



Respectfully Submitted by:

**Chabot College**

25555 Hesperian Blvd.

Hayward, CA 94545

## Midterm Report

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC),

Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

October 1, 2019

MIDTERM REPORT – CERTIFICATION PAGE

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC),  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

From: Dr. Susan Sperling, President  
Chabot College  
25555 Hesperian Blvd.  
Hayward, CA. 94545

We certify there was broad participation/review by the campus community and believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of Chabot College.

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (Date)  
Board of Trustees

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chancellor, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (Date)

Chabot College

\_\_\_\_\_  
President, Chabot College, Chief Executive Officer (Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Academic/Faculty Senate President (Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Classified Senate President (Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Student Senate President (Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Accreditation Liaison Officer (Date)



# CHABOT COLLEGE

## MIDTERM ACCREDITATION REPORT

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | Midterm Report – Certification Page .....                              | ii |
| II.  | Chabot College Report Preparation .....                                | 1  |
|      | Background .....   | 1  |
|      | Preparation of the Midterm Report .....                                | 1  |
|      | Acknowledgements .....   | 2  |
| III. | Response to Team Recommendations and the Commission Action Letter..... | 2  |
|      | College Plan 1.....  | 2  |
|      | College Plan 2.....  | 4  |
|      | College Plan 3.....  | 5  |
| IV.  | Institutional Reporting for Quality Improvements.....                  | 6  |
|      | IV.A. Response to College Recommendations for Improvement .....        | 6  |
|      | Recommendation 2.....  | 6  |
|      | Recommendation 3.....  | 9  |
|      | Recommendation 4.....  | 11 |
|      | Recommendation 5.....  | 13 |
|      | Recommendation 6.....  | 14 |
|      | Recommendation 7.....  | 15 |
|      | IV.B. Response to District Recommendations for Improvement .....       | 18 |
|      | Recommendation 1.....  | 18 |
|      | Recommendation 2 .....   | 20 |
|      | Recommendation 3 .....   | 21 |
|      | Recommendation 4.....  | 23 |
|      | IV.C. Data Trend Analysis .....  | 25 |



## II. CHABOT COLLEGE REPORT PREPARATION

---

### BACKGROUND

Chabot College submitted its 2015 Self Evaluation report in July 2015. An evaluation team from the ACCJC visited the college in October 2015. On February 5, 2016, the Commission notified Chabot College that its accreditation was reaffirmed with a requirement that the college complete a Follow-Up Report addressing College Recommendation 1 and District Recommendation 5 to be submitted to the Commission by March 1, 2017. The college submitted its Follow-Up Report on March 1, 2017. A Follow-Up ACCJC team visited the college in April 2017, and in a letter dated June 23, 2017, the Commission noted that Chabot College had resolved College Recommendation 1 and District Recommendation 5, as identified in the Commission's action letter of February 5, 2016, reaffirming the college's accreditation.

---

### PREPARATION OF THE MIDTERM REPORT

Subsequent to the 2015 Commission's Team Visit, a Midterm Report time-line was developed by the college's Accreditation Steering Committee, (Chaired by the Vice President of Academic Services and the Faculty Senate's appointee) who initiated work to address Recommendation 1 for the Follow-Up Report and recommendations 2-7 for the Midterm Report.

College Committees involved in this work included committees from the old (2006) and new (2017) Chabot College "Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process". The committees included Faculty/Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students, Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC)/Outcomes and Assessment Committee; Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC)/Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC); Professional Development Committee; Program and Area Review. Various college departmental staffs were also involved, including the Office of Student Services, the Office of Academic Services and the President's Office.

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 website for campus-wide comment and revised accordingly. In March 15, 2019 Chabot College's Midterm report content and format was finalized. In the April 1, 2019 the Midterm Report was presented to Academic, Classified, and Student Senates and President Council. In May, 2019 the Midterm Report will be reviewed by Academic, Classified, and Student Senates, President's Counsel, and PRAC for second reading and approval. Between June – August, 2019 final copies of Chabot's Midterm Report were completed and signatures obtained. The Midterm Report was placed on the Board of Trustees agenda for approval. In September 17, 2019 the Board of Trustees approved the Midterm Report and the report was submitted to ACCJC.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank all members of the College and the District who have generously contributed to the preparation of this report.

Dr. Susan Sperling, President Chabot College, Dr. Stacy Thompson, Vice President of Academic Services, Deonne Kunkel Wu, Dean Arts, Media, and Communications, Kristin Lima, Dean Applied Technology and Business, Dale Wagener, Mon Khat Senate President, Cheree Manicki, Patricia Shannon, Heather Hernandez, Noel Adams, Donna Gibson, Jeanne Wilson, Kirti Reddy, Aubrie R. Ross, Chasity Whiteside, Katrin Field, Wing Kam, Rich Hassler, Trish Shannon, Erin Kelly, Gabriel Chaparro, Julie Coan, Rick Hassler, Stephanie Zappa, Robert Nakamoto, Na Lue, Noell Adams, Craig Shira, Cynthia Gordon da Cruz, Angela Castellanos, Megan Parker, Virginia Criswell, and Melissa Patterson.

## III. PROGRESS TOWARD COLLEGE IDENTIFIED PLANS

### COLLEGE PLAN 1

#### SHARED GOVERNANCE PROCESS

The College committed to completing the work on the shared governance committee structure and document in the 2015-2016 Academic Year. The College committed to widely communicate and share the completed structure and document. In July 2015 the Office of the President organized the recommendations into a proposal for revision of Chabot’s shared governance structures and procedures. The president presented the revised proposal, based upon the recommendations of the college community in 2014-2015, to PRBC and all three Senates for a first reading in early fall 2015. Following consultation and the gathering of any further recommendations, the revised document was resubmitted for a second reading in fall semester 2015. Following feedback in response to the second reading, the president recommended approval of the document to College Council at their last fall semester meeting in December. Following College Council approval, the final document was shared with the Board and the new processes initiated in early 2016.

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Self-Identified AIP</b> | College Plan 1<br>Structure and Document                                       |
| <b>Standards</b>           | IB.1; IIIC.2; IVA.1; IVA.5   |
| <b>Timeline</b>            | Instituted in Fall 2017;<br>Assessed: April and May 2018<br>Revised: Fall 2019 |

## Outcome

The College committed to completing the work on the shared governance committee structure and document in the 2015-2016 Academic Year. The College committed to widely communicating and sharing the completed structure and document. In July 2015 the Office of the President organized the recommendations into a proposal for revision of Chabot's shared governance structures and procedures. The president presented this revised proposal, based upon the recommendations of the college community in 2014-2015, to PRBC and all three Senates for a first reading in early fall 2015. Following consultation and the gathering of any further recommendations, the revised document was resubmitted for a second reading in fall semester 2015. Following feedback in response to the second reading, the president recommended approval of the document to College Council at their last fall semester meeting in December. Following College Council approval, the final document was shared with the Board and the new processes initiated in early 2016.

