MIDTERM REPORT
OF CHABOT COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Submitted by

Chabot College

25555 Hesperian Boulevard

Hayward, California 94545

To:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

Chabot College submitted its 2009 Comprehensive Evaluation report in October of 2009. On January 29, 2010, the Commission notified Chabot College its accreditation was reaffirmed with a requirement that the college complete a Follow-Up Report addressing Recommendation 2 to be submitted to the Commission by October 15, 2010. The college submitted its Follow-Up Report on October 15, 2010, and on January 31, 2011; the Commission noted that Chabot College had resolved Recommendation 2, as identified in the Commission's action letter of January 29, 2010.

Subsequent to the 2009 Commission's Team Visit, a Midterm Report time-line was developed and the college initiated work to address five college and two college and district recommendations. Committees and groups with representatives involved in this work were the Faculty and Staff Professional Development Committee, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students, Student Learning and Assessment Committee (SLOAC), Technology, On-Line Learning, Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) Committee, The Learning Connection, Library and Learning Resource faculty and staff, District Budget Study Group (DBSG), Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC), Office of Academic Services and Academic and Student Services Dean's Councils, Vice President of Student Services, and the Office of Institutional Research.

A draft of the Midterm Report was reviewed by the college shared governance committees and the college president. A copy of the Midterm Report was posted on the Chabot College web for campus-wide comment and revised accordingly. In September 2012 the Midterm Report was presented to the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Board for first reading and submitted for second reading and approval at its October board meeting.

REPORT REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The institutional Midterm Report is submitted to provide narrative analysis and evidence that demonstrates how deficiencies have been resolved, describes progress on recommendations for improvement, and identifies the status of improvement plans (planning agenda items) identified in Chabot College's 2009 Comprehensive Evaluation Report.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe this report accurately describes the progress made in responding to the Commission's recommendations.

_____

Ms. Isobel F. Dvorsky, Board of Trustees PresidentDate   Date

_____

Dr. _____, Chancellor   Date
Chabot Las Positas Community College District

_____

Dr. Susan Sperling, President, Chabot College   Date

_____

Dr. George Railey, Vice President of   Date
Academic Services, Chabot College

_____

Kathy Kelley, President, Chabot College Faculty Senate   Date

_____

Yvonne Wu Craig, President, Classified Senate   Date

_____

Nicole Pinto, Student Trustee   Date

INTRODUCTION AND PLANNING OVERVIEW

Chabot College submitted its 2009 Comprehensive Evaluation report in October of 2009. On January 29, 2010, the Commission notified Chabot College its accreditation was reaffirmed with a requirement that the college complete a Follow-Up Report addressing Recommendation 2 to be submitted to the Commission by October 15, 2010. The college submitted its Follow-Up Report on October 15, 2010, and on January 31, 2011; the Commission noted that Chabot College had resolved Recommendation 2, as identified in the Commission's action letter of January 29, 2010.

A Midterm Report time-line was developed, and the college initiated work to address the five college and two college and district recommendations. Committees and groups with representatives involved in this work were the Faculty and Staff Professional Development Committee, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students, Student Learning and Assessment Committee (SLOAC), Technology, On-Line Learning, Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) Committee, The Learning Connection, Library and Learning Resource faculty and staff, District Budget Study Group (DBSG), Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC), Office of Academic Services and Academic and Student Services Dean's Councils, Vice President of Student Services, and the Office of Institutional Research.

The college and district are proud to note the commendations from the Commission Team and they are listed as follows:

Commendations:

The college received five commendations which highlighted institutional excellence in the areas of Student Services Area Outcomes Assessment and Program Review, Institutional Research and its role in supporting the development of a culture of evidence to guide the strategic planning process, Maintenance and Operations Division's effectiveness in maintaining a welcoming and pleasant physical environment and leadership in implementing green technology in campus facilities projects such as the installation of solar panels over our parking lot and LEED Silver designation for two of our newly constructed buildings. Our District Office of Human Resources was commended for its user-friendly Web page such that it "represents a best practice."

Commendation: The team commends the student services division for completing a full cycle of Service Area Outcomes, integrating Student Assessment Outcomes into program review and unit plans, and utilizing the planning and assessment process in continuous improvement efforts.

Commendation: The team found that the Office of Institutional Research has done an excellent job of creating and promoting a culture of evidence to guide the strategic planning process. The

Office is highly responsive to faculty and staff requests for a variety of research and analysis related to program improvement.

Commendation: Employees, students, and visitors appreciate the well maintained facilities and the college's extra efforts to present a pleasant and welcoming physical environment. Attractive landscaping presents a professional image for the college and extends throughout the campus. The college is dedicated to increasing utility efficiency. All buildings are being constructed to LEED silver standards. Solar power is included in all projects and will result in additional saving in future utility expenses.

Commendation: The team commends the District Office of Human Resources for creating a user-friendly Web page of personnel forms, policies, and processes. This site represents a "best practice."

Commendation: Chabot College is leading the way in its approach to exploring basic skills and improving learning in pre-collegiate courses through faculty inquiry groups across the state. A student produced documentary called "Reading between the Lives" has been widely distributed and acclaimed for its insight into the student perspective of learning preparation.

RESPONSE TO COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

This report addresses the five college recommendations and two college and district recommendations received subsequent to our October, 2009, Accreditation Team site visit and describes the actions taken by the college in response to the recommendations issued by the Commission.

SLOAC COMMITTEE RESPONDS HERE

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. (Standards I.B, I.B.I, II.A.I, II.A.I, II.A.I.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.e.f, IIA.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

   I.   **Progress Made:**

   II.   **Analysis of Results Achieved:**

   III. **Evidence:**

Recommendation 2

In order to meet the standards, 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.I.a, II.A.I.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.I.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.I, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, II.C.2)

I.   **Progress Made:**

On January 29, 2010, the Commission notified Chabot College its accreditation was reaffirmed with a requirement that the college complete a Follow-Up Report addressing Recommendation 2 to be submitted to the Commission by October 15, 2010. The college submitted its Follow-Up Report on October 15, 2010, and on January 31, 2011; the Commission noted that Chabot College had resolved Recommendation 2, as identified in the Commission's action letter of January 29, 2010.

