institutional research data on student success and persistence, student satisfaction and engagement survey results, learning outcomes, and other student and

course information to identify barriers to student learning and propose solutions. Student services programs are using in-house data to evaluate whether improvements are needed, and often some changes are made. Administrative services programs have not yet systematically engaged in outcomes development or assessment. (Standard I.B.7)

Conclusion

The College meets the Standard.

College Recommendations

2. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College should document ongoing Service Area Outcomes (SAO) assessments and the appropriate measures implemented to improve services in all areas of the College. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.5, II.B.3.a-c, II.B.4)

3. To improve its effectiveness, the College needs to complete, document, and communicate the new shared governance structure and evaluate the effectiveness to make needed improvements. (Standards I.B.1-4, I.B.6, IV.A.1-3, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.3.g)

7. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College needs to provide ongoing professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators to develop a clear understanding of the relationship between outcome assessment results, program review, and effective utilization of data for improvement of student learning to improve communication, innovation, and integrated planning processes and strengthen institutional effectiveness. (Standard I.B.3, I.B.6, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.A.6.c, III.A.5)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services
Standard II.A Instructional Programs

General Observation

The College relies on faculty expertise to identify competency levels for courses, certificates, and programs. As such, it incorporates a component of general education for all degree programs and faculty to determine the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum. Based on provided reports, upon completion of their educational goals, Chabot students meet the competencies to gain employment and/or pass external licensure and certifications. The College uses various delivery modes to accommodate the diverse needs of its students.

The College programs are designed to address the needs of the diverse local population through educational master planning, curriculum, program review, and other means to design and provide for programs of study.

The implementation of a formal student learning assessment process is largely due to the identification of five institutional learning outcomes, referred to as College Wide Learning Goals (CWLG). These outcomes are tied to the mission statement and used to assess the College mission through Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). According to the Student Learning Outcomes website, the Student Learning and Assessment Cycle Committee (SLOAC) assumes primary responsibility for: supporting the learning college model, affirming the autonomy, integrity and individuality of the teaching process, creating opportunities for reflection on the education process for students, faculty and staff, and maintaining open and continuous dialogue about the Student Learning Outcome and Assessment cycle, which is reflected in the program review process.

There appears to be progress in building flexible documentation systems that can incorporate both quantitative and qualitative information about student learning, but the migration of data from eLumin to CurricUNET has impeded progress, but training for faculty and staff is scheduled as a Flex Day training in October 2015, after visit by the team. Curriculum Committee minutes indicate the change to CurricUNET from eLumin was voted on and approved in April 2015, and subsequently approved by the Academic Senate.

There is no current chair of the SLOAC and interim duties are currently shared by two full-time faculty members until the vacancy is filled. The previous three chairs have been adjunct faculty.

Chabot students have had higher success rates and lower withdrawal rates than anytime within the previous fifteen years. This can be attributed to the College commitment to using

28

institutional research in the planning, development, evaluation, and revision of programs and services.

Findings and Evidence

Chabot College offers 18 Associate Degrees for Transfer, 36 Certificates of Achievement, 23 Certificates of Proficiency, and five other certificates that meet vocational needs of the service area. These degrees are developed through the master planning, curriculum and program review processes, advisory committees, and data. In 2013/14, Chabot awarded 836 degrees, which is an increase of 125 over the prior year, and 241 certificates. There were 669 Chabot students who transferred to a UC or CSU, which is also an increase over the prior year. The College institutional learning outcomes (CLWGs) are tied to the mission statement, inform the general education requirements, and help assess that the instructional programs meet the mission. Once a program or course within a program has been implemented, it is subject to program review and ongoing curriculum review. For Career Technical Education (CTE) programs, the evaluation of the programs is further enhanced by advisory committees.

Chabot utilizes various modes of instruction compatible with curriculum objectives and is responsive to student needs in design and delivery of instruction. Furthermore, all faculty who wish to teach an online or hybrid course at Chabot College must complete a comprehensive Online/Hybrid Course Approval Process. (Standard II.A.1)

The College uses research and analysis to identify learning needs and assess progress towards achieving student learning outcomes. The annual student surveys are utilized as one form of data to ascertain how well students are progressing on the institution-level outcomes (CWLG). Research and data is part of the program review process, which includes course and program level assessments. However, not all courses or programs have been assessed.

Specific attention has been given to assessing Chabot's progress on student learning assessment. Those outcomes are assessed during a three-year cycle, and reporting on both those outcomes and suggested changes to enhance student learning are a required element of program review. The OIR provides information that is incorporated into program review. Included are data relating to enrollment management, success, and withdrawal rates by race-ethnicity and gender, and success rates through a sequence of courses, if applicable.

Based on placement test results, eighty-five percent of Chabot students place at the basic skills level, which then requires developmental English and/or math classes. As a result, the focus of the Title III and ongoing state-funded Basic Skills Initiative grants have been on raising awareness of the needs of basic skills students, and improving outcomes for these students. There are also a number of programs that have been developed in response to student needs, such as Puente, Daraja, PACE, Aspire, and Tech Prep. (Evidence II-6) (Standard II.A.1.a)

A wide range of delivery systems and modalities of instruction are incorporated into academic disciplines that are compatible with learning objectives and diversity of the student population. Chabot College offers courses on weekdays, evenings, Saturdays, and online. Online and hybrid courses are approved through a separate curriculum approval process as evidenced on the website for the Committee on Online Learning (COOL). In addition, online courses are assessed and compared to face-to-face courses as evidenced in program review.

Determination of delivery systems and modes of instruction rests with the faculty, through the College curriculum development process. Faculty experiment with different instructional approaches and teaching methodologies to accommodate student learning styles. Chabot is in the process of migrating data from eLumen to CurricUNET to assess and document student learning outcomes. Training on CurricUNET is provided on an individual basis as well as during designated FLEX days throughout the academic year.

Approximately 15 percent of all course offerings offered at the College are taught in online or hybrid format. In fall 2013, Chabot offered 65 hybrid course sections, and 108 online course sections (compared to 55 hybrid and 96 online course sections in fall 2012) (Evidence RS-37). The College uses Blackboard as the platform for web-based, hybrid, and online courses. During spring 2014, approximately 62 percent of all course sections (online, hybrid, and face-to-face courses) utilized Blackboard as a primary or supplementary means for instructional delivery. All faculty who wish to teach an online or hybrid course at Chabot College must go through the Online/Hybrid Course approval process, which is available on the COOL webpage. In spring 2014, Blackboard was utilized by approximately 62 percent of all course sections (regardless of the delivery mode) as the primary or supplementary means for instructional delivery. COOL provides learning management system training to all faculty on designated FLEX days and also to new online teaching faculty on an individual basis, as requested.

The COOL is a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee and has been instrumental in providing guidance for faculty who intend to teach an online or hybrid course. The online approval process is comprehensive. It also requires a face-to-face demonstration for faculty new to teaching online. COOL then certifies to the Curriculum Committee and the appropriate division dean whether the request is recommended without reservation or if there is additional work to be completed. All scheduling and assignment of online/hybrid courses are then the responsibility of the division deans. All Course Outlines of Record for online courses are consistent with those that are offered face-to-face and the evaluation process for online courses is the same for both adjunct and full-time faculty, although student evaluations for online courses are collected through a link provided for all online courses. (Standard II.A.1.b)

Chabot College identifies and assesses Student Learning Outcomes for its courses, certificates, and degrees and uses assessment results for course and program improvements. Each active course is required to have Course Learning Outcomes. The number of Course Learning Outcomes needed per course is determined by the course content. In general, three to five Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) are required to cover a three-unit course.

At least two PLOs are written by faculty for each program. PLOs are assessed when all CLOs have been assessed. The "Closing the Loop" form documents the evaluation and assessment of program level outcomes and is embedded within the three-year assessment cycle. In fall 2014, the College initiated program review for general education (GE), and identified general education outcomes.

Assessment of CWLGs and student satisfaction is done biannually through a student survey administered by the OIR. Results of the assessment for CWLG from 2003 through 2013 are posted on the OIR website (Evidence II-4). Of the 19 components of the five CWLGs, 12 indicate progress for 75 percent of the students, and other seven show progress for 68 percent and 77 percent of students. More than 75 percent of all Chabot students feel they have improved in the five CWLG. (Evidence OIR-53)

Programs and disciplines must establish an assessment schedule for courses. Every semester, primarily during FLEX days, faculty meet in their disciplines to share and discuss assessment results as part of the program review process. Plans are then developed for the improvement of instruction to enhance the learning process. Programs that have assigned program level outcomes are documented on the SLOAC website. The PLOs Progress page lists the program outcomes and verifies in which courses the outcome is introduced, demonstrated or mastered based on the related CLO. This allows faculty and students to understand how and when student will meet the required learning outcomes for the program. Program level assessment reflections are captured in program review through "closing the loop." This provides a venue for faculty to document the evidence used to evaluate the PLOs, and map CLOs to PLOs. The reflection includes program-level strengths, critical student learning issues, focus for improving student learning, effective strategies, and assessment of these strategies.

The College documents outcomes and assessment work on the SLOs and Assessment (SLOAC) website and in program review (also available on the website). The College includes discussion and training on outcomes and assessment during FLEX days. Evidence of training is provided through SLOAC as well as the staff development websites. It appears that plans for adopting integrated software to replace eLumin in fall of 2015 for program review and SLOAC have been postponed due in part to the change of SLOAC co-chairs.

The College has made significant progress in identifying and assessing student, course and program learning outcomes. Assessments are completed on a three-year cycle and incorporated into program review. However, College Plan 2: Student Learning Outcomes is to complete program level assessments, course level assessments, general education, and institutional learning outcomes. At the time of the team's visit, the College had only assessed 725 of courses and 84.3 percent of program learning outcomes, and has not completed Recommendation #1 from 2009. (Standard II.A.1.c)

Chabot College offers collegiate, developmental and pre-collegiate courses and programs, community education, short-term training, and international student programs. The College offers approximately 100 short-term courses during each of the fall and spring semesters and over 500 community education courses each year, which are determined based on the mission statement and evaluated via student surveys. The College also has a program to host

and support international students. Over 50 students from 22 countries attended Chabot in 2013-2014. (Evidence RS-17)

All courses and programs are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, which includes several levels of review and are reviewed on a three-year cycle through program review. The content of courses and programs is determined by faculty, with collaborative discussions including the division curriculum representative, curricular area faculty, division dean, SLOAC, as well as consultation with Las Positas. Proposed courses or revisions then undergo review by the Curriculum Committee, which follows a work flow that is accessed through CurricUNET. Curriculum is reevaluated on a five-year cycle and program reviews also require disciplines to report on currency within this five-year cycle. Planning and decision-making on course offerings are guided by information and analyses provided by the OIR. This information is collected through environmental scans, labor market information, and surveys of community groups. Additionally, the need for new courses and academic programs was driven by study of new students' placement test results and high school records, student persistence and success rates, student requests, surveys, and citizens' advisory boards. Program data is collected by the OIR and evaluated in program review.