President Sperling's request was approved and in Spring 2016 the college formed an ad hoc IEPI workgroup to collaborate with the Partnership Resource Team (PRT) and further the college's progress in these areas. During their initial visit in March 2016, the PRT met with the IEPI workgroup, senior administration, Academic and Classified Senates, the College Budget Committee, and the Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC) to gain a better understanding of our focus areas and desired outcomes.

Starting with the draft shared governance structure developed by the Academic Senate as the foundational document, the IEPI Workgroup then reviewed best practices from other community colleges to develop a revised governance structure. The workgroup presented the revised governance structure to the campus community, solicited feedback to identify ways to improve the proposed structure, and developed subsequent drafts based on that feedback. The final draft of the model was approved by the senates (Academic, Classified, and Student) and the College President, and was implemented in Fall 2017.

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Workgroup gathered feedback throughout the 2017-2018 academic year and met with shared governance committee chairs and Senate Presidents on April 20, 2018, to get their perspectives. In May 2018, a Shared Governance Survey was sent college-wide requesting for feedback on the new structure and process. Preliminary results and recommendations were provided to the Senate Presidents and Committee Chairs at their Chairs Training in August 2018. The completed and final Shared Governance Assessment packet was sent to the College and Senate Presidents in February 2019 with the recommendation that the Senates, in consultation with their Committee Tri-Chairs/Co-Chairs/Chairs and Representatives, reviewed and approved in the *2017-2018 Minor Revisions & Recommendation of Major Improvements* and forward its recommendation to the College

President for approval. Once approved changes were incorporated, for the College President, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Student Senate Presidents signed the revised version of the *College Governance and Collegial Consultation Process*. The shared governance was adopted fall 2018 and its effectiveness will be assessed in Fall 2019

### Evidence

Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process 2017:  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/Accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/ChabotCollegeSharedGovernanceCollegialConsultationProcess-April2017-1.pdf>

### Conclusion

Completed

---

## COLLEGE PLAN 2

### STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The College commits to increase the number of programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes to 100% by June 2017. Complete Program-Level Outcomes (PLO) assessment and reflections and use achievement of these outcomes as an additional basis for awarding degrees and certificate by June 2017.

The College commits to increasing course level assessments to 100%. The college commits to assessing instructional level assessments. The college also commits to completing comprehensive learning outcomes assessment for all General Education (GE) course by June 2016.

The College commits to achieving the ACCJC student learning outcomes rubric from Proficiency to Sustainable Continuous Quality improvement.

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Self-Identified AIP</b> | College Plan 2<br>Student Learning Outcomes |
| <b>Standards</b>           | II.A.1; IIA.1.i; IIA.3; IIA.3a;             |
| <b>Outcome</b>             | Completed                                   |

## Evidence

Follow-Up Report:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/Accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/2017%20Chabot%20College%20followup%20report%20to%20the%20ACCJC-1.pdf>

ACCJC Letter to Chabot:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/Accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/2017-06-23%20ACCJC-CORRECTED%20LETTER%20Follow%20Up%20Report%20Visit.pdf>

## Conclusion

Completed

---

### COLLEGE PLAN 3

The College commits to developing ways to address the shortfall in equipment and library materials funding for when the Bond funding runs out.

**Self-Identified AIP**      College Plan 3  
Equipment and Library Materials Funding

**Standards**                IIC1.b; IIIC.1.c; IIIC.1.d

## Outcome

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District secured a new Bond, Measure A, and the Board of Trustees has allocated \$1.2 million equipment funding annually over the first 5 years of the Bond to Chabot College. The Planning Resource and Allocation Committee (PRAC) voted to allocate \$300,000 of this annually to Library Materials. Chabot College will request through its Shared Governance bodies allocations for additional years through the life of the Bond and continue supporting the Library. PRAC also allocated State funding through both Lottery and Instructional Equipment and Library Materials Block Grant to fund Program Review equipment and materials requests from the Library. The Instructional Services & Technology Committee allocates the funding to projects for equipment. District ITS utilizes Bond funds from their allocation for eligible equipment and technology needs annually, including for Library.

The current RAC work-group College Resource Allocation Model (CRAM) had developed plan for ongoing baseline budget allocation in Lottery and Instructional Equipment and Library Materials Block Grant. Each Division will receive a set percentage of the funding allocated from the State annually; percentage to be re-assessed on a regular cycle. Library would receive baseline



through this mechanism in these funds. The CRAM was approved at the February 20, 2019 PRAC meeting. CRAM is also discussing plan to continue Library funding through life of Bond, while beginning process of progressively moving expenditures into other funding sources, including General Fund where possible, to safeguard Library equipment and materials needs once Bond sunsets.

### **Evidence**

Minutes of PRAC 5/16/2018:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/Accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/2018-05-16-PRAC%20Minutes-Approved-09-05-2018%20Measure%20B%20Library%20Laptops.pdf>

PRAC Minutes Approval of CRAM:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/Accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/2018-05-16-Minutes-Approved-09-05-2018.pdf>

### **Conclusion**

Completed

---

## **IV.A: RESPONSE TO COLLEGE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

---

### **RECOMMENDATION 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)

---

### **COLLEGE RESPONSE**

The college has implemented a process for assessing SAO's, recording results, and integrating results in the program review and planning and allocation process.

In 2017, Chabot College revised the charge of its longstanding Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee to include Service Area Outcomes and retitled the committee Outcomes and Assessment Committee (OAC). Membership for the committee was additionally revised to include additional classified professionals and faculty from service areas. Policies for assessing SAO's were created and posted to the OAC webpage and meetings were held with service areas to support the documentation of SAO assessments, which existed prior but were not publicly documented.



As part of this process, the college's Program Review process was revised to include SAO assessment results, reflections, and planning items, which are all now publicly available on the Program Review Website under each service area.

Examples of SAO assessment, planning, and implementation include:

**The Library:** One of the library's outcomes is that students who borrow laptops from the Chabot Library will have adequate access to the technology necessary to participate and persist in the courses at the college. The outcome was assessed in 2016/2017 through check-out statistics and demographic analysis, and through student satisfaction surveys. Assessment results showed that 89% of students were satisfied, use is high for disproportionately impacted students, and higher for full time students and part time. The need for additional laptops was identified and funded. The library will continue to request additional laptops as needed through the Program Review for both additional laptops and for replacement of outdated or damaged laptops. This type of purchase is an approved expenditure from the ITS Measure A allocation as evidenced by the allocation of funds for laptops in the 2018-2019 Program Review cycle by ITS.

**The Career and Transfer Center:** One of the Career and Transfer Center's outcomes is to provide services and activities for students to explore university transfer as an option in order to make informed decisions about their future through Transfer Workshops. The outcome was assessed by tracking attendance and by making adjustments in when the services and activities were offered and topics addressed.

**Puente:** One of Puente's outcomes is that its students will complete Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) components, including assessment, orientation, and student educational plans at higher rates than the college average. The outcome was assessed by tracking completion. Ninety-six percentage of Puente students met the outcomes, and the 4% of students not completed made follow-up appointments.