II.   **Analysis of Results Achieved:**

The college has made great strides in integrating the results of program review with unit planning, student learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional planning and budgeting to inform its resource allocations and institutional effectiveness initiatives. The revised program review process is utilized annually and was reviewed for improvement and modified at the conclusion of the first year of its use with input from the Student Learning and Assessment Committee (SLOAC), the Budget Committee, Academic and Student Services Dean's Councils and the Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC). Student learning and program outcome assessment results are now a required element of the annual Program Review submissions, and are forwarded to the SLOAC for further review and feedback. Student success and equity data are also easily accessible and posted annually on the college website. Disciplines are required to comment on their learning from the assessments and to incorporate plans for improvement in annual plans and budget requests. Those budget requests are then reviewed in the Budget Committee, and requests are funded in keeping with both college-wide goals and discipline-specific student learning improvement priorities. This also includes efforts to integrate technology-related requests into the program review process.

Refinements continue to be made through input from faculty, administrators, and classified staff, and in Spring 2012, PRBC conducted two retreats to address institutional planning and priority setting which resulted in recommendations to improve our program review and planning processes. A one-day retreat on March 23rd identified four key areas of focus for planning improvement:

1.   Establish very clear priorities to determine mission, establish strategic goals, and allocate resources

2. Improve shared governance model as it relates to planning and resource allocation

3. Improve committee effectiveness

4. Improve relationship between Chabot and District as it relates to resource allocation and committee functioning

A subsequent two-day retreat on May 3031st focused on development of a prioritization model and drafting the college's 2012-15 Strategic Plan based on an extensive environmental data scan.

A third PRBC retreat on August 13th refined that draft plan and further developed the prioritization model.

That draft was shared with the college during our Convocation on August 16th, with feedback sessions for all college faculty, staff and administrators. The revised plan will be presented to both Senates and our Board of Trustees during the Fall, and will serve as guidance for Spring 2013 Program Review submission development and resource allocation.

The PRBC's focus for the 2012-13 academic year will be to continue our work on these four key priorities, to improve college-wide understanding of our goals and our planning processes, and to engage more members of the Chabot community in these efforts.

III. Evidence:

- **Program review documents**
- **PRBC minutes and documents**
- **PRBC retreat agendas and minutes**
- **2012-15 Draft Strategic Plan**
- **SLO cycle documents**
- **Budget Committee actions and documents**
- **Budget request documents**
- **Classified faculty prioritization documents**
- **Technology purchases**

Recommendation 3

In order to meet the Commission's 2012 Deadline the team recommends that the library and Learning Connection unit 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 research. (Standards I.A.I, I.B, I.B.I, II.B.I, II.B.3, II.B.4)

LIBRARY:

I.   Progress Made:

In response to Recommendation 3, the Chabot College Library has developed Program Level Outcomes and assessments, Service Level Outcomes and assessments and Student Learning Outcomes and assessments. The Library moved from an annual unit plan based planning model to the 3-year program review model adopted by the college. The Library has been actively engaged using data from its assessments to establish its planning goals to ensure that the library systematically evaluates library resources and services to adequately meet students' needs.

Program Level and Student Service Level Outcomes and Assessments

The first major task was the creation of Program Level Outcomes (PLOs), Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) for the library. In order to develop useful outcomes and measurements, a Library Assessment Task Force (LATF) was created. The LATF consists of five full-time librarians, one Classified staff member (Library Services Specialist), and the Dean of Language Arts.

Program Level Outcomes (PLOs) represent the broad goals the library has set for students who come in contact with the library (in person or online) while at Chabot College. During a number of library staff retreats, the staff developed a library mission statement, a vision statement and a list of core values based on the library's resources and its services that support students diverse goals (Career, academic, recreational, etc) . Accordingly, the PLOs created by the library reflect the library's statements and particularly the Core Values:

We believe in:
- facilitating access to information by providing multiple access points that support diverse student needs;
- teaching students, faculty, classified professionals, and administrators how to find, evaluate, and ethically use information in their respective academic, professional and personal lives;
- operating at a high level of professionalism and service;
- creating a safe and welcoming environment where all students want to come; and
- fostering lifetime relationships with libraries.

To date, the library has developed the following two PLOs:

PLO.1	Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives.

PLO.2	Develop a lifelong ethic of learning.

Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), based on the Program Level Outcomes mentioned above, are an attempt to capture and measure non-instructional events or activities that take place in the library, particularly, as it relates to transaction-based services that occur at the Circulation Desk and/or Audio-Visual Check-out Desk (i.e., check-out of library materials). The nature of such services presented some challenges when it came to measuring the proposed outcomes. This required LATF to work closely with the library's Classified Staff, who are responsible for managing both public service areas, and thus, can provide the most accurate representation of these non-instructional activities. Their knowledge and expertise have played a critical role in defining and measuring the library's SAOs.

A key contribution to the SAO outcomes assessment process has been the practical approach in identifying and measuring desired student outcomes. This prompted LATF to reach out to Student Services Departments such as Counseling and Financial Aid, who share similar non-instructional, transaction-based services and who were also in the midst of developing and measuring SAOs for their respective departments. Inevitably, the library's outcomes assessment process mirrors that of Counseling and Financial Aid. For example, the library has adopted the same Service Area Level Worksheet as the aforementioned departments to document and submit its SAOs to Chabot's Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SLOAC).