Collegiate courses and programs are developed and implemented based on faculty expertise in their disciplines, faculty experience of student needs, input from advisory committees, when appropriate, and requirements of transfer institutions. (Standard II.A.2)

The College has a well-defined curriculum review and program review process and faculty are central to both processes. Both processes ensure the quality of the courses and programs. All disciplines go through a comprehensive program review process every year as part of a three-year cycle. Through this process, all disciplines submit course and program evaluations and make recommendations. Program review is used to evaluate progress toward the strategic plan goals, program, discipline, and course goals, identify accomplishments, and make necessary adjustments. This process includes both course and program learning outcome evaluation and improvement recommendations. The curriculum approval workflow includes an in-depth review process, which culminates with approval by the vice president of academic services and the Curriculum Committee. The Academic Senate charges the Curriculum Committee with final approval of the curriculum, and these recommendations go directly to the District Board of Trustees. (Standard II.A.2.a)

Faculty assume the central role in identifying and assessing competency levels and student outcomes. The PLOs are developed holistically from CLOs in a program's individual courses. There are 18 advisory boards that provide input to the process. The College has developed a three-year cycle for course and program assessment. All courses and programs have not yet been assessed. (II.A.2.b)

The College provides high quality instruction with appropriate breadth, depth, and rigor. The College adheres to the faculty hiring and evaluation process to ensure quality instruction. Course sequences have been developed for pre-collegiate to collegiate courses in math and English. In addition, the College includes program course sequencing in the College catalog, which is available for students to review and follow.

The College should be commended for the research completed on "bottlenecks" to program completion. Results from this research were shared during FLEX day activities and informed the deliberations of Faculty Senate, College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC), and PRBC. As a result, additional sections of pre-collegiate and transfer-level courses have been placed on the class schedule to shorten time to completion for many students. In English and mathematics, for example, courses are sequenced from pre-collegiate to collegiate, building competencies as progress is made through the programs.

A majority of students, 84 percent, surveyed were satisfied or very satisfied with their instructors, and 75 percent stated that faculty demonstrates a commitment to a high standard of teaching. (Evidence OIR-14, p.1 and p.3) (Standard II.A.2.c)

The College offers a variety of delivery modes and instructional methodologies that meet diverse student needs. The College provides learning communities and a First-Year Experience program, as well as numerous support programs in the Learning Center. Learning communities have been established to support students with similar background and interests; for example, one-on-one tutoring and small group conversations through various team learning programs. Faculty and staff participate in professional development focused on teaching methodology during FLEX days. Faculty are aware of different learning styles, and vary their teaching methodologies to accommodate the various learning styles of their students. They also assess student learning in multiple ways.

Surveys of both faculty and students indicate that multiple teaching methodologies are utilized to improve student learning.

Teaching methodologies commonly used:
- Lectures
- Interactive lectures
- Multimedia presentations
- Whole class discussions
- Small group work
- Hands-on activities
- One-on-one work with students (Standard: II.A.2.d)

The program review encourages faculty to identify problems faced by their students, to develop inquiry projects to study how they might be overcome, and to request resources to improve student learning. In addition, program review submissions include documentation of PLOs and CLO results, reflections, and resource requests. The requests are then forwarded to the relevant shared governance committees: faculty prioritization, facilities, budget, enrollment management, and staff development. The program review connects the evaluation to the strategic plan goals. Program SLO assessments are not yet complete although the College has set an agenda to complete course and program assessments by 2016 and 2017. (Standard II.A.2.e)

The program review process is connected to the educational master plan and the strategic planning processes. Every three years, the College develops a new strategic plan to focus

efforts in the subsequent three years. The current strategic plan was approved and carried over to the fourth year pending final approval of the master plan. Progress toward achieving the strategic plan goals, and evaluating and improving student learning, are the primary focus of the program review process, which is directly connected to resource requests and is heavily driven by institutional data.

Planning and decision-making are guided by information and analyses provided by the OIR. Through environmental scans, labor market information, the PRBC develops an understanding of both internal and external analysis of student learning outcomes, success and completion data (Evidence RS-32). Program review outcomes include student, course, and program level outcomes assessments and are available to all constituents on the College website. Program level outcomes were added to the College catalog addendum in fall 2015. Although embedded in program reviews, the College does not require course level outcomes in syllabi, the College catalog, or schedule of courses, which is more accessible for students and the community. This is a requirement to meet the standard. (Standard II.A.2.f)

The College minimally utilizes standardized testing. Those tests that are used are vetted and certified by research at the state or professional organizations (e.g. chemistry, Fire, health). (Standard II.A.2.g)

The College awards credit for courses that are approved through the curriculum process and are consistent with higher education norms or equivalencies in higher education, along with requirements found in Title 5 and the California Education Code. Faculty assign grades based on stated standards. Learning communities have been established to support students with similar background and interests; for example, one-on-one tutoring and small group conversations through various team-learning programs. (Standard II.A.2.h)

The College has developed an actionable improvement plan to meet the goal of assessing program level outcomes. The expectation was to complete the assessment of program outcomes by spring 2015, which has not yet been completed. Programs, including degrees and certificates, are approved through the curriculum process and by the Board of Trustees. (Standard II.A.2.i)

The District has a policy for the awarding of degrees and credits. Students complete 18 units of general education in language and rationality, natural science, humanities and social and behavioral sciences as well as wellness and American cultures. General education course outcomes have been developed and are being assessed on a three-year cycle and support the philosophy of general education that is found in the College catalog and on the College website. Content and methodology are determined by discipline faculty who then develop courses that meet specific GE requirements. General education course outcomes are mapped to institutional level outcomes and faculty utilize a rubric to assess general education courses. The college utilized student survey results to map the CWLGs. The College has developed an actionable improvement plan to complete outcomes assessment for general education courses by 2016. (Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.a.)

General education requirements include the capability to be a productive individual and a lifelong learner. There is a close alignment between commitment to the GE philosophy and the College mission statement, which encourages a learning environment that recognizes what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen. General education is also connected to the CWLG, which include these competencies: global and cultural involvement, civic responsibility, communication, critical thinking, and development of the whole person. The CWLG are assessed through a student survey conducted every two years that includes the student's perspective of how they have achieved the learning goals. (Standards II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

Degree programs include general education and a focused area of student learning in at least one area of inquiry, or in an established interdisciplinary core as evidenced in the College catalog program descriptions. (Standard II.A.4)

Vocational and occupational program certificates and degrees are based on the expertise and experience of CTE faculty members. They are assisted by advisory committees and external accrediting agencies in developing individual courses and programs to produce students whose skills and knowledge meet professional and industry standards. The Course Outline of Record is the first step in developing the program and then hiring faculty who have current industry knowledge. Core data is gathered to comply with federal regulations related to CTE program funding. The program review process is then utilized to analyze this data to make recommendations for program improvements. Student pass rates on external licensure exams meet external requirements. These results are documented in program review.

For the past ten years, Chabot's dental hygiene students have had a 100 percent pass rate on the National Dental Hygiene Board Exam, and an average 95 percent pass rate on the state clinical exam (first try) with a 100 percent pass rate on the second attempt. These results are documented in program review. Chabot's nursing students have had a pass rate of over 97 percent to 96.3 percent on their first attempt of the nursing licensing examination and 100 percent on the second attempt (NCLEX-RN exam). Chabot students typically report nearly 100 percent employment in local hospitals and clinics within six months after graduation. (Evidence II-24)

Advisory boards provide valuable feedback on the professional competencies of former Chabot students. Faculty CTE disciplines meet with local employers, four-year transfer program partners, and secondary feeder schools to review programs and discuss student performance. Agenda items include curriculum, laboratory equipment, staff development needs, employment trends, employment skills, and anything else that will help students meet the needs of the employers. (Standard II.A.5)

Students and prospective students find accurate information about courses, programs, and transfer policies in the College catalog, course schedule and on the College website. The College makes course outlines of record available to all students on the Academic Services website. The catalog, printed every two years (with addenda printed in alternate years) is distributed at the College and is available on the College's website. It includes, among other things, information on degree and certificate programs, graduation requirements, transfer

information, and course content and is made available in print and digital form on the College website. Course level outcomes are not included in the College catalog. Program level outcomes were recently added to the catalog addendum. Course syllabi are examined by colleagues during the process of peer review. Copies of course syllabi are collected and held in the divisional offices. According to the faculty contract article 9B, faculty are expected to put the course expected outcomes and may include the CLOs on their course syllabi (Evidence I-34). Course syllabi that were reviewed did not include course level outcomes or program level outcomes. In addition, the course level outlines included in the course outline of record, do not align with the course level outcomes being assessed in the program review process. The College is currently reviewing the variances in the course level outcomes and is providing professional development for faculty to develop a college-wide understanding of the differences between course objectives and course level outcomes. (Standard II.A.6)

Students find information on transfer-of-credit in the College catalog, in the Articulation and Counseling offices, in the Career and Transfer Office, and on the website. The College offers workshops and transfer events for students to provide additional transfer information. Students transferring courses to Chabot use the course substitution process and are reviewed by faculty on an individual basis. Entering transfer-bound students are required to meet with a counselor to develop a Student Education Plan (SEP) that identifies the courses required by transfer institutions. Transfer and articulation policies are set by the receiving institutions. These transfer institutions review Chabot's CORs to assure that corresponding courses have comparable content and outcomes. The College should be commended for participation in the GE Reciprocity Agreement with Region IV Community Colleges, which allows students to complete GE requirements and graduation proficiencies at any of the colleges. (Standard II.A.6.a)

The District and the College have policies in place for the revitalization or discontinuance of programs. Students may petition for reasonable accommodation if courses are unavailable for them to complete a program. Counseling plays the lead role in assisting students when programs are eliminated or program requirements change. (Standard II.A.6.b)

The College provides information to the community on the College website, in the College catalog, class schedule, and through various other formats. The Vice-Presidents of Academic and Student Services, along with their respective deans, review information published in any format to assure currency and accuracy. (Standard II.A.6.c)

Policies on academic freedom and student academic honesty are published in the College catalog, faculty handbook, faculty contract, and on the website. Faculty are expected to behave professionally and monitor themselves to assure that they are expressing professionally accepted views in their discipline. When voicing personal opinions, it is incumbent upon faculty members to make sure that they are not interpreted as representing the institution. These and related issues are addressed in the Academic Freedom Statement of the Faculty Contract (Evidence II-14). The College's expectations regarding student academic honesty and the penalties for dishonesty are published in the catalog (Evidence RS-32) and are reinforced by faculty on course syllabi and in class discussions. Board policy is developed to handle academic dishonestly. (Standard II.A.7, II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b)

Conclusions

Chabot College has made progress in most disciplines regarding PLOs and SLOs. However, one discipline area (Health, PE, and Athletics) appears to be behind in process given the College's projected acceleration plan of 100 percent compliance in all areas. This appears to be related to the implementation of new Title 5 regulations addressing repeatability, which required the restructuring of the curriculum in a significant number of courses. This attempt at leveling has resulted in a number of courses not being assessed due to students not yet reaching the progressive levels that are new offerings.

The College meets most of the Standards but does not meet Standards II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.6, and II.A.6.c.