---

## CONCLUSION

Chabot College has met this recommendation



---

## EVIDENCE CITED

Chabot College Website/Outcomes and Assessment Committee:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Outcome%20and%20%20Assessment%20-%20Chabot%20College.pdf>

Chabot College 2017 Follow-up Report:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/2017%20Chabot%20College%20followup%20report%20to%20the%20ACCJC-1.pdf>

Service Area Outcomes Planning Meeting Agendas:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/service%20area%20outcomes%20assessment%20meeting%20Agenda%201.pdf>

Outcome and Assessment Meeting, September 24, 2018:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/2017%20Chabot%20College%20followup%20report%20to%20the%20ACCJC-1.pdf>

Outcome & Assessment agenda November 17, 2017:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Outcomes%20and%20Assessment%20Agenda-Minutes%202017%2010%202017.pdf>

Outcome & Assessment Minutes November, 17, 2019:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Outcomes%20and%20Assessment%20Minutes%20November%2017%202017.pdf>

Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process, see page 6:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Shared%20Governance%20committee%20-%20Chabot%20College.pdf>

Service Area Outcomes Assessment Results, Reflections and Modifications in Program Review:  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Service%20Area%20Outcomes%20Assessment%20Results%20in%20Program%20Review.pdf>

ITS Bond Funding of Laptops: 2018-19 Program Technology Request –  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/governance/instructional-services-technology-committee/program-review.php>

PRAC Minutes for Measure A Library Funding 05-16-2019:  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/2018-05-16-PRAC%20Minutes-Approved-09-05-2018%20Measure%20B%20Library%20Laptops.pdf>

CRAM Workgroup's College Resource Allocation Model:  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/CRAM%20Model%20Approved%20at%20PACT%20meeting%20February%202020%202019.pdf>

CRAM model Approved at PACT meeting, February 20, 2019:  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/2019-02-20-CRAM-Workgroup-Budget-Process-Proposal-to-PRAC-Ongoing%20Library%20Funding.pdf>

---

### RECOMMENDATION 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, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, IV.A.1, 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)

---

### COLLEGE RESPONSE

In 2015, President Sperling submitted a Letter of Interest requesting technical assistance from the California Community College's Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI). In her letter, she described the college's interest in improving the nexus between our college planning and resource allocation recommendations arising through our shared governance structure. This single area of interest was defined as having three areas of focus: (1) Planning and Resource Allocation; (2) Shared Governance Structure; (3) Institutionalizing Institutional Effectiveness.

President Sperling's request was approved in Spring 2016 the college formed an ad hoc IEPI workgroup to collaborate with the Partnership Resource Team (PRT) and further the

---

college's progress in these areas. During their initial visit in March 2016, the PRT met with the IEPI workgroup, senior administration, Academic and Classified Senates, the College Budget Committee, and the Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC) to gain a better understanding of our focus areas and desired outcomes.

Starting with the draft shared governance structure developed by the Academic Senate as the foundational document, the IEPI Workgroup then reviewed best practices from other community colleges to develop a revised governance structure. The workgroup presented the revised governance structure to the campus community, solicited feedback to identify ways to improve the proposed structure, and developed subsequent drafts based on that feedback. The final draft of the model was approved by the senates (Academic, Classified, and Student) and the College President, and was implemented in Fall 2017.

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Workgroup gathered feedback throughout the 2017-2018 academic year and met with shared governance committee chairs and Senate Presidents on April 20, 2018, to get their perspectives. In May 2018, a Shared Governance Survey was sent college-wide requesting for feedback on the new structure and process. Preliminary results and recommendations were provided to the Senate Presidents and Committee Chairs at their Chairs Training in August 2018. The complete and final Shared Governance Assessment packet was sent to the College and Senate Presidents in February 2019 with the recommendation that the Senates, in consultation with their Committee Tri-Chairs/Co-Chairs/Chairs and Representatives, review and approve the *2017-2018 Minor Revisions & Recommendation of Major Improvements* and forward its recommendation to the College President for approval. Once approved changes were incorporated, for the College President, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Student Senate Presidents to sign the revised version of the *College Governance and Collegial Consultation Process*. The shared governance was adopted fall 2018 and its effectiveness will be assessed in Fall 2019

---

## CONCLUSION

Chabot College has met this recommendation.

---

## EVIDENCE CITED

Chabot College Institutional Effective Partnership Initiative (IEPI):

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Chabot%20College%20Institutional%20Effective%20Partnership%20Initiative%20-%20IEPI.pdf>



IEPI Innovation and Effectiveness Plan:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/IEPI%20Innovation%20and%20Effectiveness%20Plan%20Chabot%20College.pdf>

Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/ChabotCollegeSharedGovernanceCollegialConsultationProcess-April2017-1.pdf>

---

#### RECOMMENDATION 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)

---

#### COLLEGE RESPONSE

In spring 2014, the College identified a need to revise the classified prioritization process to better align classified hiring decisions with the integrated planning and resource allocation process. A workgroup consisting of members of the Planning, Review, and Budget Council (PRBC), Classified Senate representatives, and an administrative representative was formed to develop and propose a process. The workgroup began by reviewing the draft classified prioritization process developed and piloted at College several years prior and classified prioritization processes utilized by other community colleges. In fall 2014, the workgroup presented the revised process to the College shared governance community and it was approved by College Council and the College President in November 2014 for implementation beginning with positions requested for FY 2015-16.

As part of the approved classified prioritization process, the Classified Senate established a subcommittee called the Classified Prioritization Committee to oversee and assess the annual classified prioritization process. Below is a summary of the Classified Prioritization Committee's assessment of the process thus far.

Assessment of the first annual prioritization cycle resulted in: (1) revision of the prioritization process timeline to better align with the district and college budget calendar, and (2) revision of the program review process to require that requests for new classified professional positions be made using the *Classified Professionals Staffing Request* form which requires requesters to provide a detailed justification for the requested position.

Assessment of the second annual prioritization cycle resulted in Classified Senate making a recommendation to the College President that restricted-funded positions need to be integrated into the prioritization process. During this cycle, the College received Strong

Workforce Program funds from the state and new classified professional positions were requested through a newly created Strong Workforce Program funds allocation process at the College.

Assessment of the third annual prioritization cycle resulted in the decision to add a faculty member and an administrative representative to the Classified Prioritization Committee to increase awareness and investment in the process across constituency groups. Additionally, it was decided that in the next cycle, the prioritized list would be presented with all positions ranked in numerical order as opposed to simply indicating whether a position is a 1-high, 2-medium, or 3-low priority position as had been done in previous cycles.

Assessment of the fourth annual prioritization cycle is still underway. Preliminary assessment has revealed that the prioritization process is being utilized for unrestricted-funded positions, but restricted-funded positions continue to be prioritized through separate processes outside the current integrated planning and resource allocation process.

---

## CONCLUSION

Chabot College has met this recommendation.