The table below lists the SAOs completed to date and the corresponding alignment with the library's PLOs:

SAOs:	Alignment with PLOs:
The Library will support student learning by providing secure and adequate space, conducive to study and research.	Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives.
The Library will support student learning by providing appropriate hours of operation for students to access physical library resources.	Develop a lifelong ethic of learning. Access appropriate information to achieveeducational, professional and personal objectives.
The Library will continue to acquire audio-visual materials that support student learning across the curriculum.	Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives.
Students will be able to identify their professor's name, course, and title of the textbook(s) used in their class.	Develop a lifelong ethic of learning. Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives.

In order to assess students, the LATF worked closely with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) in creating focused data to be included in the 2011 Student Satisfaction Survey, which was administered in Fall 2011. Results from this survey served as an important dataset to contrast and triangulate with data from the 2009 Student Satisfaction Survey, as well as the in-house Library Satisfaction Student Survey conducted in Fall 2011. In addition to these surveys, The LATF developed and implemented other assessment instruments designed for measuring the achievement of both SAOs and SLOs. The goal was to create a single library data source or repository from which anyone in the library or across campus can draw data for assessment and reporting purposes.

Library assessment instruments include:

Assessment Tool	Develop	Implement	Assess
Library Satisfaction Student Survey	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012
Library Programming Survey	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012
Library Satisfaction Faculty Survey	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
Library Services Survey to Student Services Faculty	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
Library Orientation Survey	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012
Library Suggestion Box	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	ongoing

Library SAOs Assessment Schedule

SAOs:	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
The Chabot College Library will provide secure and adequate space, conducive to study and research.	Create SAO		Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust
The Library will support student learning by providing appropriate hours of operation for students to access physical library resources.		Create SAO	Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust
The Library will continue to acquire audio-visual		Create	Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust

12

materials that support student learning across the curriculum.		SAO			
Students will be able to identify their professor's name, course, and title of the textbook(s) used in their class.	Create SAO and Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust		

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), unlike SAOs, focus on what occurs inside of the classroom. When it comes to the library, this is limited to Library Orientations, Library Skills 1 (LIBS 1), and Library Skills 2 (LIBS 2). In spring 2010, librarians begun to formalize the assessment of both, the Library Orientations and Library Skills courses. This required the development of unique SLOs, particularly, for Library Orientations since these are one-time instruction sessions and not semester long courses like LIBS 1 and LIBS 2; thus, it is difficult to measure the impact that Library Orientations have on student success. Despite these limitations, librarians have successfully 1) identified appropriate SLOSs, 2) developed and implemented a Library Orientation Survey, and 3) established an Assessment Schedule.

Library Orientation SLOs

Library Orientation	SLOs:	Alignment with PLOs:
Library Orientation in Rm. 119 (Computer lab with 24 work stations wi8th hands on activity)	**SLO.1:** Learn how to search Chabot Library's online catalog for materials **SLO.2:** Learn how to develop and implement a search strategy **SLO.3**: Learn how to search the Library's online databases for research on a particular topic **SLO.4:** Learn how to email and print a full-text article from an online database	Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives.
Library Orientation in Rm. 107A & 107B (Lecture conference room for up to 75 students with no hands on activity)	**SLO.1**: Learn how to search Chabot Library's online catalog for materials **SLO.2**: Learn how to develop and implement a search strategy **SLO.3:** Learn how to search the Library's online databases for research on a particular topic	Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives.

Library Orientation Assessment Schedule

Library Orientations	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
Library Orientations in Rm. 119	Draft SLOs	Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust	Assess
Library Orientations in Rm. 107A & 107B	Draft SLOs	Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust	Assess

It is worth noting that in the last year, there has been an increase in the number of requests of Library Orientations outside of the library. These are orientations conducted by a librarian in the classroom due to space limitations at the library. Although these orientations or class visits are devoid of hands-on instruction, the recent increase of requests merit the eventual development of SLOs and ensuing assessment. Similarly, the implementation of drop-in library sessions at the end of each semester, referred as "Last Minute Research" Workshops, call for future assessment.

	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Classroom Visits	Draft SLOs	Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust	Assess
"Last Minute Research" Workshops	Draft SLOs	Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust	Assess

Unlike Library Orientations, Library Courses (LIBS 1 and LIBS 2) lend themselves to a more systematic assessment of SLOs. A credit-bearing, half semester-long library course allows for the creation of an information literacy rubric, which in turn, can be used to evaluate institutional effectiveness. To this end, the library has 1) implemented SLOs for LIBS 1 and LIBS 2 by completing the Course-level Outcomes Closing-the-Loop Form, and 2) established an assessment schedule.

SLOs Assessment Schedule

Courses	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
LIBS 1	Assess	Reflect	Reflect	Implement & Adjust	Implement & Adjust	Assess

LIBS 2	Draft SLOs	Assess	Reflect	Implement & Adjust	Assess	Reflect

Course-level Outcomes

Library Courses	SLOs:	Alignment with PLOs:
LIBS 1	**SLO.1**: Develop and implement a search strategy **SLO.2**: Distinguish between popular and scholarly sources	Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives. Develop a lifelong ethic of learning.
LIBS 2	**SLO.1**: Create an annotated bibliography **SLO.2**: Evaluate information and its sources **SLO.3**: Draw references to one's personal life from materials presented in class	Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives. Develop a lifelong ethic of learning.

II.   Analysis of Results Achieved:

The library is using the result of the creation and assessment of the PLOs, SLOs, and SAOs in its planning actions. A symbiotic relationship exists between this outcome's assessment process currently underway and future allocation of institutional funding for the sustainability of resources and services at Chabot College Library. The library evaluates resources and services to ensure that identified student needs are met through the appropriate allocation of funds. In short, the library's outcomes assessment process serves as the basis for improving student success.

A major element of this process is the analysis of results achieved from assessment tools like surveys—both in-house and college-wide. To date, the library has conducted multiple in-house surveys via Survey Monkey, an online survey site.