College Recommendations

1. As was noted by the 2009 evaluation team, in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College expedite the development, assessment, dialogue, and improvement plans related to the course and program learning outcomes. The College needs to ensure that SLOs for all courses and programs are clearly, accurately, and consistently available to students and the public in both print and electronic documents, including course syllabi and the catalog. (Standard II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.6, II.A.6.c, ER10, ER19)

7. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College needs to provide ongoing professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators to develop a clear understanding of the relationship between outcome assessment results, program review, and effective utilization of data for improvement of student learning to improve communication, innovation, and integrated planning processes and strengthen institutional effectiveness. (Standard I.B.3, I.B.6, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.A.6.c, III.A.5)

Standard II.B Student Support Services

General Observations

Chabot College serves a diverse population of students with the Hispanic population exceeding that of the county in which the college resides by ten percentage points. Chabot College has a legacy of support for students from diverse backgrounds as the original home of both the Puente Project and Daraja Program which provide learning communities with Chicano/Latino and African American themes, respectively. Learning communities for first year students are also provided through Chabot's Early Decision, First Year Experience (FYE), and Pathways programs.

Chabot College offers an array of student support services including financial aid, counseling, health services, Career and Transfer Center, and Student Life Office. In addition, various special programs exist to serve underserved and diverse student populations. Faculty are invested in helping their diverse students succeed by sponsoring clubs such as Striving Black Brothers, which includes a service component in which students tutor and mentor middle school students in the Hayward Promise Neighborhood (HPN) program. The HPN provides support for all children growing up in the Jackson Triangle Neighborhood in South Hayward. HPN seeks to impact local students from "cradle to career" by creating a network of community based organizations and educational institutions. Collaboration among various disciplines, programs, and community leaders also resulted in the creation of *The Great Debate* where Chabot College students, community leaders and city residents participated in a guided discussion around "hot topics."

Findings and Evidence

The College provides a comprehensive array of student support services. Admissions & Records (A&R), Career & Transfer Center (CTC), Counseling, Financial Aid, Health Services and the Student Life Office are core student support services. The College also offers many varied special programs designed for underserved and diverse student populations. Most programs are regularly reviewed through Program Review (PR), SLO and SAO. Ongoing assessment of student support services takes place during weekly division/department meetings. Issues such as timing of registration, changes to hours of operation, program review findings, and staffing requests are discussed across departments during these meetings. Student Services administrators also meet weekly to address items critical to the successful delivery of quality programs and services. PR findings and staffing requests are reviewed by this group; however, documented discussions regarding assessment results from SLOs and SAOs demonstrating closing the loop to improve student learning and achievement was not found consistently in all areas of Student Services. There appears to be variability among various programs regarding how many complete cycles of SLOs and SAOs have been identified, evaluated and discussed to improve student learning and support.

The fall 2013 Student Satisfaction Survey, administered bi-annually by the OIR indicated a high level of satisfaction in all areas of student services ranging from a low of 69 percent for counseling appointments to over 80 percent for all other services. Students are able to access

support services both on campus and through Student Online Services, which provides computer access and support for students as they apply to the College, apply for financial aid, register for classes, complete assessment, and learn how to use the online portal. An online learning student assistant is also available to help students learn how to use Blackboard for online classes. The major student services offices have services available in person, information online, and interactive services online. (Standards II.B1.B3.a)

In response to Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) requirements, students who apply to the College receive explicit direction on next steps in the SSSP process. The College recently implemented a registration system giving new students higher registration priority when SSSP core services of assessment, orientation, and educational planning are completed. This change allowed newly matriculated students greater access to basic skills English and mathematics courses. The Basic Skills Committee also made this recommendation since 85 percent of students place into basic skills English and/or mathematics. Quantitative data, provided by OIR, indicates that this change supports student learning by increasing student persistence and success. (Standards II.B, II.B1)

The College publishes its catalog in hard copy biannually with an addendum reflecting curriculum changes produced between catalog printing years. The catalog and addendum are also available online. All required information is available in the catalog. The class schedule is produced for the summer/fall and spring terms. The number of print copies was significantly reduced to promote online usage. (Standards II.B.2, II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d.)

The College regularly evaluates the learning support needs of its student population through student surveys, analysis of the Student Success Scorecard, SLO and SAO assessments, and program review. The 2013 Bottleneck analysis performed by the OIR helped determine where students needed courses and made recommendations in terms of faculty hiring based upon the data. The OIR also provides disaggregated data in order to evaluate the learning support needs of various student populations including basic skills students, students of different ethnicities and gender, athletes, veterans, foster youth, and students in special programs. The College uses all of these mechanisms to evaluate and make improvements to services and programs to support the needs of its student population. (Standard B3)

Students enrolling in online or hybrid classes receive a "Welcome to Online Learning" email containing instructions and resources for getting started in their online or hybrid class. An online, self-paced orientation to online learning is available to all students and includes video demonstrations and step-by-step instructions. This resource can be revisited by students anytime.

The Online Learning website hosts the self-paced orientation along with information on available online classes, how to enroll, log in and use Blackboard, and where to go for help. Success tips, FAQs, and access to an online Help Request System are also available from this site. The counseling division has assigned a counselor to online advising. Students may log in and ask questions and receive a response via secured email typically within two days. Online students have access to Degree Works, a degree audit/educational planning program. The

College is working on expanding this service to all students. This program provides an online advising tool for students to create, verify, and modify their Student Educational Plans (SEPs) in consultation with a counselor. The self-evaluation report includes a table with those student support services areas that offer information online or in an interactive online format. Interactive formats vary from office to office and, at a minimum, allow for students to download forms. In the counseling department, online counseling is provided utilizing a single sign on through the portal allowing for a reasonable level of confidentiality. (Standard II.B.3.a.)

A robust program to support a learning environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility exists at Chabot College. The department of Student Life sponsors programs that promote understanding of social justice issues, civic responsibility and intellectual/ personal development. When a fall 2011 Student Satisfaction Survey indicated that 60 percent of Chabot students had never had a serious conversation with students of different religious beliefs or political opinions, an interdisciplinary collaboration spearheaded *The Great Debate*. This event took place at Hayward City Hall and included students, community leaders and residents in a guided discussion around "hot topics".

A recent student survey included questions concerning civic or personal engagement not previously asked. Over 70 percent of students reported making "some" or "a lot" of progress towards becoming informed about current issues affecting the United States and the world and developing a personal code of values and ethics. Student diversity is also respected and celebrated. The student survey showed a very high degree of respect for differences in race/ethnicity, gender, physical disability, age, sexual orientation and native language, (all above 80 percent) and religion (79 percent). The fall 2013 Accreditation Survey indicated that a large percentage of Latinos and African American students feel welcome at Chabot College and would encourage others to attend. (Standards II.B.3.b, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.d.)

Student equity funding has increased the College's capability to expand programs and services designed to improve access, and close completion, success and retention gaps of identified groups of students. A review of data identifying equity gaps at the College by faculty, staff, administration, and students led to the development of a proposal process for all interested groups to design and submit proposals to address these gaps. Projects were analyzed using criteria identified by the OIR that would have the greatest impact on improving the disproportionate impact to several identified groups of students to determine funding priorities. The funded projects established new or expanded existing programs. The College has supported two long-standing culturally relevant learning communities including the Daraja Program, which promotes self-confidence and cultural pride while promoting transfer and increased academic and personal success for African American students; and the Puente Project, which prepares students for transfer by pairing counseling and English instruction with an emphasis on Chicano/Latino literature, history, and issues facing the Chicano/Latino community. The College also offers a significant number of programs and events throughout the school year that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity. (Standard B3.d.)

Admissions policies are outlined in the catalog, class schedule, and website. The majority of students apply to the College using the California Community College's statewide online admission application (CCCApply). The District conducts annual audits help ensure the Office of Admissions and Records complies with state and federal regulations related to admissions and residency requirements. Assistance is provided to students to access the online application via the Student Online Service Center, Disabled Students' Resource Center, International Admissions Office, Admissions and Records, and through application workshops. The fall 2013 Student Survey indicated that 77 percent of students found registering online easy and 80 percent felt the online application was easy to complete. (Standards II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d, II.B.3.a)

The College uses assessment and placement instruments that have been validated and placed on the California Community College Chancellor's Office list of approved instruments. Local validation of cut scores and disproportionate impact takes place on a six year cycle. Cut scores were raised in 2009 for both English and mathematics placement based upon the data collected, but lowered in 2015 for English upon a review of cut scores, multiple measures and disproportionate impact. Although students are placed into courses utilizing assessment results, a Prerequisite Override Request may be submitted by students in person or online to general counseling. The request must be supported by documentation of one of the following: other college transcripts verifying successful completion of an equivalent prerequisite course; AP test score of three or higher in English, math, or chemistry; or an EAP test score of "College Ready." Students have the right to submit a prerequisite challenge to the appropriate division dean if the override request is denied by a counselor or if the reason for not completing the prerequisites meets one of the stipulated matriculation criteria. (Standard II.B.3.e)

The College adheres to provisions of state laws and regulations, FERPA, and District BP 5310 regarding Student Records: Maintenance, Retention and Destruction. Imaged document storage is maintained by District Information Technology Services (ITS), and scanned documents are shared between the Colleges. Student records are maintained on Banner, an enterprise software package provided by the vendor Ellucian. Banner data is backed up daily on tape and stored in a locked fireproof unit at the College within the secured building, with limited access to designated ITS staff responsible for this function. District system back-ups are performed on an automated nightly and weekly schedule.

The Director of Admissions and Records authorizes access to the Banner system through a Computer Access Request form. Student records from 1994 to present are accessible via the Banner system. Records prior to 1994 are stored on microfilm and are housed at both the College and District offices. Information is not released to a third party without written authorization from the student. Records are retained and destroyed according to FERPA and Board policy. These policies are published in the College catalog and related board policies are posted on the District website. (Standard II B3.f.)

The College's student support programs evaluate its programs and services utilizing student surveys, data provided by the OIR, PR, and to varying degrees SLO and SAO assessment results. There is a heavy reliance on student survey results and review of student

demographic data when modifying programs and services. Resource requests are linked to PR and several recent staffing requests were a result of PR processes. SLOs and SAOs are identified by most areas of student services; however, only a limited number have assessment results which have been used as the basis for improvement. (Standard II B4).

Conclusion
The College meets the standard.

Standard II.C Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

Chabot College's Library and Learning Support services are integrated throughout the organization and support the mission of the College. The support services include the Library, the Learning Connection, the student computer laboratory, and the audiovisual center. The Learning Connection (LC) is the overall coordinating program for various academic support programs including the Writing, Reading Across the Curriculum (WRAC) Center, the Language Center, the STEM Center, Communication Studies Laboratory, a World Language laboratory, and the Learning Assistant program (embedded tutors). All students have access to tutoring, computer labs, and media materials within the library and the Learning Connection.

PLOs, SLOs, CLOs and SAOs are some of the measures used to evaluate their effectiveness in ensuring that students learn. Surveys, evaluations, and pre and post tests are also utilized. Multiple cycles of assessment have been completed and the results have been used to plan and implement improvements, including increases in resource allocation for Films on Demand and mobile devices for students. Other improvements through program review and resource allocation requests include additional staffing support and extended library hours.