---

## EVIDENCE CITED

Classified Prioritization Committee Website:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Classified%20Prioritization%20Committee%20Website-%20Chabot%20College.pdf>

Classified Prioritization Process:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Classified%20PrioritizationProcess.pdf>

Classified Professional Staffing Request Form:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/ClassifiedProfessionalStaffingRequestForm.pdf>

Classified Prioritization Committee/Senate's Recommendations to the President:

2018-19 Cycle:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Cassified%20Priortization%20Committee%20and%20Senate%20Recommendation-to-President-18-19.pdf>

2017-18 Cycle:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Classified%20Prioritization%20Recommendation-to-President-17-18.pdf>

2016-17 Cycle:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Classified%20Prioritization%20Recommendation-to-President-16-17.pdf>

2015-16 Cycle:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Classified%20Prioritization%20Recommendation%20to%20President%202015-16.pdf>

---

## RECOMMENDATION 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)

---

## COLLEGE RESPONSE

During the June 8, 2016 Deans' Planning Retreat, a draft Administrative Prioritization process was developed. This draft was reviewed by the IEPI Work Group (see IEPI Workgroup description in Recommendation #3 College Response) as part of their process to revise the College's shared governance structure. The Workgroup recommended expanding the membership of the Administrative Prioritization Committee which was listed as "All College Administrators" to include the Academic Senate President and Classified Senate President for a more global perspective in the process. The Vice President of Academic Services and Deans then discussed and further refined the Administrative Prioritization process at the Deans' Planning Retreat on March 20, 2017.

On March 28, 2017 and January, 23, 2019, the revised Administrative Prioritization process was vetted at the All College Administrator Meeting. The process was then reviewed by the Planning & Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) multiple times in Spring 2018. Academic Senate and Classified Senate Presidents took the draft to their respective Senates for feedback. One additional recommendation that was incorporated into the final version was the inclusion of 1 Faculty Association representative and 1 SEIU representative on the Administrative Prioritization Committee. PRAC voted to recommend the process on May 16, 2018 and forwarded its recommendation to President Sperling. President Sperling reviewed the recommendation with the college executive team and approved on January 29, 2019. Implementation of the new process is to begin in Spring 2019 and will be assessed in



Spring 2020 as part of the annual assessment of the shared governance structure and process. Revisions will be based on the assessment as needed.

The Administrative Prioritization Committee is included in the final vetted and approved new Shared Governance structure with the purpose to *“Prioritize new administrator position requests in alignment with the college mission and strategic plan.”*

---

## CONCLUSION

Chabot College has met this recommendation.

---

## EVIDENCE CITED

Governance – Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/ChabotCollegeSharedGovernanceCollegialConsultationProcess-April2017-1.pdf>

Administrative Prioritization Process:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/ChabotCollegeSharedGovernanceCollegialConsultationProcess-April2017-1.pdf>

---

## RECOMMENDATION 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)

---

## COLLEGE RESPONSE

All committees are currently listed on the Governance website and each committee has its own webpage. The chairs of each respective committee are responsible for keeping it updated and current as defined in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process. When requested, training is provided on how to update committee website.

All Committees follow the agenda and minutes templates with roles and responsibilities defined in the Committee Guidelines.

---

## CONCLUSION

Chabot College has met this recommendation.

---

## EVIDENCE CITED

Chabot College Shared Governance Committee Homepage:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Shared%20Governance%20committee%20-%20Chabot%20College.pdf>

Shared Governance Committee Guidelines (page 6 & 7):

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/chabotcollegesharedgovernancecollegialconsultationprocess-april2017.pdf>

---

## RECOMMENDATION 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)

---

## COLLEGE RESPONSE

The Outcomes and Assessment Committee (Formerly known as the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC)) is responsible for supporting the assessment process and recording and publicizing assessment results in collaboration with the Program Review Committee. The Program and Area Review Committee is responsible for developing, administering, and publicizing the results of the Program Review process. The Program and Area Review process includes reflecting upon assessment results, planning, and making resource requests to better meet outcomes, then at the institutional level working with the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee to use the results of program review to guide planning and allocation.

The Professional Development Committee supports the Outcomes and Assessment Committee and the Program Review Committee by working with them to offer professional development workshops and college wide conversations that develop a clear understanding of



the relationship between outcomes assessment results, program review, planning and allocation.

Since our last accreditation visit, the following college wide outcomes conversations and professional development activities have taken place to support the work:

On September 5, 2017 and January 1, 2018 the Outcomes and Assessment committee engaged the entire campus in conversation around its Institutional Learning Outcomes assessment results. The conversation included a review of assessment results, large and small group reflections and planning conversations, and planning as a college that was then recorded and folded into college wide planning efforts. Faculty and staff developed a clearer understanding of the linkages between assessment, planning and institutional effectiveness. As a result of the 2/1/18 college wide conversation, the college updated its definition of one of its ILO's, Development of the Whole Person, to include time management.

Shifting to a fully online and integrated Program and Area Review software computer application in Fall 2017 has made a substantial improvement in both our process and our outcomes. In 2017, the application provided submitters the ability to submit responses (planning and reporting) to key analysis, planning, and reporting questions as well as submit resource requests. In 2018, the application also gathered discipline plans, which reflect course and program planning. The application allowed the college, for the first time, to provide aggregated resource requests by mid-December. While we are still working out some kinks, for example, clarifying supplies versus equipment, the availability of aggregated data, both qualitative in regard to disciplines and programs, as well as quantitative in regard to resource requests, has significantly enhanced our work on integrating planning and budgeting. Work by the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee as well as all appropriate Shared Governance committees in developing and applying rubrics as well as college allocation models is in process.

In regards to providing professional development in support of the transition to the application as well as improving our understanding of how student outcomes are linked to resource planning, the Program and Area Review Committee provided extensive briefing and training opportunities as well as ongoing communication and support throughout the past two years. The Program and Area Review Committee made presentations at College Day and two training sessions were held on each Flex Day during Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. Extensive explanations, definitions, links to key documents, as well as a PowerPoint slide show that walks the viewer through the application and how to use it (as well as common errors), multiple emails with directions and explanations, weekly drop-in training sessions, and extensive email support were provided. Two training sessions were offered to administrators. Moreover, beginning in Fall 2018, key student data was provided in Tableau, which provides a graphic as well as numeric display, providing for enhanced understanding of data relationships.



---

## CONCLUSION

Chabot College has met this recommendation.