Assessment Tool	Develop	Implement	Assess
Library Satisfaction Student Survey	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012
Library Programming Survey	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012
Library Satisfaction Faculty Survey	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
Library Services Survey to Student Services Faculty	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012
Library Orientation Survey	Spring 2011	Fall 2011	Spring 2012

Using this information, the library is completing its first 3-year cycle of Program Review. The library has implemented the following changes based on Program Level Outcomes and its outcome measures:

Access appropriate information to achieve educational, professional and personal objectives

Student Learning Outcomes:

1. LIBS 1 and LIBS 2 classes use SLOs to improve students' success and to assess what Information Literacy Skills they gain. SLOs also help instructors improve their teaching skills to meet the diverse learning skills of students. The outcomes assessment, implementation, adjustment and reflection process for LIBS 1 and LIBS 2 is well underway, and data for each course has been completed and entered into eLumen, a database that allows faculty to consistently and accurately document what students are actually learning at Chabot College. In preparation for this assignment, an LATF member will attend a series of college-wide trainings in early spring. The end goal is to have a more seamless and meaningful process for our next assessment cycle.. After the assessments, the instructor:
    a. Increased the amount of time and experiential learning on identifying and distinguishing library resources and creating MLA citations for them.
    b. Increased the amount of time and in class discussions for identifying various types of sources to be used for research—especially on periodicals.
    c. Had students create 2 MLA citations from the Library MLA handout before introducing students to use Noodlebib citation generator.

2. A*s* a result of the assessments of the surveys in the library orientations, the librarians:

    a. Confirmed the need for more computer workstations in the library in any proposed library remodel.
    b. Started offering orientation in locations outside the library (specifically Room ____)

Develop a lifelong ethic of learning.

Service Level Outcomes:

In Fall 2011, the library conducted an in-house student survey using Survey Monkey, an online survey website. The survey was designed to assess the four SAOs listed on Page 12—see survey attached. Upon completion of the survey, which was made available both in print and online, the resulting data was assessed by the librarians in spring 2012. Some of the most relevant findings include:

1.	81.6 % use the library primarily for study space
2.	51.5% use the physical library on a daily basis

3.	59.6% feel the library is open *most of the time* when they need to use it
4.	37.2% feel the noise level at the library is at a satisfactory level while 16.5% feel it's poor

1. Made the library a more inviting place to study:

   In administering our Chabot Library Student Survey (Fall 2011) we learned that 51.5% of students surveyed use the library in person daily with 35.8% using it weekly, and 81.6% of those students use the library for study space. How the physical space within the library is utilized is very important to student study. We found that many students find the noise level to be too high in the Library. Our survey results showed that 16.5% of students found the noise level to be poor, 37.2% satisfactory, 30.5% good, and 14.6% great. Students were able to provide free text comments under question 10 in which many described the noise level to be too high for them to study effectively. In Spring 2012, the library staff began to assess the Student Survey data and recommended changes to create a better library environment conducive to study and research.

   In response to these findings, as well as part of the assessment cycle, the library has adjusted accordingly. For example, the demand for more study space in the library, prompted the librarians to convert valuable office space into a silent study room, which is now in use. In addition to creating a quieter study area, the library sought to create more student study space for groups. New lounge seating and balcony tables were purchased for group study.

   This adjustment also meets the need of those students who may feel the library's noise level is too high. Another very important finding and of special interest to the entire library staff is the level of satisfaction among students when it comes to hours of operation. Survey data shows that 59.6% feel the library is open *most of the time* when they need to use it. More telling, however, are the students' comments (attached), which express a clear dissatisfaction with the current library hours. This is worth noting given the current budgetary challenges faced by the college and the district at large. It is safe to say that if library hours were furthered reduced student dissatisfaction would prevail; moreover, the library would be unable to provide the same services and resources to date.

   Through the Circulation Survey results, the library staff identified a student need in the area of reserve textbooks and materials. Students would approach the circulation desk in order to check-out the textbook for their course, but many did not know the name of their instructor, or the title of the textbook that they were utilizing in class. In turn, students often left the circulation desk without the textbook that they needed. The Circulation

Staff then developed and assessed a service area outcome to address the issue during the Fall 2012 semester. Data was collected on the number of students that could not produce the information needed to find their course textbook. Once the data was collected, the Fall 2011 semester was used to implement and adjust recommendations for the SAO.

As a result, the Circulation Staff now create a master list of all the reserve textbooks and materials for each course and instructor that has materials on reserve for student use. This list is updated each semester and is kept at the circulation desk for student use. Students can look through the list and identify their course, instructor, and title of the textbook, and then request the textbook for checkout. Students have a better chance of finding and checking out the correct materials after they utilize the list. Students also learn the importance of having accurate information about their course, instructor, and textbook title when approaching the library circulation desk for services.

III.   Evidence:

URL: http://www.chabotcollege.edu/library/accreditation.asp

LEARNING CONNECTION

I.   Progress Made:

Program Design: Unlike some learning support programs headed by full time classified staff, our program is lead by faculty discipline leads who rotate responsibility for running the tutoring labs across campus and assessing their effectiveness in relation to student need.