The College has been innovative in creating opportunities for learning support. Widespread marketing and dialogue on the part of the LC coordinator has resulted in a variety of new services based on solicitation of faculty input. A renovation of Building 100 has centralized many of the learning support functions on the first floor. Challenges faced by the Library and LC include a heavy dependence upon bond funding, insufficient staffing and budget resources, and inadequate access to learning support services for distance learning students.

Findings and Evidence
Library

The Library has an established mission, vision statement, and core values that support the mission of the College as well as student learning. The Library is open 58 hours per week (Monday-Thursday 7:30 a.m. to 8 p.m., Friday 8 a.m. to 12 noon, and on Saturday from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.); the Learning Connection and the STEM Center is open Monday to Thursday 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and on Friday from 9:00 a.m. to12 noon at 43 hours per week for each area. The Library houses a collection sufficient to support the diverse needs of its student learners. The Library has 63,492 print volumes, access to 32,444 periodical titles and 83,400 ebook volumes, and over 20,000 streaming videos that are fully close captioned. The library provides access to 28 databases at a cost of $67,000 per year and to 23 Academic Search Premier Suite of databases that is provided by state funds. Measure B funds of $1,000,000 from 2004 have supported the library's ability to purchase materials. There are no plans for institutionalizing the funding once the Measure B funds run out in the next year. To further support adequate materials, a librarian serves on the curriculum committee, a collection development librarian supports course outcomes, and outreach librarians work with the learning communities. The Library collection development policy guides the ways librarians

collaborate with faculty and prioritizes item purchases relevant to the curriculum and college priorities. The Library website is kept current by the librarians and has been modified to provide a mobile version for library users. The Worldshare Integrated Library system allows for cross-searching of databases. Reference assistance include chat services via the Library H3lp, email reference, phone and in-person help. Service Area outcomes, annual surveys, faculty input and a Library Assessment Task force are methods used to assess the effectiveness of the services. (II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c)

Learning Connection

The Learning Connection includes numerous academic support programs and has developed program level outcomes and service area outcomes that support the mission of the institution and student learning. One rotating faculty member at 60 percent is responsible for coordinating all learning support services. There are several hubs of services including the WRAC, STEM lab, Learning Assistant program of embedded tutors, Communication Studies Lab, and the World Language Lab that operate with various hours and are located in different buildings throughout the college campus. The college provides access to learning support sufficient to maintain the instructional programs including one-to-one tutoring by appointment or drop-in group tutoring, peer study, and embedded tutors. The Learning Connection (LC) collaborates with faculty by offering tutoring only in subjects recommended by instructors, and develops pilot programs that the LC helps to implement. The LC hires over 100 tutors per semester for over 18,000 separate sessions and reaching over 2000 students. Students have access to 57 computers at the WRAC with MS Word, Blackboard, Inspiration 9, and 48 computers in room 354. Models of muscle, skeletons, and organs can be checked out from the STEM center. The self-study evidence confirms these targeted tutorial programs are heavily used. SARS Grid is the check-in mechanism at each of the tutoring sites to corroborate usage with student success. Distance learning or online tutoring is not provided as a separate service as students are expected to directly contact their instructor for any assistance. (II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c)

Information competency is included in the general education program as well as through the library skills courses, library orientations, and online tutorials. College librarians work with faculty to provide orientations (119/year) and teach course specific library instruction classes customized to focus on information competency skills. The College has an information competency requirement that is embedded in the critical thinking component of general education for Associate degrees. Seven courses (Bus 10, Eng 4, Eng 7, French 2A, 2B, and Spanish 2A and 2B) were approved to fulfill this GE requirement.

Several librarians also teach Library Skills 1 (1 credit/unit) about library resources, and social media. Library Skills 2 (2 credits/units), a research class titled "Hip Hop & Popular Culture", is a popular course with 17 students for this term. The Library also has created SearchPath, an online tutorial with six modules last updated in 2014. (II.C.1.b)

Building 100, which houses both the Library and Learning Connection is secured by Campus Safety and Security departments and armed doors. The Library has an electronic book detection system and an alarm system for the building. A complete inventory in 2014

showed 2693 items were 'missing'. Further inquiry determined that the 2014 inventory was the first in over 20 years. That, along with a possibly incorrect data migration from the prior SIRSI library management system, was given as the explanation for the high number of missing items. Laptops and computers are secured by PC Trak and are under staff supervision. As mentioned earlier, the Learning Connection uses SARS Grid to track and monitor those using the various labs and service centers. (II.C.1.d)

The College participates in a variety of state and regional consortia that are beneficial in affording the College access to shared resources that are significantly more cost effective. There is a formal interlibrary loan agreement with Las Positas College. There is evidence of agreements such as OCLC Worldshare (purchased by the District) and the Community College League of California that provide services at consortium pricing. (II.C.1.e).

The Library has a Library Assessment Task Force (LATF) that oversees use, access, and the relationship of the services to intended student learning. The LATF has engaged with the library and the OIR to develop and implement SAOs to assess the effectiveness of the services. Evidence of assessment of the library is documented through the SAOs, program review, satisfaction surveys, and analysis of database usage. Resource allocation requests are made via the Program Review process. Documented improvements include a renovation of library instruction room 119 to expand the computer capacity of the room, the creation of a Silent Study room, and the purchase of more laptops to checkout for student use outside of the Library. (II.C.2)

The Learning Connection meets the standard for evaluating learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. PLOs, CLOs, and SLOs are regularly assessed and revised and evidence is provided on how that assessment is utilized to modify the program for improvement and resource allocation. (II.C.2)

Conclusion

The evidence shows the Library and learning support services are sufficient to support the College's instructional programs. However, there are concerns about the continuation of funding once the Measure B funds are exhausted as there appears to be no plan for determining a funding source other than the Library requesting it via program review.

The College meets the standard.

Standard III Resources
Standard III.A - Human Resources

General Observations

The College employs qualified faculty, staff, managers, and administrators. Through its employee hiring-policies, procedures, and programs the College attracts and retains qualified employees necessary to enable and support its commitment to student success. As evidenced by the College catalog, a large number of faculty members and administrators have doctoral degrees. Minimum qualifications for faculty positions are established by the State Chancellor's Office and per board policy; the College and District office follow these requirements related to the discipline. All job announcements include these minimum qualifications; in addition, announcements also include information regarding request of equivalency by the applicant.

Faculty and staff at Chabot College express a deep pride in the accomplishments of its current and former students. During open forums and in interviews, staff often repeated their feelings for the College as an environment that nurtures global citizenship and community partnerships. Many staff and students expressed their enthusiasm for the work being done at Chabot and the collaborative work environment. The College is in the process of recovering staffing levels and human resources in key areas since the Great Recession that impacted many colleges. Although, Human Resources Administration is a shared responsibility between the College and District, the District provides the preponderance of Human Resources leadership and support. The responsibilities for Human Resources management are almost completely centralized at the District office and there is no current infrastructure for a Human Resources presence at Chabot. This was noted as a problem by several people interviewed.

Findings and Evidence

To ensure the institution assures the integrity and quality of is programs and service by employing qualified personnel, hiring procedures are in place for the recruitment and processing of applications for all hiring categories. Job descriptions are created or updated and efforts are made to recruit for positions in ways that increase faculty and staff diversity. Human Resource staff ensure minimum qualifications are met for all positions and in adherence to standards set for programs with outside accrediting bodies. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are available on the District website. Board Policy 4312 (Selection of Fulltime Faculty) and Board Policy 4006 (Faculty and Staff Diversity and Equal Employment Opportunity), details employment of college faculty, the responsibilities of the District Equal Employment Opportunity membership, recruitment, screening and selection process, review and evaluation A significant number of faculty and staff expressed agreement that the practices for hiring qualified personnel advance the mission of the College. (III.A.1)

The College employees are sufficiently qualified by education, experience, and dedication to meet the College standards and goals, and to maintain the integrity and high quality of

college programs and services. Criteria for faculty selection are determined by individuals with discipline experts. Discipline faculty are involved in the development or revision of job descriptions and sit on hiring committees. All job announcements include minimum qualifications; in addition, announcements also include information regarding the process to request equivalency by the applicant. In the case of applicants from non-U.S. institutions, the District seeks evaluation from an outside agency, and this information is made clear in job posts. The evidence supports that Human Resources does provide continuing training to ensure fairness in recruitment and evaluation practices. (III.A.1.a)

The College evaluates personnel systematically on an established cycle. Administrator's evaluations are based on Board Policy 4120 and each administrator is evaluated annually by a procedure developed in conjunction with the administrative staff and approved by the Chancellor. Administrative evaluation is conducted per the "Annual and Comprehensive Administrator Performance and Evaluation Procedures and Processes" which includes the relevant forms. Evaluation procedures for both faculty and classified professionals are contained in the respective collective bargaining agreements and accompanying forms are available on the District website. All supervisory, confidential and classified employees are evaluated on a yearly basis. Classified employees are evaluated according to the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Collective Bargaining Agreement. Tenured faculty members are scheduled to be evaluated every three years. The process for faculty evaluation is documented in student surveys, peer observations, faculty professional review reports, and by supervisors. The evaluation process, timing and criteria used are the same for all types of faculty and are specified in the collective bargaining agreement. The College is behind on faculty evaluations, but the faculty union and the administration have agreed to a timetable for tenured faculty evaluations that will remedy the solution by the end of 2015. Part-time faculty are automatically evaluated in their first semester of teaching with the District; however, if a satisfactory evaluation occurs or no evaluation is conducted in the first two semesters, the part-time faculty member is automatically placed on the seniority list enabling them to teach without evaluation for three years. New full-time faculty undergo a much more rigorous annual evaluation process. The evaluation of the College President is performed by the District Chancellor and the evaluation of the District Chancellor is outlined in Board Policy 2435. (III.A.1.b)

Specific criteria regarding the creation, implementation and assessment of SLOs at the course, program, service area, and college level have been determined. Faculty evaluation articles include statements regarding assessments. The District has reached agreement with the Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association (CLPFA) to include the requirement that creating and assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Service Learning Outcomes (SAOs), Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), and Program Level Outcomes (PLOs) are professional responsibilities and are a part of evaluation. However, evaluation forms for faculty such as counselors and librarians and others directly responsible for student progress towards achieving stated student learning outcomes should be revised to reflect the recent changes in contractual language. For the purpose of reporting, the SLO's were integrated into the College's program review process, which includes the divisions of Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services. (III.A.1.c)

The AP 2170 established a conflict of interest code for the Board of Trustees and employee groups. The Faculty Senate adopted the Chabot Academic Faculty Senate Professional Ethics Statement. The institution has recently adopted Board Policy 3050 Institutional Code of Ethics and an accompanying administrative procedure to address the ethical standards and expectations for all personnel. (III.A.1.d)

The College maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility and meets its Faculty Obligation Number as required by Title 5 regulations. Faculty staffing levels are determined through a process involving the analysis of productivity by each discipline, student needs, and the individual requirements of each discipline. The district is also compliant with "the fifty percent law." This College Enrollment Management Team's role in planning and the allocation of Full-time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) is based on the contract.