---

## EVIDENCE CITED

Outcomes and Assessment Homepage:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Outcome%20and%20%20Assessment%20-%20Chabot%20College.pdf>

March 2017 Follow-Up Report:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/March%202017%20Follow%20up%20Report%20.pdf>

Program and Area Review – Basics Page:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/Program%20and%20Area%20Review%20Basics%20-%20Chabot%20College.pdf>

ILO: Development of the Whole Person – September 5, 2017 Flex Day (pg.1)

Program & Area Review – 9/5/17 Flex Day (pg.1):

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/ILO%20Development%20of%20the%20Whole%20Person%20September%205%202017%20page%201.pdf>

February 1, 2018 Flex Day ILO: Development of the Whole Person (General Session) – 2/1/18

Flex Day (pg. 1) Curriculum and CurricUNET Training – 2/1/18 Flex Day (pg. 3)

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/February%201%202018%20Flex%20Day%20Development%20of%20the%20Whole%20Person%20General%20Session.pdf>

September 7, 2018 Flex Day: Decoding the Mystery of Program & Area Review – 9/7/18 Flex Day (pg. 4), Developing the Discipline Plan – Program Review and Enrollment Management – 9/7/18 Flex Day (pg. 5):

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/2019-midterm/docs/submissions/September%207%202018%20Decoding%20the%20Mystery%20of%20Program%20and%20Area%20Review%20%20flex%20day%20schedule%20Chabot%20College.pdf>

## IV.B. RESPONSE TO DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

### RECOMMENDATION 1

In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the Board establish a regular evaluation cycle of its policies and procedures, 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.)

### DISTRICT RESPONSE

In 2013, the District adopted a regular five-year evaluation schedule for on-going review of all Board policies and procedures. The cycle was later amended to be a six year cycle ([BP 2410](#), adopted April 16, 2013). The policies and procedures are divided into seven chapters, corresponding with the Board Policy and Procedure organizational structure. Over the course of a full review cycle, approximately 400 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures are reviewed and evaluated for currency and ease of understanding. Any revisions are made through a standardized process.

[Administrative Procedure 2410](#) outlines the inclusive and participatory process in which both Board Policies and Administrative Procedures are drafted, revised and reviewed. This process includes:

1. Anyone can propose a new or amended BP or AP. Proposals are submitted to the Chancellor's Office to be accompanied by a cover sheet explaining rationale and anticipated impact(s).
2. The Chancellor's Office reviews content for legal requirements.
3. After legal review, Chancellor's Senior Leadership Team (SLT) reviews proposal and either forwards to the next step or returns to the originator with an explanation of why it is being returned.
4. After SLT reviews, the proposal is placed on the agenda at Chancellor's Council for two readings. For the first reading, Council members distribute the proposal(s) to their respective constituent group for review and comment. Council members are to be copied on any/all comments provided. For the second reading, agreed upon recommendations are incorporated into the proposal for final review and vetting.
5. After second review, Chancellor's Council makes a recommendation to the Chancellor.
6. For Board Policies, Chancellor approved proposals are submitted to the Board of Trustees for a first and second reading. For Administrative Procedures, Chancellor approved proposals are submitted to the Board of Trustees as an information item.



At adoption of the process, because of the need to work through some chapters without delay, the normal order of the review cycle was not followed, although all of the policy and procedure chapters were reviewed and updated over the period from 2013 to 2015. At the time of its adoption, it was noted that the cycle would be fully operational, in the established order, by round three of the cycle implementations.

Chapter 1 was deferred to 2018-2019, while the colleges completed work on revising their governance and committee structures. In this current round of the cycle implementation, Chapter 1 is being addressed separately from Chapter 2. Chapter 2 will be reviewed in 2019-2020. It should be noted that revisions required by changing law or procedures are accomplished and placed into policy and/or procedure between full evaluation cycles as they arise.

In order to increase effectiveness and assure its policies and procedures are current, the District also subscribes to the Community College League of California's Policy and Procedure Services (PPS). This statewide service provides timely updates which identify any changes in law, regulation or accreditation standards and also suggests technical edits. This resource is used to make technical edits or substantive changes to policies and procedures in accordance with the procedure established in AP 2410. This process operates alongside, and in addition to, the regular review cycle to assure that the district and its colleges have the most current information with which to assure the district policies and procedures are appropriate and consistent with regulations and law.

In 2016, the CLPCCD Board policies and procedures were reorganized and moved to an online format for ease of college and public access. Explanatory information was included along with links to additional resources that identify laws and regulations which govern district and college operations. This website (<http://www.clpccd.org/board/activebps-aps.php>) is now used in policy and procedure trainings by the Community College League of California's Policy and Procedure Service as an example of ways in which colleges can effectively organize and publicize their policies.

---

## CONCLUSION

The district meets this recommendation by having a regular evaluation cycle for its policies and procedures that is being implemented, and is available for public view. Under the implementation plan, all of the policy and procedure chapters have been reviewed, with final revisions to Chapter 1 being done in 2018-19.



---

## EVIDENCE CITED

September 18, 2018 Board of Trustees informational item 8.3, [“Report on Current Status of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures.”](#)  
[Board Policy 2410](#)  
[Administrative Procedure 2410](#)  
[Chancellor’s Council – September 11, 2018](#)  
[CLPCCD website containing Board Policies and Administrative Procedures](#)

---

## RECOMMENDATION 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)

---

## COLLEGE RESPONSE

The CLPCCD Board of Trustees has a long-standing history of conducting a regular self-evaluation. The process has varied over the years, from self-administered evaluation forms to processes facilitated by consultants. The Board culture has not included transparency of evaluation results and improvement outcomes related to Board operations. However, the Board of Trustees has used the results of its self-evaluation processes (and other information, including other college and district plans and goals) to establish Board Goals and Board Priorities that have been presented in public sessions of the Board meetings, and posted online.

The Interim Chancellor is assisting the Board of Trustees in reviewing its self-evaluation process and to utilize improvement outcomes from that process to improve Board performance. Efforts are underway to determine an appropriate process to lend transparency to evaluation results and objectives that pertain to Board operations, in addition to the Board Priorities which are already publicized and posted. In addition, ACCJC Standards will be referenced where appropriate in the new process.

At its March 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Board reviewed drafts of the updated 2019-22 Board of Trustees’ Goals and Priorities. These documents were a result of work conducted by the Board during their February 23<sup>rd</sup> retreat. The Board Goals reflect goals that the Board established for themselves to achieve. These goals will become the basis of the Board’s self-evaluation that will be conducted in Fall 2019. The Board Priorities are the strategic direction set by the Board for the Chancellor to implement.

## CONCLUSION

The District and College meets this recommendation by having clearly established and articulated Board goals and priorities that institute expected outcomes and are the framework upon which the Board will conduct their self-evaluation in Fall 2019.

---

## EVIDENCE CITED

[Board of Trustees Self Evaluation conducted in Fall 2018](#)

[February 23, 2019 Board of Trustees Retreat agenda](#)

[February 23, 2019 Board of Trustees Retreat minutes](#)

[March 19, 2019 Board of Trustees meeting agenda](#)

[March 19, 2019 Board of Trustees meeting minutes](#)

[2019-22 Board of Trustee Goals](#)

[2019-22 Board of Trustee Priorities](#)

---

## 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.1a, III.C.1.d, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.f, IV.B.3.g).