1. Completed full assessment cycle integrating qualitative and quantitative assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) as well as Institutional Research (IR)
   a. Revised Course Level Outcomes (CLOs)
   b. Wrote Program Level Outcomes mapping to CLOs
   c. Developed Assessment Schedule
   d. SLOs fully assessed:
   - Tutor surveys Fall 2010
   - TUTR 1B SLO assessment Fall 2009
   - TUTR 1A and 1B SLO assessment Fall 2011
   - Tutoring Lab Survey Spring 2011 and Fall 2011
   - Campus Wide Learning Assistant Student Engagement Surveys Fall 2009 through Spring 2011
   - Learning Assistant Instructor surveys Fall 2010
   - Learning Assistant Survey Fall 2010
   - IR Assessment of English, History, and Psychology 115s

   e. SAOs fully assessed:
- Tutoring Lab Survey Spring 2011 and Fall 2011
   f. Center for Teaching and Learning assessed
- Faculty Staff Development FLEX Day Surveys
- Reading Apprenticeship reports

2. Results of assessment integrated into planning for resources and services to address student needs
   a. Program Review completed Spring 2011 and 2012
- Introduced online appointment scheduling to improve access and efficiency
- Maintained half of program funding using evidence of student achievement
- Supported staffing requests using evidence of student need
   o Additional hours requested, position still pending
   o Vacancy filled with temporary replacement, permanent replacement approved
- Piloted online tutoring program to improve access
- Modified tutor training program in response to assessment
- Introduced supplemental courses to meet student needs (History and Psychology 115s)
- Offered training (RA) to support faculty in meeting identified student needs
- Offered workshops to support faculty in meeting student needs
- Designed Building 100 to meet needs identified through assessment, including faculty development needs
- Restructured website to publicize SLOs, assessment results, and Program Review
- CTL:
- CTL:
- LAC:
- LAC

3. Evaluation of services used to provide evidence of student success and to serve as a basis for further improvement
   a. Academic Learning Support needs integrated into Discipline Program Reviews across campus
   b. Program Review presented to Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC), the college-wide planning and budget committee
   c. Educational Master Plan informed by Program Review
- Facilities requested to house programs identified through assessment to meet student needs
- Infrastructure requests made in response to assessment of student needs
   o IR on student success integrated into Environmental Scan and presented at College Council [date from Karen Silva]

o Designed website to publicize PLOs, SAOs, results of assessment, program review, and institutional research

II. Analysis of Results Achieved:

Accomplishments: narrative of above

Evaluation of Process:
Though assessment of SAOs and SLOs has successfully been integrated into college planning for resources and services, a number of structural impediments remain, including lack of staff, faculty, and technological support to build and maintain processes. Cuts to the program as of last year threaten progress made…. including cutting discipline lead funding, a reduction in IR support, web support, and unfilled vacancy, SARS support…

III. Evidence:

Assessment and Outcomes:
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/learningconnection/AssessmmentandOutcomes/index.cfm

Program Review and Planning:
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/learningconnection/programreview/index.cfm

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.I, II.B.3, II.B.4, III.C, III.C.I, III.C.2)

I.   **Progress Made:**

II.   **Analysis of Results Achieved:**

III. **Evidence:**

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)

I.   **Progress Made:**

In the Fall of 2010, in order to better integrate program review, planning and budgeting, the Institutional Planning and Budget Council (IPBC) was reorganized and the Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC) was established. The IPBC charge was reviewed, revised and approved by IPBC, College Council and the Academic and Classified Senates. The most significant change involved the make-up of council membership. The majority of PRBC membership is now comprised of the chairs/designees of shared governance committees in an effort to more closely align planning and budget. Since shared governance committees assess campus needs as well as allocate college resources, it seemed a natural fit. The committee charge was also revised to include the integration of findings from college assessments and to clarify relationships with the Program Review and College Budget Committees. The new PRBC committee charge was approved on [DATE] at College Council.

PRBC was chaired in 2010-11 by Kathy Kelley, Academic Senate President and Yvonne Wu Craig, Classified Senate President. In 2011-12, Susan Sperling chaired the committee for the majority of year until she became Chabot College President whereupon PRBC elected Jan Novak who continues to chair the committee to this day. Major accomplishments since the establishment of the PRBC include:

1. A thorough review and analysis of Environmental Scan data

2. Developing recommendations from Environmental Scan data

3. Establishment and piloting of the Classified Prioritization Process

4. Review of Faculty Hiring Prioritization results

5. Review of College Budget Committee resource allocations

6. Review of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) updates

7. Revision of Program Review forms to include SLOAC functions

8. Making presentations about the integrated Program Review process at College Flex Days where the planning process, forms and resource allocation spreadsheets were reviewed

These efforts concentrated on reviewing resource allocations to ensure alignment with the Strategic Plan before they were forwarded to the College Council, coordinating the efforts of college shared governance committees through frequent updates, and reviewing data and findings from program review and assessments.

Since PRBC was a "new" committee, it was important to evaluate the effectiveness of it and other college shared governance committees. Therefore, in Spring 2011, the PRBC piloted a committee effectiveness survey with the Committee on Online Learning. Our goal is to utilize this survey tool to assess the effectiveness of our campus governance components as perceived by the members of those committees, and we plan to fully implement this survey in Spring 2013 following a new overall committee outcomes and effectiveness process that will be further developed this Fall. The PRBC Retreat in March 2012 also had a major focus on review of our current shared governance structure and effectiveness, and how to engage more of the Chabot community in shared governance.

Our plans are to:

1. Engage the committees in developing annual and 3-year goals consistent with our Strategic Planning cycle and the inputs from Program Review.

2. Update committee charters and membership annually.

3. Provide guidance/training to committee chairs on goal development and reporting, and broader participation of the College community through communication of goals, meeting agendas, and minutes on a timely basis.

4. Assess campus governance components annually in three ways:

   a. Committee self-reporting on goal achievement and membership engagement

   b. PRBC review of goals and goal achievement, as well as the communication effectiveness of each committee

   c. Committee effectiveness surveys, both of members of each committee as well as the College at large.

These plans were shared first with Committee Chairs, and then all employees of Chabot were invited to participate in goal development and informal committee effectiveness workshops during our September 6-7 FLEX days.