Decisions about hiring faculty are a product of district and college considerations and processes. Initial proposals stem from Program Review requests which are supported by enrollment data and trends in the Weekly Student Contact Hour/Weekly Full-time Equivalent Faculty

(WSCH/FTEF) ratios and additional data are provided by the OIR. The College has recently revised the "Process for Prioritization of New and Replacement Full-Time Faculty Positions"; however, faculty note a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the process to support both growth and sustainability of programs that see faculty attrition through separation. One significant concern revealed in the spring 2014 Staff Survey and supported by interview with the College staff, was in regard to the institutional planning process and its current effectiveness in integrating staffing decisions with other planning components – educational programs, student services, and the use of fiscal and financial resources.

In the area of technology resources and services, interviews with College staff indicate a concern over the current lack sufficient technical staff to support day-to-day use of existing technology and the acquisition of additional equipment. The College has indicated plans to hire additional personnel. Regarding sufficient administrative personnel, two dean positions remain in interim status at the time of the site visit. The College has also requested to fill an existing College Administrative Assistant position that reports to the Vice President of Administrative Services to act as liaison with the District's Human Resources office and a central contact for Human Resources-related paperwork and payroll timesheets. Due to this vacancy, there is not a dedicated staff member at Chabot to support Human Resource operations. (III.A.2)

Personnel policies and procedures are clearly posted on the District website and conform to negotiated contracts and board policies. The District adheres to these policies; however, there is no evidence that policies and procedures are systematically reviewed and many policies were only recently reviewed after not having been reviewed for many years. There is evidence that the institution maintains confidential personnel records in a secure location with restricted access and routinely creates electronic copies of documents in favor of keeping originals. (III.3, III.3.a, III.3.b)

The District demonstrates a strong commitment to issues of equity and diversity. The College creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that supports the diverse personnel as evidenced by Board Policies (4006, 4029 and 4012) and contractual provisions. The faculty and classified contracts contain provisions that prevent discrimination and support a diverse staff. The Human Resources office has led efforts at encouraging diversity among employees and the high level of satisfaction expressed by employees with the college's climate regarding respect for ethnic and gender differences between employees is evidence of that commitment. The College's Values statement also provides evidence of this commitment as well as the many programs that celebrate and serve diverse student and employee populations. (III.4.a, III.4.b, III.4.c)

The College plans flex professional development days during the year to provide opportunity for faculty and staff to receive training and there is evidence that those activities are assessed for effectiveness by the participants to inform future offerings. During on campus Flex Days, faculty and staff must attend activities, and their presence is verified via sign-in sheets. The faculty contract Article 29 outlines the responsibilities that both the Professional Development Committee works under and how faculty can access professional development opportunities. The Professional Development program has developed PLOs and created its first program review in 2014-2015, and is becoming more involved in planning. (III.5.a, III.5.b)

For several years, College faculty and staff have lacked significant professional development opportunities due to a lack of dedicated, ongoing, and sustainable funding. In recent years the loss of professional development funds from the state has not been addressed in the College's budget priorities and any professional development opportunities provided supported programs with external accreditation requirements or only those individuals whose needs seemed most dire. Funds came from a mixture of leftover general fund money or grant money. The Professional Development Committee struggled to support employees due to the lack of resources. The current state of important academic processes, such as assessment of student learning outcomes, reflects that lack of support.

Plans for a Classified Professionals Leadership Succession Program are also being developed slowly due to lack of funding. As funds have returned to the College, co-chairs have been compensated for their time through overtime or reassigned time, and the College President has committed significant resources, $75,000 for the present fiscal year and $25,000 more in the coming fiscal year, to support professional development activities. Also, the Professional Development Committee has responded quickly to develop a process, currently in draft, to allocate those funds in a manner that is integrated with overall planning. However, it's clear that the current funds are a one-time infusion of funds into professional development, and though the desire is strong by all constituent group leaders to support professional development funding, there is no evidence that the College has institutionalized an adequate and ongoing professional development budget to meet the needs of its employees. (III.5)

Human Resource planning is integrated with institutional planning in some regards. The College links staffing decisions to its institutional planning with a fully developed and transparent process for assessing and filling human resource needs for classified and faculty

positions. The classified and faculty processes were revised, approved and used for academic year 2014-15. However the evidence indicated that a similar process needs to be created for administrators. All positions are identified in program review, but no prioritization process exists for administrative hires to support presidential decision-making. The District Human Resource office completes a strategic plan, but the team found no evidence about how the plan is evaluated or assessed at the College or District level. (III.A.6)

Conclusion

The College employs individuals that are qualified by education, training, and experience to fill positions. The recruitment and selection process for selecting candidates for positions is broadly communicated and established in board policy. The team noted effective efforts to encourage a diverse faculty and staff and in the equity in its hiring practices. At this point, Student Learning Outcomes are part of the faculty evaluation process. The evaluation of faculty is guided by the negotiated contract between the District and the Faculty Association. (III.A.1.c.). The College can improve its effectiveness by evaluating its process for prioritizing classified positions and creating a process for prioritizing administrative hiring (III.A.2). In addition, the College can improve by providing ongoing professional development in key areas (III.A.5) and by establishing a regular evaluation cycle of its policies and practices that leads to revision, if necessary, through a collaborative, inclusive process of revision (III.A.3). In order to meet Standard III.A.6, the District and College should regularly evaluate and communicate clearly the delineation of responsibilities described in the Functional Map so that all employees understand the division of responsibility.

The College meets this Standards.

College Recommendations
> 4. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College should evaluate its process for prioritization of classified staff positions and make modifications as needed. (III.A.2)

> 5. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College should adopt a process for prioritization of administrative positions, and evaluate the effectiveness of that process. (III.A.2)

District and College Recommendation
> 3. To increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the District and College regularly evaluate role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the Colleges in meeting educational goals. (Standards III.A.6, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

Standard IIIB Physical Resources

General Observations

Chabot College's physical resources reflect a creative, forward-looking and inspirational spirit and the processes used to manage those resources stand out as collaborative and data-informed. Designed and constructed in the 1960s, Chabot College has been transformed by the passage of "Measure B" in 2004 and the implementation of the 2005 Facilities Master Plan. Measure B provided $496 million to the District and Chabot received approximately $250 million for capital improvements, new construction, and renovations.

The team toured the College and saw an impressive integration of functionality and creativity. Chabot created a public Art Committee to implement the board-funded "Nike Site" initiative to solicit permanent works of art to enhance the learning environment. Much of this artwork adorns new and renovated buildings that have been designed and built to meet LEED standards. Safety features and accessibility features, including ramps, electric doors, and fire and emergency alarms were visible and easy to locate. Student service offices were inviting for students, including the "Living Room" on the second floor of the Student Service Center, and the team was informed of plans for the creation of a Veterans Resource Center in the near future to accompany other student services facilities such as the Disabled Student Services Center and the tutoring center.

Interviews with representatives at the CLPCCD facilities team and with members of the Chabot College Facilities and Sustainability Committee (FSC) revealed a highly collaborative consultation process that includes active participation by students and key district personnel in order to support prioritization of facility needs and to encourage innovation in facility management and sustainable practices, often initiated by students. The committee and its decisions are highly transparent and is supported by a comprehensive website.

Findings and Evidence

The College provides for the safety of students through safety inspections, emergency and other trainings, and campus patrols by security officers. Recently, emergency call phones were installed in the parking lots and student can sign up to receive "Alert You" text messages regarding safety-related incidents. Security cameras are installed and a new card key system has been deployed to replace regular keys. The College contracts with Keenan and Associates to provide risk assessments. The spring 2014 Staff Accreditation Survey shows that a majority of staff believe buildings are constructed and maintained with safety in mind and a commendable 90 percent of employees report feeling safe on campus during daylight hours. Over 80 percent of respondents believe Campus Safety and Security staff responds quickly in emergency situations. The College complies with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and Division of the State Architecture (DSA) regulations. The College publishes crime statistics on its website in compliance with the CLERY Act. (III.B.1)

In order to assure effective utilization of space to meet program and service needs, Chabot has a variety of processes planning and identifying immediate and long-term physical resource needs. District staff complete an annual five-year construction plan based on annual feedback from the FCS. Program Review is the primary source to identify many physical resource and facility's needs. The program review process includes an addendum known as "Appendix F8: Facilities Requests" which is an information gathering tool for the FSC which documents how a facility resource requests supports educational programs or institutional purposes and how the requests supports the Strategic Plan. Also, the FCS tracks the ongoing quality of its facilities through the use of the "Chabot College Facilities Construction/ Maintenance/Enhancement Request/Information Tracking Form." This process allows for work requests that have been identified outside of the program review process. These are immediate needs to be addressed and tracked based on prioritization decisions made by the committee. (II.B.1.a)

Along with these mechanisms, the College collects survey data on employee attitudes towards facility issues including staffing levels for Maintenance and Operations (M&O) areas. This was an area of concern identified by Organizational Review of District Office and M&O Department assessment in 2014, and recent survey numbers show a majority of employees feel that M&O is inadequately staffed and they do not agree that there are sufficient personnel and resources to maintain the buildings and grounds. In response to this data, the District has made a priority of rebuilding its M&O staffing levels to 2008-2009 levels as soon as possible, while assessing the needs in this area through its planning processes. In addition, the District has fulfilled a Memorandum of Understanding agreement with Service Employees International Union to complete a Classification and Compensation study for Classified Professionals. The agreement is to be approved by the Board of Trustees at its October business meeting and will be implemented over the next three years (IIIB.1.b and III.B.2).

The College effectively plans and evaluates facility and equipment needs regularly and takes into account space utilization needs in planning to meet student needs and to determine long-range planning to support the College mission. The District has taken steps to more effectively analyze its regular capacity/load ratio assessments, and is introducing new software solutions to make this process more effective. Measure B funds have been used over the last ten years to accomplish countless renovations, room and building improvements, and new construction projects based on a Facilities Master Plan (FMP) completed in 2012. Monthly updates on Measure B are provided and the Facilities and Sustainability Committee maintains a comprehensive website with information. The District and the College collaborate effectively to address issues that are identified through planning processes that fall outside of the FMP. The program review process includes an addendum known as "Appendix F8: Facilities Requests," which ensures planning is integrated with the Strategic Plan and leads to improvements and the identification of needs to support learning environments at the College. Though the College Facilities and Sustainability Committee has a short-range prioritization and planning process that considers the costs of maintaining facilities and equipment, the College and District have not yet agreed upon a definition of the total cost of ownership of facilities and equipment to be used in long-range planning processes and budget development. (III.B.2.a)

Conclusion

Chabot College is a safe and aesthetically-inspiring campus that has leveraged bond funds with careful and creative management of District funds to transform many areas of the campus to support improved student success. As the state returns from the debilitating recession, more funds are available to rectify inadequate staffing levels in Maintenance and Operations and this is seen as a priority at the District and College levels. Measure A has allowed the College to fulfill its 2012 Facilities Master Plan and a new draft Education Master Plan will be the basis for future long-term planning. However, Standard III.B.2.a requires colleges to have a long-range capital plans that support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of facilities and equipment. The College and District must work together to define the total cost of ownership of facilities and equipment and integrate that definition into long-range planning processes.

The College meets all Standards except III.B.2.a.