---

## COLLEGE RESPONSE

The District Functions Map was first adopted by the Board of Trustees on January 16, 1996. It was later reviewed and readopted by the Board, most recently, in 2015 and 2018 and is next scheduled for review in 2021. The recent reviews have been conducted with participation from both colleges and the district, using an established process led by District and College senior leadership. The process for evaluating the functions map was established at the recommendation of constituents and college accreditation committees during the comprehensive accreditation reviews in 2014-2015. The college presidents guide assessment of the functions map at the colleges. Input is then returned for discussion and adoption by consensus of the Senior Leadership Team. The document is then included in the regular accreditation evaluation and reporting process for final review and approval.

As a result of this latest review, changes were made based on experience with the model and reflect the current view of roles and governance within the district. As an overview, one function which had been shared was changed to the colleges primary responsibility. Another five elements, originally primary or secondary to the colleges were changed to shared





responsibilities between the colleges and the district. These changes reflect the consensus of all parties in assuring the effectiveness of the colleges in meeting their goals.

Specifically, these changes are:

- Standard II. A.2.b, c, d, e, and f were changed from “shared” to the primary responsibility being at the college and secondary for the district;
- Standard II.7 changed from a primary responsibility at the college to a shared responsibility of both college and district;
- Standard II.C.1.d was changed from a secondary responsibility of the college to a shared responsibility of both college and district;
- Standard III.C.1.d and III.C.2 changed from primary responsibility of the college to a shared responsibility of both college and district;
- Standard III.D.2.a and d changed from a secondary responsibility of the college to a shared responsibility of both college and district; and,
- Standard IV.B.2.c. changed from primary college responsibility to a shared responsibility of both college and district.

In addition, clarifications were made to the summary of functions delineating centralized functions where the district is primary. For certain functions originally cast as centralized, several are now considered shared functions with the colleges based on current experience. Those functions are: Technology Development and Planning, Desktop Support, Classroom and Computer Lab Support, and Media Services/Audio Visual.

Also, edits were made to the summary to reflect the most current titles, e.g. Blackboard was changed to Canvas, reflecting the current instructional platform.

With the 2018 review and updates, the district function map accurately reflects the most current responsibilities of the district and its colleges and how they coordinate to achieve the goals of both. The review schedule assures a regular and timely review of these functions and thus responds fully to the accreditation recommendation.

---

## CONCLUSION

The District and College meets this recommendation by regularly reviewing and evaluating the delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the Colleges in meeting educational goals.

## EVIDENCE CITED

---

#### RECOMMENDATION 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, IIID.3.B.3, IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3, d).

---

#### COLLEGE RESPONSE

The District's budget allocation model (BAM) has been in place since 2013. It was developed by a district budget study group composed of representatives from both colleges and the district. This study group developed a revenue-driven model which had clear components and not only predicted revenue to each college and the district but also had a provision to build back district resources. At the time of the previous ACCJC evaluation (2015), the BAM had been in place for two years. In 2016, in order to assess the model's effectiveness, the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) established the BAM Review Subgroup. This subgroup was charged with reviewing the functioning of the BAM and recommending any changes, clarifications or additional requirements that were necessary.

The subgroup met throughout 2016 and in the spring semester of 2017 to evaluate the model and recommend any needed changes. In May 2017, the subgroup reported its recommendations to the Planning and Budget Committee.

These recommendations included:

- changing the funding method for the District Office and Maintenance & Operations (M&O) from a percentage of total to a model using the base with augmentation based on metrics;
- prior year ongoing funding (2017-18) was to be used as a base for the 2018-19 base funding for the District Office and M&O;
- Metrics for District Office and M&O were set and included increments for increase or decrease;
- Revenues that were identified as flowing through all sites were to be based on percentage change to the total budget (increase and decrease), including requiring all revenue generated through general apportionment FTES and must go through the BAM, including rollbacks;
- Revenues identified as student-centered or student-focused were to be allotted to the colleges;

- Augmentations were to be automatic unless there was decreased funding to the colleges;
- Several OPEB (Other Post Employee Benefits Funding) revisions were made to change distribution amounts to various entities and to increase OPEB reserves to the equivalent of three times the annual retiree medical benefits costs; and,
- Establishing an upper limit for unrestricted District Reserves.

A full description of each recommendation and its rationale may be found below.

With careful rationale, based on data, the Planning and Budget Committee adopted these recommendations and forwarded to the Chancellor for ratification and adoption. The Chancellor's review resulted in one change, requiring a review of the district matrices in one year rather than the two years recommended. With that change, the Chancellor approved the recommendations on April 10, 2018.

The subgroup identified two issues for further discussion: determination of appropriate reserve levels and an evaluation schedule for the model itself. During the 2018-19 year, the Planning and Budget Committee continued the discussion of appropriate level of reserves, currently 10.3 million which is 2.78 million above the district mandated 8 percent of budgeted expenditures.

The PBC determined that the model will be evaluated in the spring of every academic year. This regular evaluation schedule ensures the model's integrity and effectiveness in adequately supporting college operations and district support activities. An annual evaluation also allows for modifications as environmental changes occur, such as changes in the state funding model in 2018-19.

Also in 2018, the PBC, using the BAM, recalculated FTES and general fund accounts between the colleges and was satisfied that the model was appropriately supporting their operations. The PBC also discussed the potential impact of the state funding model on the BAM. In the fall 2018 semester, the committee agreed that there is was a need for revisions to the BAM to align with the state funding model. Based on these discussions and evaluation, an outside facilitator has been contracted with to support the PBC with this task. On March 1, 2019, Cambridge West attended the PBC meeting to initiate this work.

---

## CONCLUSION

The District and College meets this recommendation by its ongoing evaluation of the Budget Allocation Model (BAM). This ongoing evaluation not only ensures the fiscal integrity of the District and College but also provides a mechanism to improve upon district-wide resource allocations, ensuring resources are provided supporting the mission of the College.

---

---

## EVIDENCE CITED

[Planning and Budget Committee \(PBC\) website](#)

[PBC Recommendation to the Chancellor: Budget Allocation Model](#)

Budget Allocation Model (BAM)

<http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/StateCalculation.pdf>

Planning and Budget Committee BAM Recommendations

<http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/SignedRecommendationMandatedcost.pdf>

[http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/ApprovalofTrusteeElectionTrueup\\_000.pdf](http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/ApprovalofTrusteeElectionTrueup_000.pdf)

<http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/Rollbacksfrom2015-16reportingadrecalc.pdf>

<http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/Rollbacksfrom2015-16reportingadrecalc.pdf>

Recalculation Data, 11/01/2018

<http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/11-2-2018ReserveBreakout.pdf>

PBC Minutes on Recommendation

<http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/PBCMeetingNotesMar2-2018.pdf>

Board of Trustees Minutes where it was presented

[http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2018\\_May15\\_Minutes\\_Official.pdf](http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2018_May15_Minutes_Official.pdf)

---

## ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT ITEMS

### IV.C. DATA TREND ANALYSIS

To determine institution-set standards and stretch goals for Student Course Completions, Degree Completions, Certificate Completions and Transfers, Chabot College used the *standard deviation method of goal setting* (see definition below). This method was proposed by the new Coordinator of Institutional Research after discussing goal-setting processes with multiple stake holders (e.g. institutional researchers at other CA CCs, math faculty, and shared governance participants). The Planning Resource and Allocation Committee at Chabot approved the usage of the standard deviation method for goal-setting.