II.   Analysis of Results Achieved:

III.   Evidence:

- **Committee Effectiveness Survey Pilot**

- **PRBC Retreat Minutes**

- **Revised Charge of IPBC (tracked changes)**

- **Final Charge of PRBC**

- **Data Trends and Recommendations Summary**

- **Flex Day Presentation Materials**

- **Classified Prioritization Process**

Recommendation 6

In order to improve, the team recommends that the Board establish and formally adopt a clearly delineated orientation program for new Board members. (Standard IV.B.I.d, IV.B.I.e, IV.B.i.f)

I.   Progress Made:

A board policy with procedures has been written which delineates the process for orientation of new board members as well as student trustees.

II.   Analysis of Results Achieved:

The policy will be disseminated through the Chancellor's Council which is made up representatives of all major constituent groups. Once it has been disseminated and returned to the Council it will move to the Board of Trustees for approval.

The policy and procedures will be on the board agenda for first reading on October 16,2012 and 2nd reading on November 20, 2012

III.   Evidence:

Minutes from the October 16 and November 20, 2012 Board Meetings.

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)

I. Progress Made:

A meeting was held with the Interim Chancellor and college staff to determine how best to proceed with the mapping process. **It** was decided that this document should be a fluid, usable document that will delineate the relationship of the colleges with the District.

The Interim Chancellor will, after discussion with the Chancellor's Cabinet, provide a draft to be distributed to the Chancellor's Council (composed of representatives of all major constituent groups for additional discussion and input. Once all input has been received from the colleges, a formal document will be created.

This document will be presented to the Board of Trustees for information only by December,

2012.

II.   Analysis of Results Achieved:

This document will be reviewed each year by the Chancellor's Council to ensure its accuracy and usefulness.

III.   Evidence:

Minutes from Board of Trustees meetings and Chancellor's Council.

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 2010-2011 academic year, ensuring transparency and assessing the effectiveness of resource allocations in supporting operations. (Standard III.D.I, III.D.3, IV.B.3)

I.   Progress Made:

District Budget Study Group (DBSG) was formed in 2009 designed to evaluate the effectiveness and operations of the District Allocation Model. Led by a faculty member, the subgroup, known as "Nuts and Bolts" was composed of all constituent groups including faculty, classified staff, and administrators from both colleges and the District Office. The sub group was charged with the responsibility to study the structure and function of the Model and make recommendations to DBSG.

The Allocation Model was developed in the early 1990's, and is based on the 1988 California law Assembly Bill 1725. The Program-Based Funding system established within the law directed funding from the State of California to each Community College district and then to the colleges and district operations based on researched best practices percentage formulas and state wide goals. While the AB 1725 formulas were not proscriptive to the districts, (the districts were not required to use the formulas), the DBSG recommended adoption of the formulas and Model and the Board of Trustees adopted the Allocation Model in 1994. The Model was modified in 2000 to include a Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) Allocation category which takes full-time faculty salaries "off the top" before the balance is allocated to each college for supplies, equipment, capital expenses, etc. In this manner, one college does not enjoy an advantage over the other if it has a younger faculty. The FTEF Allocation category was expanded after the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) was formed. This Committee was formed as a result of the 2002 through 2005 Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Faculty Association. The FTEF Allocation change was made to include adjunct faculty costs consistent with the FTEF allocation from DEMC. In addition, the Model has several other categories, including Special Allocations, which covers retiree benefits, Allocation to Specific Sites, including grants and other local revenue, and Discretionary Allocations, which functionally balances revenue to the District Office and Maintenance and Operations sectors after the allocations are made to each college.

The Nuts and Bolts subgroup reported to DBSG during the Spring semester of 2010 that the Allocation Model was flawed and outdated. It is important to note that in the wake of the allocation categories noted above, only a small percentage of revenue remains to be Split by Model, *e.g.*, in 2009-10, just 11 percent of the District's $112.0M unrestricted revenue was indicated as Split by Model. In addition, there existed a strong perception among faculty and staff at the two colleges that the Model short-changed the colleges. In the current era of diminishing revenues from the state, funding reductions to non-instructional budgets appear to be deeper and more painful at the colleges. There may be a mathematical basis for such a phenomenon, because the allocation to the District Office is based on a flat 14.2 percent as suggested by AB 1725. This allocation includes certain administrative costs, such as funds for the Offices of the College Presidents and Administrative Vice Presidents that are in the present Model, but formally expensed within the college budgets. As part of its report to DGSG, the Nuts and Bolts subgroup recommended that DBSG critically review what constitutes District Services, to better understand what funding truly needs to be allocated for District Services and provide an appropriate level of support to the

colleges. Further, it was noted that the District has a strong and functional mechanism which is found in the DEMC which is designed to allocate instructional costs. Developing a similar mechanism for other budget areas would be one possible approach to updating the current Allocation Model. Regardless, an updated Model would need to incorporate the DEMC allocations.

In addition, DBSG expanded the charge of the Nuts and Bolts subgroup to investigate allocation models in other multi-college districts in California in Spring 2010. To this end, the Vice Chancellor of Business Services provided a survey of allocation models from other districts in California [Exhibit (2) below]. The Nuts and Bolts subgroup reviewed the survey on the basis of a list of criteria-based questions provided by various committee members and other budget-oriented personnel in the District. The result of this work, as provided to DBSG, is given as Exhibit (3) below. It is interesting to note that allocation models in other Districts seem to work in two basic formats. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) Allocation Model provides revenue from the state allocation dollars to the colleges and district sites directly according to calculated percentages— while in contrast, in a number of districts' apportionment dollars go directly to the campuses, upon which a calculated amount is reallocated back to district operations for services rendered to the campus. This latter approach was intriguing to some members of the subgroup, based how it stresses District operations as a service-providing entity. However, it may be difficult to implement such an approach within the framework of our contractual DEMC process. The DEMC allocations account for variances at one campus which has a markedly larger framework of low-productivity programs such as Nursing and Dental Hygiene. Thus, by design, the instructional dollars allocated to the campuses are not proportional to their FTES targets.