District and College Recommendation
> 5. To meet the standard, the Colleges and District should update and integrate their long range facilities planning process to reflect the total cost of ownership projections of facilities and equipment. (III.B.2.a, ER 19)

Standard III.C Technology Resources

General Observations

The self-study report outlines a process by which the institution assures that technology support is designed to meet the needs of the College. Through the use of the Technology Committee, the Chabot Computer Support (CCS), the District Information Technology Support (ITS), and the newly developed draft of the Strategic Plan (to be completed in fall 2015) there is evidence that the College provides technology support to meet the needs of teaching, learning and operational systems. Individual program review outlines the technology needs of the various areas.

The plans indicate that technological resources are integrated into the planning processes at the College through the creation of goals in the new Educational Master Plan (to be completed with the assistance of a consulting firm in fall 2015) and priorities in the new planning process, which will be utilized by the College for the next cycle. In addition to inclusion in stated goals, technological resources are addressed in a formal Districtwide technology plan and through a committee structure designed to implement the larger College goals. However, the drafts are currently moving through the appropriate governance approval processes and therefore have not been implemented to evaluate their effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

The evidence and interviews with the Chabot staff indicates that the Technology Committee is one place where overall discussions occur. However, there is no applicable policy that requires major technology decisions to come through this committee. As a consequence, some recommendations and decisions do not flow directly through the Technology Committee, so multiple, alternative forums exit in which technology planning can occur. (III.C, III.C.1)

The College evaluates the effectiveness of its technology resources through regular surveys, issued by the Office of Institutional Research. Full-time staff expressed concerned that there is not adequate technical staff to support the use of technology on campus. There has been a reduction in the ITS staffing over the past several years due to budget constraints and the growth in the numbers of computers and technology-based or supported curriculum has stretched currently IT staffing support. In addition, staff expressed concern regarding the lack of staff development/training, linking some of the technology decisions to institutional planning and having college input in the selection of some of the instructional technology. This was documented in the self-study report. (III.A.2, III.C, III.C.1)

Concerns of appropriate technology, support, training and structure, communication and funding are to be addressed by the newly developed CLPCCD Technology Coordinating Committee, whose broad charge is to coordinate technology related information between the colleges.   However, this new process has not been implemented long enough to evaluate its effectiveness. (III.C, III.C.1)

The College uses Banner Enterprise and its applications to support administrative functions in Student Services, Academic Services, Human Resources, Payroll and Business Services. It is housed and supported by District ITS, which provides the network infrastructure to support Districtwide enterprise services available to students, faculty, and staff. (III.C.1.a)

Blackboard is the current course management system available to faculty for creating an online learning environment for students who are enrolled in online, hybrid, and traditional courses. The College is continuing to expand its distance education course offerings, support student learning needs and to provide greater access to technology. Computers are available to students in campus labs, the Chabot Library, and the Student Services building. (III.C.1.a)

In May 2008, a technology plan was developed to establish technology guidelines to help Chabot College with technological planning and enhancement. It was identified that the plan would guide current and future technology and be reviewed every other year. An updated Districtwide plan was completed as of September 2015.

The Chabot Technology Committee and COOL are both key factors in determining the path of technology at the College. Procedures identify that technology requests are integrated through two mechanisms; program review and technology requests. The new processes now in place allow these committees to have more input into decision-making at all levels, involving technology used at the College to ensure that its meets the needs and demands of a learning environment. (III.C.1.a)

The self-study and the evidence support that limited resources and a need for staff, place limits on training possibilities. School Services of California recommended the hiring of two trainers for user training of the ITS staff. For the 2015/16 academic year, the District ITS plans to hire one of the two trainer positions. (III.C.1.b)

Using Measure B bond funds, the District ITS developed a life cycle plan for systematically analyzing equipment needs and determining standardized systems specifications as well as when to replace or update existing equipment and systems. Once the Bond Technology funding expires, and the performance of the technology infrastructure begins to gradually degrade, the College and District operational funds for technology will need to be increased accordingly to cover these technology replacement costs in the future. A new revision to the District ITS Strategic Plan and the revised Educational Master Plan in fall 2015 will address this. However, these new plans are currently in draft form and have not completed the approval process or been fully implemented to evaluate their effectiveness. (III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d, III.C.2)

The District has addressed the need for technological resources in the document "Technology Plan Update – Bond Activities and Enterprise Systems 2014- 2015". This document is the most recent update to the current Technology Plan, which was completed in September 2015. This document contains project status for both the Bond Measure B projects and the Enterprise Systems utilized Districtwide.

In conjunction with the Educational Master Plan, the District is developing a new District Strategic Plan to support the Colleges' Educational Master Plan, which will also be completed by the end of fall 2015. These plans have not completed the approval process and therefore their effectiveness could not be evaluated.

Technology goals and objectives are specified in the new District Strategic Plan and this information will be utilized to develop a new five-year Technology Plan for 2016-2020. The projects within this current Technology Plan, that have not been implemented as of yet, will be re-evaluated and included in the new five-year Technology Plan as is appropriate.

The new Districtwide Technology Coordinating Committee (TCC) will be responsible for working collaboratively with the Chabot and Las Positas Technology Committee to develop the new Technology Plan based on inputs from the Colleges' Educational Master Plan and the District Strategic Plan goals and objectives. Each of the technology goals and objectives will be evaluated in order to drill down further and identify future automated system solutions to implement at the Colleges and District. As these plans are currently moving through the appropriate governance approval processes their effectiveness could not be evaluated.

The evidence supports institutional planning efforts have begun to address campus-wide needs and that there is a clear linkage between planning and resource allocation to support these efforts.

The College does not currently have a systematic process for acquisition, maintenance, upgrades, and replacement of the technology infrastructure and equipment to meet the future institutional needs after the completion of the Measure B Bond.

Conclusions
The College meets this standard.

District and College Recommendation
>3. To increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the District and College regularly evaluate role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the Colleges in meeting educational goals. (Standards III.A.6, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

Standard III.D- Financial Resources

General Observations

The CLPCCD has made a remarkable recovery from the recession. The District has successfully pulled itself out of financial difficulties experienced during the recession when they had negative ending balances and significant enrollment loss. The unrestricted general fund reserve was at a five year low of 6.42 percent in 2011/12. The unaudited reserve for 2014/15 is 15.98 percent. District funded enrollment levels have increased from 15,889 full-time equivalent students (FTES) in 2011/12 to 16,861 FTES in 2014/15. During this time period funded enrollment at Chabot College has increased from 9,361 FTES to 9,935 FTES.

The District began using a revised resource allocation model in 2013/14 which distributes unrestricted general fund money to the two Colleges by FTES. Districtwide expenses, district office, and maintenance and operations functions are budgeted first and the remainder of the funds are allocated to the Colleges.

There were inaccuracies and omissions in the writing of this standard. The evidence provided consisted of high level board policies, budgets and audits. While these documents were needed, many more were needed as well. Much time was spent looking for evidence on the District and College websites.

Findings and Evidence

The Chabot College mission statement states "Chabot College is a public comprehensive community college that prepares students to succeed in their education." Student success is a priority at Chabot College evidenced by the process the College employed to cut classes when the workload reductions were instituted during the recession. Analysis was done so that cuts would have the least impact on students. Meeting the needs of the students during this difficult time was evident. (Standard III.D.1)

Financial planning is conducted through a collaborative process that includes participation of governance committees such as the College Council, PRBC, College Budget Committee, CEMC, and the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC). Accreditation survey results from spring 2015 indicate that only 27 percent of respondents have a clear understanding of the role of the College Budget Committee, and 34 percent understand the role of the DEMC. The vice president of administrative services is working on improving communication. The charge of the College Budget Committee is now posted on the Chabot College website and the role of the committee was discussed in a presentation on College Day in August 2014. (Standard III.D)

The College is informed of its revenue allocations that are allocated through the District Budget Allocation Model (BAM) and the required level of student enrollments, which is communicated by DEMC. The budget is developed by the vice president of administrative services. Any increases in general fund allocations above the maintenance of effort/baseline budget are allocated based on the process of program review, prioritization processes, vice

president's recommendations, and College President approval. The president and vice presidents typically discuss these allocations and make funding decisions after considering program review requests, however, in 2015/16, one time funds were allocated directly to each vice president to allocate in their areas which was a departure from the usual process. (Standards III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d)

The College's institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability. The CEMC at each college develops enrollment targets and forwards that information to the DEMC for discussion and revisions, if necessary. The DEMC makes recommendations to the Chancellor regarding enrollment targets. The District's Business Services office prepares preliminary revenue assumptions based on the Governor's January budget and later adjusts these projections based on information in the Governor's May revise and the final state budget. (Standard IIID.2.b)

An actuarial study of retiree health liabilities is completed every two years. The district has elected to pay for retiree medical benefits on a "pay-as-you-go" basis. In addition, the district has set up a self-insurance fund called the Retiree Unfunded Medical Benefit Liability fund (RUMBL). Funds are set aside in this fund to assist in funding this liability. As of June 30, 2015, RUMBL had an ending balance of $4,603,295. The institution does not have an irrevocable trust and is not funding its annual required contribution (ARC). The actuarial study dated May 28, 2015 indicates an ARC of $13,053,241. The district does not have any plans to establish a trust at the present time. The district plans to use ongoing dollars to fund the increases in PERS and STRS. In the event that the ongoing funds are not sufficient to cover the increases in PERS and STRS, the college reserve would first be utilized and the district reserve would be utilized next. (Standards III.D.1.c, III.D.3.c)

The institution follows it guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the allocation of funds. The College Budget Committee reviews and recommends allocations from program review requests for instructional supplies funded with restricted lottery money, Instructional Equipment/Library Materials, instructional equipment using Measure B Bond funds and Perkins funding. This committee makes recommendations to the PRBC, College Council, and the College President. There is currently no assessment after the items are purchased to determine how these items improved the program. (Standard III.D.1.d)

The District and Colleges prepare tentative and final budgets. The budgets are posted on the District and College websites. Each unit of the College oversees and manages its funds through the Banner system. Each unit has online access to its budget that allows for real-time account analysis and review. The vice president of administrative services monitors all general and co-curricular fund budgets and makes reports to the College Budget Committee. Financial records of the District are audited annually by an independent CPA firm. The audit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, had three audit findings pertaining to internal controls. Two of the recommendations were implemented in fiscal year 2014/15. The third will be implemented after November 10, 2015, with the hiring of new staff that will provide for separation of duties. This audit showed that all recommendations for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 2013, had been implemented. Audits are posted on the District website. (Standard III.D.2.a-b)

Financial information is provided to the College through the governance structure including the College Council, PRBC, and College Budget Committee. The vice president of administrative services, who serves on these committees, is regularly scheduled on the agendas. The vice chancellor of business services presents budget information to strategic planning groups, the Senior Leadership Team, and the Board of Trustees. Tentative budget information is communicated after the governor presents the state tentative budget, after the May revise and the final budget is communicated after the state budget has passed. (Standard III.D.2.c)

Financial resources are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source. Financial and Performance audits are done of the bond fund each year and the Measure B Citizen' Oversight Committee meets quarterly. Meeting minutes and agendas are posted on the district website. The Chabot Office of Development and the Foundation was re-established in 2013. Tax exempt status was granted and made effective June 25, 2014. A goal of the foundation is to increase funds available to students, faculty, and staff through revenue generating activities. An independent accounting firm handles the accounting functions for the foundation. Any full-time member of the college may apply for a grant by completing grant forms and discussing the project with the Grant Development Office. All grants are managed by an administrator. (Standard III.D.2.d)