The “Standard Deviation Method for Goal Setting” includes gathering the most recent five years of data of a metric, then calculating the standard deviation of the metric to see how much the metric varies on average. Each year, “Institution Set Standards” are established for the coming year by multiplying the standard deviation by 1.96 and

subtracting it from the current year's actual performance. (95% of values fall 1.96 standard deviations above and below the mean.) Similarly, each year, to develop accreditation "Stretch Goals," one standard deviation is added to the current year's actual performance on a metric. (68% of values fall one standard deviation above and below the mean.)

Past annual reports have used a different method of establishing "Institution Set Standards," utilized by the previous Coordinator of Institutional Research. The previous method resulted in establishing "Institution Set Standards" that would be considered aspirational "Stretch Goals," according to ACCJC current definitions. (The previous method is likely consistent with earlier ACCJC definitions, as the outgoing coordinator was a veteran institutional researcher.) In order to adapt to the most current ACCJC definitions of "Institution Set Standards" and "Stretch Goals," as well as to use a consistent method for goal-setting across all three years, all numbers in this report have been updated to use the standard deviation method of goal setting outlined above.

For goal-setting for Licensure Pass Rates, the faculty in Dental Hygiene and Nursing chose the institution set standard of 85%. They did not choose stretch goals. For setting institution set standards for Job Placement Rates, the College uses the Federal Perkins goal of 72%. Chabot College did not establish stretch goals on these metrics.

## ACCJC Midterm Report Data Reporting Form (for reports due through Spring 2020)

### ANNUAL REPORT DATA INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS

#### STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION

(Definition: The course completion rate is calculated based on the number of student completions with a grade of C or better divided by the number of student enrollments.)

| Category<br>Comprehensive Review            | Reporting Years since |        |        |
|---|-----------------------|--------|--------|
|   | Year 1                | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Institutional Set Standard                  | 68.43%                | 69.25% | 69.37% |
| Stretch Goal                                | 69.67%                | 69.84% | 70.55% |
| Actual Performance                          | 69.64%                | 70.15% | 71.12% |
| Difference between Standard and Performance | 1.21%                 | 0.90%  | 1.75%  |
| Difference between Goal and Performance     | -0.03%                | 0.31%  | 0.57%  |

Analysis of the data:

Chabot College has done quite well with course completion rates. We have consistently stayed above our institution-set standards for all three years. Further, we almost hit our stretch goal in year one and well-exceeded our stretch goals in years two and three.  
 \*\*Notes: The numbers listed are annual course completions (summer, fall, spring) and "Year 1" refers to 2015-2016. Historically, course completion rates have little variation, likely due to the sheer number of enrollments/year. In order to be able to goal-set and analyze improvements more precisely, we have included two decimal places for this metric.

#### DEGREE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more degrees may only be counted once.)

| Category<br>Review         | Reporting Years since Comprehensive |        |        |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|
|                            | Year 1                              | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Institutional Set Standard | 631                                 | 619    | 708    |

|   |      |     |     |
|---|------|-----|-----|
| Stretch Goal                                | 856  | 821 | 988 |
| Actual Performance                          | 753  | 893 | 949 |
| Difference between Standard and Performance | 122  | 274 | 241 |
| Difference between Goal and Performance     | -103 | 72  | -39 |

\*all degree completion data are unduplicated head count

Analysis of the data:

Chabot College has seen large increases in our degree completion rates over the last several years. Similar to course completions, we have consistently stayed above our institution-set standards. We did not hit our stretch goal in year one, but far-exceeded our stretch goal for year two. In year three, we set a particularly ambitious stretch goal. While we did not reach our ambitious stretch goal, we still saw significant growth in our degree completions. We attribute our strong growth in degree completions in large part to the growth of associate degrees for transfer. \*\*Notes: The numbers listed are annual headcounts of degrees (i.e., students who earn more than one degree are only counted once). "Year 1" refers to 2015-2016.

## CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more certificate may only be counted once.)

| Category Review                             | Reporting Years since Comprehensive |        |        |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|
|   | Year 1                              | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Institutional Set Standard                  | 287                                 | 149    | 287    |
| Stretch Goal                                | 430                                 | 309    | 518    |
| Actual Performance                          | 255                                 | 440    | 469    |
| Difference between Standard and Performance | -32                                 | 291    | 182    |
| Difference between Goal and Performance     | -175                                | 131    | -49    |

Analysis of the data:

Historically, certificate completions have bounced around quite a bit at Chabot. In our first year following the ACCJC visit, we had a lower number of certificates awarded; with Chabot dipping below both our institution set standard and stretch goal. We were able to recover in the second year, with a massive increase in certificates awarded (from 255 to 440), exceeding both our institution set standard and stretch goal in 2016-17. For year three, similar to degree completions, we set a particularly ambitious stretch goal. While we did not reach this goal, we still saw growth in our degree completions, far exceeding our institution set standard. \*\*Notes: The numbers listed are annual

headcounts of certificates (i.e., students who earn more than one certificate are only counted once). "Year 1" refers to 2015-2016.

## TRANSFER

| Category Review                             | Reporting Years since Comprehensive |        |        |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|
|   | Year 1                              | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Institutional Set Standard                  | 861                                 | 848    | 781    |
| Stretch Goal                                | 953                                 | 958    | 896    |
| Actual Performance                          | 921                                 | 857    | 957    |
| Difference between Standard and Performance | 60                                  | 9      | 176    |
| Difference between Goal and Performance     | -32                                 | -101   | 61     |

Analysis of the data:

Historically, Chabot has also had some variation in numbers of students that transfer annually. In our first year following the ACCJC visit, we had a solid number of students (921) transfer to UCs, CSUs, in-state privates (ISPs), and out-of-state (OOS) colleges and universities. We exceeded our institution set standard but did not quite meet our stretch goal. Our second year following the ACCJC visit, we did not have as many students transfer. While we exceeded our institution set standard, we did not come anywhere near our stretch goal. For year three, we saw a great bounce back in our numbers of transfer students (957) exceeding both our institution set standard and stretch goal. \*\*Notes: The numbers listed include transfers to UCs (source: institution website), CSUs (source: institution website), ISPs (source: datamart) and OOSs (source: datamart). "Year 1" refers to 2015-2016.

## STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

| Category Review                  | Reporting Years since Comprehensive |                   |                  |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|                                  | Year 1                              | Year 2            | Year 3           |
| Number of Courses                | 608 <sub>1</sub>                    | 1333 <sub>2</sub> | 717 <sub>3</sub> |
| Number of Courses Assessed       | 608                                 | 1157              | 503              |
| Number of Programs               | 170                                 | 165               | 170              |
| Number of Programs Assessed      | 170                                 | 165               | 170              |
| Number of Institutional Outcomes | 5                                   | 5                 | 5                |





|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Institutional Outcomes Assessed | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Analysis of the data:

<sup>1</sup> During transition from Elumen to Curriconet, so total number of courses is based on those in college catalog but excluding exempt courses, courses with less than 15 students, and apprenticeship courses.

<sup>2</sup> During transition from Elumen to Curriconet, so all course from the catalog were entered in and made up the total courses. Year 2's number courses assessed include those assessed in year 1 and 2 because they fell within the same cycle.

<sup>3</sup> Number of courses represents those offered (on schedule) in 17-18 and were assessed during the assessment cycle due to continued cleanup and improvement of assessment reporting systems.

Chabot College is on a 3-year assessment cycle. Due to transition in systems and personnel, parameters for counting courses and tracking assessment have changed. Going forward, the Outcomes and Assessment Committee (O & A) will determine a policy to define and clarify terms and reporting periods and ensure consistent tracking for the purposes of regular and ongoing assessment.



## LICENSURE PASS RATE

(Definition: The rate is determined by the number of students who passed the licensure examination divided by the number of students who took the examination.)

| Program Name            | Institution Set Standard | Actual Performance |      |      | Difference |     |     | Stretch Goal | Difference |    |    |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------------|-----|-----|--------------|------------|----|----|
|                         |                          | Y1                 | Y2   | Y3   | Y1         | Y2  | Y3  |              | Y1         | Y2 | Y3 |
| State Dental Hygiene    | 85%                      | 100%               | 95%  | 100% | 15%        | 10% | 15% | NA           | NA         | NA | NA |
| National Dental Hygiene | 85%                      | 100%               | 95%  | 100% | 15%        | 10% | 15% | NA           | NA         | NA | NA |
| Nursing                 | 85%                      | 97%                | 100% | 100% | 12%        | 15% | 15% | NA           | NA         | NA | NA |
|                         |                          |                    |      |      |            |     |     |              |            |    |    |
|                         |                          |                    |      |      |            |     |     |              |            |    |    |
|                         |                          |                    |      |      |            |     |     |              |            |    |    |
|                         |                          |                    |      |      |            |     |     |              |            |    |    |
|                         |                          |                    |      |      |            |     |     |              |            |    |    |

## JOB PLACEMENT RATE

(Definition: The placement rate is determined by the number of students employed in the year following graduation divided by the number of students who completed the program.)

| Program Name                              | Institution Set Standard | Actual Performance |     |     | Difference |     |     | Stretch Goal | Difference |    |    |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|-----|-----|------------|-----|-----|--------------|------------|----|----|
|   |                          | Y1                 | Y2  | Y3  | Y1         | Y2  | Y3  |              | Y1         | Y2 | Y3 |
| Architecture and Architectural Technology | 72%                      |                    |     | 86% |            |     | 14% | NA           | NA         | NA | NA |
| Accounting                                | 72%                      | 71%                | 80% | 82% | -1%        | 8%  | 10% | NA           | NA         | NA | NA |
| Administration of Justice                 | 72%                      | 69%                | 86% | 75% | -3%        | 14% | 3%  | NA           | NA         | NA | NA |
| Automotive Technology                     | 72%                      | 76%                | 85% | 94% | 4%         | 13% | 22% | NA           | NA         | NA | NA |

|  |     |      |      |      |      |     |     |    |    |    |    |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|
| Business Administration                            | 72% | 75%  | 86%  | 77%  | 3%   | 14% | 5%  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Business Management                                | 72% | 84%  | 81%  | 80%  | 12%  | 9%  | 8%  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Child Development/<br>Early Care and Education     | 72% | 82%  | 80%  | 81%  | 10%  | 8%  | 9%  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Computer Information System                        | 72% |      |      | 71%  |      |     |     | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Computer Software Development                      | 72% |      | 74%  | 84%  |      | 2%  | 12% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Construction Crafts Technology                     | 72% | 100% |      | 100% | 28%  |     | 28% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Dental Occupations                                 | 72% | 100% | 100% | 95%  | 28%  | 28% | 23% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Electronics and Electric Technology                | 72% | 78%  | 87%  | 100% | 6%   | 15% | 28% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Fire Technology                                    | 72% | 86%  | 95%  | 96%  | 14%  | 23% | 24% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Manufacturing and Industrial Technology            | 72% | 66%  | 84%  | 76%  | -6%  | 12% | 4%  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Mass Communication                                 | 72% | 63%  | 87%  | 57%  | -9%  | 15% |     | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Medical Assisting                                  | 72% | 74%  | 84%  | 90%  | 2%   | 12% | 18% | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Office Technology/<br>Office Computer Applications | 72% | 76%  |      |      | 4%   |     |     | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Real Estate  | 72% | 47%  | 70%  | 76%  | -25% | -2% | 4%  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Registered Nursing                                 | 72% | 80%  | 98%  | 87%  | 8%   | 26% | 15% | NA | NA | NA | NA |

## ANNUAL FISCAL REPORT DATA

### General Fund Performance

| Category  | Reporting Years since Comprehensive Review |             |             |
|---|--|-------------|-------------|
|   | Year 1                                     | Year 2      | Year 3      |
| Revenue   | 127,434,927                                | 124,568,416 | 132,970,320 |
| Expenditures  | 115,519,238                                | 122,492,947 | 135,449,541 |
| Expenditures for Salaries and Benefits                      | 95,700,931                                 | 102,859,348 | 115,100,383 |
| Surplus/Deficit   | 9,997,372                                  | 780,940     | (4,524,604) |
| Surplus/Deficit as % Revenues (Net Operating Revenue Ratio) | 8%   | 1%          | (4%)        |
| Reserve (Primary Reserve Ratio)                             | 23%  | 22%         | 17%         |

Analysis of the data:

|   |
|---|
| The deficit is due to the district prefunded Supplemental Employee Retirement Plan in one year. |
|---|

### Other Post-Employment Benefits

|   | Year 1      | Year 2      | Year 3      |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) for OPEB        | 125,360,697 | 191,285,336 | 200,280,667 |
| Funded Ratio (Actuarial Value of Plan Assets/AAL) | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| Annual Required Contribution (ARC)                | 10,923,853  | 13,147,960  | 13,985,253  |
| Amount of Contribution to ARC                     | 5,653,785   | 6,140,696   | 7,091,795   |

Analysis of the data:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| The district is consistent in using the “pay-as-you-go” model to provide retiree health benefits. |  |
|---|--|

---

Enrollment

|   | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |
|---|--------|--------|--------|
| Actual Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTES) | 10,455 | 9,023  | 11,111 |

Analysis of the data:

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

Financial Aid

|   | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |
|---|--------|--------|--------|
| USED Official Cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD - 3 year rate) | 15%    | 17%    | 12%    |

Analysis of the data:

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|