During fiscal Year 2011-12, the apportionment revenue declined by approximately 7 percent, and was further impacted by a state-wide deficit of about 2.7 percent. Most of the spending reductions came from instructional accounts reductions. Through DEMC action, instructional programs were reduced by 10 percent, resulting in $2.6M savings, with further concessions from the Faculty Association Agreement, saving an additional $1.2M. Additional savings were needed from non-instructional expenses; however, the District elected to spend down revenue reserves in order to delay a reduction of classified staff. As such, the Board of Trustees approved budgets to the sites which allowed each college to spend in excess of their revenue allocations by the Model.

In Spring 2012, DBSG became aware that extraordinary and painful cuts to non-instructional expenses would be necessary. It was also clear that using the Allocation Model would create widely disparate impacts at each college site. After much dialogue, the DBSG membership recommended that Chabot College, Las Positas College, and the District Office would each reduce spending by $1.5M, beyond the instructional savings previously identified. This recommendation was developed by discussing criteria outside of the Model and included the impact the reductions would have on each site's operations, given current expenditure patterns. Reductions, totaling $4.5M, were presented to DBSG in May, 2012.

CLPCCD has engaged a consultant, Mr. Michael Hill, to work with DBSG to develop a new Allocation Model. The initial goal is to have this new Model in place for the development of a budget for Fiscal Year 2013-14. While some believe it is an ambitious stretch goal for the District, many believe it is essential to complete this goal quickly. The necessity of accomplishing this goal is compounded by the uncertainties surrounding the passage of Governor Brown's tax initiative on the November 2012 ballot. A District-wide dialogue has begun this Fall with the promise of progress in the air.

II.Analysis of Results Achieved:

Establishing a new Allocation Model has been difficult during the current climate of budget reductions. Much effort and dialogue has been spent across the District seeking ways to support programs and services for students and this has hindered progress toward final solutions for a new model. During Summer 2012, emphasis has been placed on seeking solutions through Mr. Hall, the District Consultant for the District Budget Study Group.

The basic analysis of the "Nuts and Bolts" subgroup results was summarized for DBSG in November 2010 [Exhibit (1) below]. Basic findings are:

The Model is based on program-based funding, which was replaced by California law SB 361

1. The Model has so many items taken "off the top" that it functions more like an expense model than an allocation model. This is evidenced by the fact that less than 12 percent of the District's total revenue is actually distributed by the model
2. As revenue is reduced from the state, non-instructional expenditure reductions appear to affect the colleges disproportionately
3. The basic allocation for District Services needs to be studied and better understood.

While the State of California Budget continues to decline and the result is a dramatic reduction in education and services for students, this fact makes developing a new allocation tool especially difficult. However, the effort to develop a fair and functional allocation model would be beneficial for all District entities. Ensuring and supporting fiscal responsibility will enhance the district in serving its students with the best practices available to our communities. In the development of the current budget, it is noted that the Tentative Budget approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2012, retains the practice from the prior year, of incorporating expenditure levels at each site that are inconsistent with revenue allocations. It is clear the Board of Trustees wishes to support student learning, success, and a well-qualified faculty and support staff. The practice of allocating beyond revenues makes it essential that movement with our fiscal consultant is critical in order to sustain a balanced and fair budget into the next fiscal year.

The District acknowledges the need to develop an effective Model that determines equitable funding levels for each site. Initial discussions with the consultant, Michael Hill, have been positive. In the coming months, DBSG will need to perform closer analysis in several categories, including but not limited to spending at each site, where funding disparities persist, and how dollars can best be allocated to minimize the negative impact to college programs, and services provided to the surrounding communities. CLPCCD has met the intent and spirit of the District and College Recommendation 2 that directs the District and colleges to evaluate the resource allocation process, ensure transparency, and effectiveness of resource allocation in support of district-wide operations.

III.Evidence:

Allocation Model Issues and Recommendations Nov, 2010

      (Specific to nuts and bolts of the current model)

Allocation Model Survey, March, 2010

       (Survey of allocation mechanisms in other districts in California)

Allocation Model Questions Addressed May, 2010

       (Includes the California survey and some initial recommendations)

RESPONSE TO PLANNING AGENDA

STANDARD I: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS	
STANDARD	**STATUS**
Standard 2B: The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.	
Planning Agenda Promote awareness of the college-wide goals, the goal-setting process, and how unit planning relates to the college-wide goals	
Standard 3B: The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data.	
Planning Agenda Increase communication across the campus to make visible the collaboration and coordination between IPBC and other college committees such as Facilities, Technology, Staff Development, Program Review, and CEMC in the institutional planning process.	
Standard 4B: The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.	
Planning Agenda Increase the opportunities for classified professional staff and adjunct faculty to participate in college-wide planning.	
Standard 5B: The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.	
Planning Agenda: Expand avenues to make assessment data available and accessible to the public	

Standard	Status
Standard 6B: The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation process by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including intuitional and other research efforts.	
Planning Agenda: Establish a regular and frequent process for evaluating the planning and resource allocation processes, including institutional and other research efforts.	
Examine shared governance roles and strengthen links between committees.	
Standard 7B: The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support.	
Planning Agenda: Disseminate the results of Program Review through shared governance structure to increase the level of awareness of the systematic review of instructional programs, student services, the Library, and other learning support services.	

STANDARD II: STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES	
STANDARD	**STATUS**
Standard 1A: The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and upholds its integrity.	
Planning Agenda: Write and assess program outcomes in the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years.	
Standard 1A.a: The institution indentifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and diversity, demographics and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.	
Planning Agenda: Increase the number of students using the Assessment Testing Center	
Continue working through the SLO assessment cycle	

Standard 1A.c: The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assess student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.	
Planning Agenda: Complete SLOA cycle for each course	
Review assessments in Program Review and implement changes	
Write and implement program-level outcomes in 2009-2010	

Standard 2A.b: The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.	
Planning Agenda: Develop procedures to record and assess all program and institutional learning outcomes	

Standard 2A.c: High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.	
Planning Agenda: Examine course sequence information and insure that courses are offered accordingly	

Standard 2A.d: The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.	
Planning Agenda: Strengthen communication and coordination among the Staff Development Committee, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Instructional Technology Center to provide more on-campus opportunities for professional development in areas of identified need	
Develop a college-wide professional development plan that will provide faculty with ideas, information, and support for improving their knowledge of the learning needs of our students and methods for meeting those needs.	