The District has three findings from the year ended June 30, 2014, regarding internal controls. The District Business Officers, made up of the Vice Chancellor of Business, Director of Business Services and the two vice presidents of administrative services and key staff members meet on a regular basis to discuss and evaluate business related activities including internal control. District staff also documents processes each year before the audit. Instances of weak controls are addressed when they come to the attention of the business office staff or administration. (Standard III.D.2.e)

The institution currently has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability. The unaudited reserve as of June 30, 2015, was 15.98 percent. The District has borrowed from another fund in the past, but that has been repaid. (Standard III.D.3.a)

The institution practices effective oversight of finances for auxiliary services. All auxiliary budgets are reviewed by the vice president of administrative services and by the district Business Office staff. Cafeteria services are contracted with Fresh and Natural Inc. and Bookstore services are contracted out to Follett Higher Education Group, Inc. The vice president of administrative services oversees the college's contacts and revenue from percentage of sales. The District Business Services Office requests financial aid funds from the US Department of Education and works with Higher One, a third party administrator of financial aid, to get the funds into the hands of the students. (Standard III.D.3.b)

The District's only locally-incurred debt instrument is general obligation bond debt, which is paid by ad valorem taxes, so it has no impact on institutional operations or financial stability. (Standard III.D.3.d - e)

The audit for the year ended June 30, 2014, included a finding that there is no evidence of review of the number of days used in the Return of Title IV (R2T4) calculations. The institution has a corrective action plan. The financial aid director indicated that the financial aid office had implemented the auditors' recommendation, but the 2014/15 audit report has not been issued. The College adequately monitors loan default rates. Loan rates are within federal guidelines. (Standard III.D.3.f)

Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution. Contracts are reviewed at the college or district business offices, sent to the purchasing office for another review and then submitted to the Chancellor's Senior Leadership Team for a final review. Contracts that are deemed to meet the institution's goals and objectives are presented to the vice chancellor of business services for signature. The institution requires three quotes for goods and equipment purchased with costs between $30,000 and $86,000. Purchases of good and equipment in excess of $86,000 require a formal bid process. (Standard III.D.3.g)

The District uses external audits and any findings to evaluate and improve the internal control structures and management practices. (Standard III.D.3.h)

Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The College Budget Committee reviews and recommends allocations from program review requests. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement of the institution. The District implemented a new allocation model in 2013/14. After approval of the new model, the District established the Planning and Budget Committee. One of the duties of this committee is to assess and evaluate how the financial resources facilitate instruction and student support. The committee began meeting in May of 2014. (Standard III.D.4)

Conclusion

While a preliminary financial analysis has been completed on the new BAM, the college and district still need to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the new BAM and make appropriate adjustments.

The College and District meet this standard.

District and College Recommendations
> 4. In order to increase effectiveness and ensure the Colleges can meet their missions, the team recommends the District and College regularly assess the budget allocation model (BAM) to ensure its integrity and effectiveness in adequately supporting College operations. (Standards III.D.1, III.D.3, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3 d)

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance
Standard IV.A. – Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The College enjoys a culture that encourages participation by all constituencies, described as a "bottom to the top" model that encourages and welcomes all views. Constituent participation includes the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Students of Chabot College, and College management. The College Council provides broad-based input into decision-making as recommendations to the College President.

The College has committed to completing and communicating a revised governance structure and procedures by spring 2016. This work is in response to a 2009 ACCJC Recommendation and follows changes reflected in a subsequent 2012 Midterm Report. At present, the *Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process* document describes an "Everyone governs the entire college" approach to College governance (p.2). Constituency organizations and College governance committees are listed on the College web site. Although the College encourages broad governance participation, part-time faculty, and classified staff responses from a spring 2014 staff survey shows a high degree of disenfranchisement. Additionally, the College self-evaluation notes only one in three faculty/staff members agree or strongly agree with the following survey statement: "The current structure of Council and Committees enables effective college-wide participation in decision making for all segments of the College community" (p. 315).

Findings and Evidence

The College embraces a culture of broad participation wherein "all constituencies have the right and opportunity to express their opinions, and that anyone may bring forth a position or idea that will be treated with respect and given reasonable consideration" (Evidence I-19, p.3). The College webpage, "Chabot ALL" emails, presidential reports, and College Hour "Brown Bag" presentations encourage student, staff, and faculty participation in process improvement. Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students, and administrative representatives appear as committee Core Representatives in the Revised 2006 Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process document. (Standard IV.A)

The College is engaged in the work of establishing and implementing a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. Fall 2014 Shared Governance Retreat Recommendations were distributed to College constituent groups, councils, and committees. College Program Review and Budget Committee (PRBC) then began the work of a College governance redesign, which included reducing the number of committees, committee composition, and charge statements. The Faculty Senate crafted its own draft recommendations during spring 2015 while PRBC solicited and received possible revisions to their proposal. College Actionable Improvement Plan 1 commits the College to "completing the work on the shared governance structure and

document in the 2015/16 Academic Year" (p. 311) and College leadership anticipates a spring 2016 completion. (III.A.1)

Although the documented College leadership structure appears to empower all constituents and supports a philosophy of openness, current written policy does not entirely follow suit. The College may constrict systemic participative decision-making processes by limiting governance committee participation to Core Representatives "in some instances" (p.313). Chabot governance committee participation is restricted in cases when "individuals, faculty, staff, or students, [are] under consideration for advancement or discipline" (Evidence I-19, p.4). Additionally, the spring 2016 Shared Governance Structure redesign may address the unclear governance role between the classified union and classified senate. Finally, the current *Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation* document cites "the importance of the passing of California AB 1725 in 1988, which mandates the sharing of governance on community college campuses" (p. 312). The College "shared governance" interpretation of AB1725 legislation may confound effective decision-making. The team observed a robust dialogue among many participants but without a clear flow and culmination in timely decision making. This has, at times, seemed to result in "interminable dialog". To be effective, participatory governance allows for ample opportunities for constituent groups and stakeholder to have a voice in decision-making, but ultimately the college community should be clear on the authority for decision making in a transparent manner. (Standard IV.A.2)

Board Policies 2014 and 2015 recognize the Chabot College Academic Senate as the faculty representative body making recommendations about student learning programs and services. Curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, grading policies, and accreditation faculty roles fall under the "primarily rely upon" category, with the remaining seven academic matters are to be considered with "mutual agreement". Several committees rely on the primacy of faculty for recommendations about student learning programs and services. Committees such as Curriculum, PRBC, Student Learning Outcome Assessment Committee (SLOAC), Committee on Online Learning (COOL) and Basic Skills Committee (BSC) are all faculty-driven. The new Integrated Planning and Budget Model (IPBM) established guiding principles for all college-wide committees to follow. Survey results dating back to 2008, however, show only one in three faculty/staff members believe they may effect institution-wide discussion, planning, and implementation. *Chabot College Organizational and Governance Charts* describing established governance structures and College committee charge statements articulate reporting/recommending responsibilities that may not adequately encourage the discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies. Additionally, out of date webpages on governance make communication about governance challenging. (Standard IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)

The institution demonstrates honesty and integrity with external agencies, including the Commission. Since 2009, the College has endeavored to comply with College Recommendation # 5 addressing the Commission's Leadership and Governance requirements. For example, the College Program Review and Budget Committee (PRBC) is a redesign of an earlier integrated planning body which included changes in committee composition and charge. College Actionable Improvement Plan 1 commits the College to "completing the work on the shared governance structure and document in the 2015-2016

Academic Year" (p. 311). The new shared governance structure should include an on-going outcome assessment. The College has experienced significant administrative leadership change between 2009 and the present. The institution, however, has responded to prior team recommendations. (Standard IV.A.4)

The College adopted its Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process in 2004 and reviewed it in 2006. In 2014, the College updated its vision, mission statement, and values. The College 2005-2015 Educational Master Plan identifies a Strategic Planning process that is "outcome centered" (p.10). There is evidence of wide participation in the development of the Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan including all constituent groups and members from the community. In 2012, the College PRBC created a second Strategic Plan with one identified goal: "Increase the number of students that achieve their educational goal within a reasonable time by clarifying pathways and providing more information and support" (p. 312). Initiatives in support of this goal are documented in the *Progress on the Strategic Plan Goal and Initiatives 2012-15*. Conversely, the College Self-Evaluation notes relatively low employee (38 percent) understanding of administrative responsiveness and College/District responsibilities. Though the College appears committed to continuous quality improvement, a systematic College committee effectiveness evaluation process tied to the College mission and the 2012 single goal does not appear to exist. (Standard IV.A.5)

Conclusion

The College has a culture that encourages participation of all constituencies, and has committed to completing and communicating a revised governance structure and procedure by spring 2016. A revised governance structure should include a comprehensive process evaluation and outcome assessment plan. This work is a response to a 2009 ACCJC Recommendation and follows changes reflected in a subsequent 2012 Midterm Report.

The College meets this standard.

College Recommendations

> 3. To improve its effectiveness, the College needs to complete, document, and communicate the new shared governance structure and evaluate the effectiveness to make needed improvements. (Standards I.B.I, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, IV.A.I, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.3.g)

> 6. In order to improve its effectiveness, the College is urged to update their committee webpages to reflect current information. (Standards IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance
Standard IV.B – Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The Chabot-Los Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) Board of Trustees consists of seven at-large, biennially elected trustees from the communities of Castro Valley, Dublin, Hayward, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Leandro, San Lorenzo, Sunol, and Union City. Staggered trustee elections in even-numbered years result in one-half of the trustees being elected each term. Two college elected non-voting Student Trustees serve two year terms. The majority of the trustees have served at least two terms.

The CLPCCD Chancellor began her term July, 2013. The Chabot College President has served since February 2012 and has led on-going revisions to the College Mission Statement and current shared governance process documents. New committees, such as the Program Review and Budget Committee, were formed in an effort to outwardly align College program review, planning, and budgeting. During the President's term, a *2012-2015 Strategic Plan* has been developed with a singular goal: Increase the number of students that achieve their educational goal within a reasonable time by clarifying pathways and providing more information and support. These revisions were outputs from established College governance processes. The President uses Convocation and College Hour convening opportunities, along with a "President's Corner" posting and regular emails to communicate with students and the employee base.

Findings and Evidence

Revised Board Policies are posted on the District website and divided into seven "chapters", redesigning past structure, numbering, and content as necessary. Board Policy 2200 recognizes and designates the CLPCCD Board to "establish, review, and revise policies that define the institutional mission and set prudent, ethical, and legal standards for college operations aligned with appropriate state and federal policies affecting community colleges". Board Policies 2431 and 2435 establish the board's obligations for the chancellor's selection and evaluation. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District began updating Board Policies and Administrative Procedures in spring 2013 in order to align them with changes in laws, regulations and accreditation standards. The District engaged Community College League of California (CCLC) services in this review. Once reviewed or revised, Board policies are adopted by the board of trustees, administrative procedures are developed, and then posted on the District's website. While CLPCCD has done a tremendous amount of work this past year in policy and procedure revisions, there remain crucial policies and procedures that need updating. The review and revision of all Board Policies and Administrative Procedures requires consistent attention. (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.j)

The CLPCCD Board appears to operate as an independent and "ethical and cohesive team" focused on student success, as web-posted 2013-2016 Board Priorities. Board Policy 2715 notes a commitment to "[w]ork with fellow Board Members in a spirit of harmony and

cooperation in spite of differences of opinion". Board Workshop Retreat "Role of the Board" minutes reflect periodic review of technical elements, such as Brown Act compliance, and Robert's Rules of Order. Board Values, such as Transparent, Fair, Sensitive, and Trustworthy, are presented on the District website as "Words that describe what we value about ourselves as individuals and how we work together as a Board of Trustees for CLPCCD". (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.c)

In 2013, the CLPCCD Board established priorities later to be reflected in revised College and District Mission Statements. Both statements are consistent with improving student learning programs and services. Shortly thereafter, the District began a systematic evaluation and revision of all CLPCCD Board Policies with guidance from the Community College League of California (CCLC). Not all new CLPCCD Board Policies have been approved and posted. Board Policies 3100 organizational structure, 3200 Accreditation, and 3250 Institutional Planning are examples of revision yet to be adopted. Board Policy 2150, Participation in Local Decision-making, appears to be a critical policy yet to be adopted by the District. District Actionable Improvement Plan 2 commits the District to completing the process of revising all Board Policies. A 9-15-15 Project Culmination MATRIX document identifies multiple Administrative Procedures yet to be approved by the CLPCCD Board. Policies regarding size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures are posted on the District website as *Index of Revised Board Policies and Administrative Procedures*. (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c, IV.B.1.d)

It appears that the board actions are consistent with established Policies and Bylaws. Board Policy revision recommendations are routed through the Chancellor's Council before being considered for adoption by the Board. Board Self Evaluation BP 2745 generally describes a commitment to an evaluative tool used to assess current year outcomes and guidance for future year Board goals. In March, several trustees attended a 2014 Government Institute on Student Success (GISS) conference and the board later adopted the GISS Board Self-Assessment as an evaluative tool. Draft 2014 GISS Board Self-Assessment Report results are generally positive. Board Policy 2740, Board Education, articulates a commitment to continued board development through local workshops, statewide ACCT trainings, and the like. Improvement outcomes from the Board self-evaluation process, however, were not provided in the College Report nor during site visit interviews. (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g)

Newly elected board member on-boarding is described in Administrative Procedure 2740 and describes training protocols for both area and student trustees. This AP addresses the prior team's Recommendation #6 (District and College Recommendation): "In order to improve, the team recommends that the Board establish and formally adopt a clearly delineated orientation program for new Board members". The newest CLPCCD Board member has undergone the new orientation. Training protocols include college orientations, review of Education Code, other regulatory legislation, as well as Board ethical considerations. The team found no evidence of an evaluation tool for this Board orientation process. (Standards IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.g)

The Board has a 14-point Code of Ethics detailing ethical responsibilities and trustee standards of practice. Adopted in April of 2013, Board Policy 2715 reinforces ethical behavior based in Brown Act principles, Board development obligations, and roles within the Board as a unit. A two-member ad hoc group from the Board is charged with initiating and completing inquiries into any possible acts in violation of the Code of Ethics. (Standards IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.h)

The CLPCCD Board of Trustees appears to have been kept informed about and involved in the accreditation process. October 2014 and April 2015 presentations were made to the board by the College Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), along with regular communiques provided by the chancellor. Governing Board member interviews substantiated this finding. (Standard IV.B.1.i)

There are CLPCCD Board and Administrative Policies delegating authority to the chancellor and other administrators, including the College Presidents. Policy 2431 addresses the selection of a permanent Chancellor and BP 2432 delegates to the chancellor the authority to select an acting administrator for no more than 30 days at a time. All constituency groups are represented in the Chancellor Search Committee, participating in the job description development and interview process. The chancellor is charged with reasonable interpreting and executing Board Policy as described in AP 2430 and holds the chancellor accountable for the operation of the District. The chancellor's annual evaluation is conducted by the board in accordance with BP 2435, which describes criteria grounded in mutually agreed upon objectives, the posted job description, and Board Policy. The sitting chancellor was evaluated in 2014 using these protocols. Each CLPCCD president is evaluated using the Administrator Performance Evaluation Process; highlighted by District-aligned goals, mutual appraisal by both chancellor and president, and formal feedback from the chancellor. Additionally, every three years the presidents undergo a multi-feedback/resource Comprehensive Evaluation Process. Board and Administrative Policies address the selection of the CLPCCD Chancellor. Despite the challenges presented by significant chancellor-level turnover in recent years, it appears the Chabot President has been evaluated in accordance with this practice. Board (Standards IV.B.1.j)

Presidents of the colleges report directly to the chancellor and have primary responsibility in planning, organization, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and addressing institutional effectiveness. The College *Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation* notes that Board Policy 2012 establishes that each president reports to the chancellor and relatedly, that BP 4115 outlines management responsibilities as delegated to the chancellor and presidents. The *Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation* evidence log provided these documents, but the team found no such documents posted on the web. (Standard IV.B.2)

The College president has guided the improvement of learning through the development of a Draft 2015-2020 Educational Master Plan, dated July 2015. While the organizational chart depicts an executive director of development and grants reporting directly to the president, page 334 of the *Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation* notes the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) does the same. Under the direction of the president, it appears

the OIR collects and distributes program review data as the undergirding of College planning. Presidential oversight of the administrative structure is evidenced by the recent addition of a new College dean position. Along with BP 2012 found in the College evidence log, the Self Study did include an organizational chart suggesting the delegation of authority from the College President to the three College vice presidents, who in turn are supported by deans, directors, and managers. The president has committed to a College governance committee redesign to be forwarded to the board for approval spring 2016. (Standards IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a, IV.B.2.b)

The College is developing a governance structure that provides a framework for the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies. The president confers regularly with Student Senate, academic, and classified leadership. She has also enhanced community relations, as evidenced by the development of the Friends of Chabot College Foundation. As the College Council chair, the president has developed a culture "modeling academic freedom and democracy in the College" (p. 337). The president leads the administrative staff meetings, delegating policy implementation to the appropriate College manager. The vice president of administrative services reports directly to the president as is charged with managing District-allocations made according to the Budget Allocation Model (BAM). Page 339 of the *Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation* document acknowledges the need for clarity and transparency within the context of a future College Shared Governance Policy and self-identified College Actionable Improvement Plan1. (Standards IV.B.2, IV.B.2.b, IV B.2.c, IV.B.2.d, IV.B.2.e)

The CLPCCD has progressed slowly toward clearly identifying authority and responsibilities between the colleges and district. A Functions and Task Map identifies primary, secondary, or shared functions across the District. This Functions and Task Map was vetted through the Chancellor's Senior Leadership Team, College Accreditation Steering Committee members, and finally approved by College Council. As written in the *Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation*, this effort has been "partially accomplished" in an effort to delineate college and district functions through a functional map that is regularly assessed. Fewer than one-in-four of the employees agreed or strongly agreed with the following survey question: "The division between District and College operational responsibilities is clearly communicated." It appears this outcome may correlate with College Plan 1 as the institution finalizes a Shared Governance Policy framework. This new framework may improve the effectiveness; facilitating discussion and communication among all constituencies. (Standards IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a)

Recent analysis resulting in a District-level leadership reorganization is evidence of a continued commitment to effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions. District Plan 3 promises a "collaborative assessment process (PR) of District Services that is available to the public" (p.343). School Services of California provided the District an analysis resulting in a new vice chancellor of educational services position as well as a Maintenance & Operations staffing plan. The *Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation* acknowledges the District and College "partially meet this standard". (Standards IV.B.3, IV.B.3.b)

In 2013, the District developed a BAM to determine a system of fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the College. A District Budget Study Group (DBSG) was formed and an outside consultant was engaged to address District and College Recommendation 2: "To meet the standards, the team recommends that the district and the college complete the evaluation of the resource allocation process in time for budget development for the 2010/11 academic year, ensuring transparency and assessing the effectiveness of resource allocations in supporting operations". The DBSG was reformed; becoming the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) and is scheduled for a future improvement review. Statements within the *Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation* acknowledge a shared understanding of "concepts and definitions and how they will be applied, will shape implementation. Assessments of and improvements to the model will be proposed by the PBC as part of their charge" (p.344). District leadership anticipates a completed evaluation cycle during the 2016-2017 year. (Standards IV.B.3, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c)

The District effectively controls its expenditures by Board Policies 6100 – 6910, delegating to the chancellor the authority to supervise procedures and assuring that the budget is managed in accordance with Title 5 and the California Community College Budget and Accounting Manual. Annual fiscal reports to the ACCJC and other evidence to the team suggest the College has no financial audit issues. (Standards IV.B.3, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.c, IV.B.3.d)

The chancellor delegates full responsibility to the respective presidents for the successful operation of the Colleges. Weekly District-wide Senior Leadership Team meetings, along with progress reports to the CLPCCD Board hold the presidents accountable for College operations. Board Policies 2012 and 4115 stipulate each college's unique programs and services as well as the president's accountability to the chancellor. The chancellor holds the presidents accountable through annual and three-year formal evaluations. (Standards IV.B.3, IV.B.3.e)

The District acts as a liaison and facilitates communication between the colleges and the governing board through monthly Chancellor's Council meetings. In accordance with the Brown Act, Board packets are made available to all constituents. Additionally, the Academic, Classified, and Student Senate leadership report out to the board each month. Several District committee redesign activities, including the evolution of the District Budget Study Group Planning to a Budget Committee, provide evidence of a commitment by the District to improve communications. For example, new District Education Support Services (ESS), Facilities, Technology (TCC), and Budget (PBC) committees may facilitate improved College and District communications. The District and Colleges have committed to clearly defining the organizational roles within the CLPCCD multi-college system. This work is a response to a 2009 ACCJC recommendation and follows changes reflected in a subsequent 2012 Midterm Report. (Standards IV.B.3, IV.B.3.e, IV.B.3.f)

Revised CLPCCD Board Policies codify district role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure institutional integrity and effectiveness. A

future *District Strategic Master Plan* promises further evaluation and communication for the purposes of improvement. The *Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation* acknowledges "District Action Plan 3: In order to fully meet the standard, the District and the Colleges will create a collaborative assessment process (PR) of the District services that is available to the public" (p.347). (Standards IV.B.3, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

Conclusion
The College and District meet this Standard.

District and College Recommendations

1. In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the board establish a regular evaluation cycle of its policies and practices, revise them when necessary, and publish for the public. (Standards IV.B.I.d, IV.B.I.e, IV.B.I.f)

2. In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the board clearly define and implement improvement outcomes from the established board self-evaluation process as a mechanism for improving board performance. (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g)

3. To increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the District and College regularly evaluate role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the Colleges in meeting educational goals. (Standards III.A.6, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g)

4. In order to increase effectiveness and ensure the Colleges can meet their missions, the team recommends the District and College regularly assess the budget allocation model (BAM) to ensure its integrity and effectiveness in adequately supporting College operations. (Standards III.D.1, III.D.3, IV.B.3, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3 d)