Standard 2A.e:
The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of

their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.	
Planning Agenda: Create a mechanism for units to receive feedback on Unit Plans and Program Reviews from the IPBC and the Budget Committees	

Standard 2A.f:
The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees, the institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

Planning Agenda: Continue to implement the procedures for systematic evaluation and ongoing planning that have been put in place	
Standard 2A.i: The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.	
Planning Agenda: Write and assess program outcomes for degree and certificate programs and use achievement of those outcomes as the basis for awarding degrees and certificates	

Standard 2A.3:
An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas included the humanities and fine arts, at the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

Planning Agenda: Assess student achievement of stated learning outcomes of the general education program	

Standard 2A3.c:
Recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen: qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historic and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.

Planning Agenda: Assess general education learning outcomes	
Complete learning outcomes at the course and program level, and correlate them with GE outcomes	

Standard 2A5:
Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards

and are prepared of external licensure and certification.	
Planning Agenda: Create a systematic mechanism to track students in career technical education programs	

Standard 2A6:

The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about education courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its digress and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outlines.

Planning Agenda: Develop an optional basic syllabus form that can be adapted to a particular course or section and transmitted electronically	
Maintain a collection of syllabi writing resources in the Center for Teaching and Learning	

STANDARD IIB: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES	
STANDARD	**STATUS**

Standard 2B1:

The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.

Planning Agenda: Continue to expand the work of the student Equity and Success Coordinating Group college-wide to increase the percentage of student who attend Chabot upon graduating from high school	
Ensure an adequate level of support services targeted to Spanish-speaking and Hispanic students	
Revisit the growing need in the college community for Career Technical Education as identified by Clarus and other survey tools	
Re-emphasize support for transfer as an instructional priority	

Standard 2B2:

The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning (B2.a) General information, (B2.b) Requirements, (B2.c) Major policies Affecting Students, and (B2d) Locations of publications where other policies may be found.

Planning Agenda: Include Academic Freedom Statement in College publications such as the College Catalog and the *Student Handbook*	
Standard 2B.3.a The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.	
Planning Agenda: Expand support services offered to Online Learning Students	
Ensure an adequate level of support services for students at the San Leandro and Union City Centers	
Integrate online counseling services information via "The Zone" single sign-on web portal with the online course information	
Standard 2B.3.b The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.	
Palnning Agenda: Support the efforts of the ASCC to expand involvement and opportunities for all students	
Standard 2B.3.c The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.	
Planning Agenda: Implement the new Matriculation Passport System	
Increase Psychology-Counseling course offerings	
Expand and explore interventions for at-risk students	
Evaluate the effectiveness of transfer counseling	
Standard 2B.3.d The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.	
Planning Agenda: Expand the work of the Student Equity and Success Coordinating Group to involve all segments of the college community	
Continue the short- and long-range planning for maintaining status as a Hispanic	

Plan the Multicultural Center/El Centro in the new Community and Student Services Center	
Standard 2B.3.e The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.	
Planning Agenda: Continue to evaluate the College assessment instruments for accuracy and placement effectiveness in the required six year cycle	
Through the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) Committee, explore the possibility of	
mandatory assessment, orientation, and placement	
Standard 2B.3.f Student records are maintained permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained.	
Planning Agenda: Explore resources and options for consolidating all records, including the possibility of off-site data storage for back-up documentation	
Continue progress towards a records management manual with a records classification	
system based on state requirements to be utilized for staff training and reference	
Co-mingle student records from Chabot and Las Positas Colleges so that the records are	
easily accessible between colleges	
Standard 2B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.	
Planning Agenda: Refine the Unit Planning and Program Review processes as a single avenue for providing evidence and utilizing assessment results to improve services to students	
STANDARD IIC: LIBRARY & LEARNING SUPPORT SERVICES	
STANDARD	**STATUS**
Standard 2C.1a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational	

equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.	
Planning Agenda: Analyze student research habits to increase the use of the Library collections by students	
Work closely with the administration on a realistic Learning Connection budget,	
identifying additional resources for funding, such as the Chabot Foundation	
Standard 2C.1c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.	
Planning Agenda: The Portal Committee will continue to improve services and explore avenues for easier access to online library resources including online reference	
Provide more services to the weekend on-campus students	
Standard 2C.1d. The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.	
Planning Agenda: Library: Pursue the remodel and new building options	
Learning Connection:	
Purchase laptop computers and appropriate security devices	
Continue with the check-out system	
Refine staffing priorities to ensure that websites are maintained	
Standard 2C.1e. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.	
Planning Agenda: **Learning Connection:** We are proceeding appropriately in considering collaboration with other institutions or resources as we develop our projects.	

Standard 2C2.
The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Planning Agenda:	
Research and implement ways to better fulfill students' research needs in the Library and through the Library's online presence	

STANDARD IIIA: HUMAN RESOURCES

STANDARD	STATUS

Standard 3A1.a.

Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Planning Agenda:	
Implement any agreed to changes identified in the Classification Study	
Implement revised Faculty Hiring Policy when adopted	

Standard 2A4.c.	
The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.	
Planning Agenda: Update Board policy for unlawful discrimination based on Title 5 and the State's EEO Plan	

Standard A.5.b.	
With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.	
Planning Agenda: Develop and coordinate the efforts of the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Staff	
Development Committee, and the Instructional Technology Committee	

Standard A.6.
Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.