

**IA.****Mission**

*The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.*

**Description**

The current mission statement defines the institution's purpose, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. The mission statement reads:

*Chabot College is a public comprehensive community college that prepares students to succeed in their education, progress in the workplace, and engage in the civic and cultural life of the community. Our students contribute to the intellectual, cultural, physical, and economic vitality of the region.*

*The college responds to the educational and workforce development needs of our regional population and economy. As a leader in higher education, we promote excellence and equity in our academic and student support services. We are dedicated to student learning inside and outside the classroom to support students' achievement of their educational goals.*

The focus on learning also appears in the accompanying vision statement ([Evidence RS-31](#)):

*Chabot College is a learning-centered institution with a culture of thoughtfulness and academic excellence, committed to creating a vibrant community of life-long learners.*

In addition, the college's mission and vision are supported by the following collective values ([Evidence RS-32](#)).

**Learning and Teaching**

- supporting a variety of teaching philosophies and learning modalities
- providing an environment conducive to intellectual curiosity and innovation
- encouraging collaboration that fosters learning
- engaging in ongoing reflection on learning, by students and by staff
- cultivating critical thinking in various contexts
- supporting the development of the whole person

**Community and Diversity**

- building a safe and supportive campus community
- treating one another with respect, dignity, and integrity
- practicing our work in an ethical and reflective manner

- honoring and respecting cultural diversity
- encouraging diversity in our curriculum and community of learners

#### Individual and Collective Responsibility

- taking individual responsibility for our own learning
- cultivating a sense of social and individual responsibility
- developing reflective, responsible and compassionate citizens
- playing a leadership role in the larger community
- embracing thoughtful change and innovation

The College exists in order to fulfill educational purposes that are appropriate for a public comprehensive community college—helping students pursue their educational goals in college, in the workplace, and in the community. The College is committed to excellence and equity in the academic and student support programs that help students achieve their goals.

The College is committed to preparing its students to succeed academically, in the workforce, and to engage in communal life. The mission statement expresses a dedication to achieving student learning, and it is supported by strong statements about student learning in the vision and values statements.

#### Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Chabot College mission statement defines its broad educational purposes and its intended student population. The mission, vision, and values statements articulate the College's commitment to student learning.

Awareness of the mission and vision statements is widely established—82 percent of the staff are familiar with them, an increase from 71 percent in 2008. Two-thirds of staff are familiar with the values statements (Evidence [OIR-1](#)).

#### Actionable Improvement Plan

None

**IA.1.** | *The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.*

#### Description

The commitment to student learning, engagement, and the achievement of educational goals as expressed in the mission statement is fostered throughout the institution by the ongoing establishment and refinement of curriculum, programs, and services to match the needs of the student population and the local economy.

In order to “prepare students to succeed in their education, progress in the workplace, and engage in the civic and cultural life of the community,” Chabot provides a general education curriculum, associate degree programs, career and technical education programs, remedial and basic skills instruction, and transfer courses ([Evidence RS-32](#)). Courses and programs are updated or revised systematically and new courses are developed every year in response to academic and workforce needs (Evidence I-1). The OIR provides updates about how Chabot career and technical education programs are addressing the demands of the local labor force (Evidence I-2).

The Chabot curriculum provides student learning programs and services that reflect the population’s educational goals and needs (Evidence I-3). While approximately 66 percent of students intend to transfer and/or earn an AA degree at Chabot, over 80 percent of entering students need remediation in mathematics and/or English before taking college-level courses (Evidence I-3).

In addition, almost 60 percent of students report low incomes, and 73 percent are first generation college students (Evidence I-3, Evidence I-4). Consequently, Chabot students need a variety of learning support services to succeed and persist in college. Therefore, Chabot has established a comprehensive array of student learning support services, learning communities, pathways, student services, and cocurricular activities. Chabot College provides a wide range of student support services such as orientation, academic and personal counseling, assessment, admissions and records, financial aid, and follow-up services. Services are intended to help students succeed, persist, and reach their educational goals. Current efforts include the state-supported Student Success & Support Program (SSSP), which mandates that all new students to be provided orientation, assessment, counseling, and an educational plan. Three major students program specifically target low income and/or first generation students for extra support services: Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) a TRIO Student Success grant called ASPIRE, and a TRIO success grant aimed at low-income ESL students (Evidence I-5).

Many of the learning support services were developed and continue to be improved through Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIGs) and Pilot Projects (Evidence I-6). The Learning Connection oversees a number of tutoring labs and learning support programs across campus, including the Learning Connection Center (LC), Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM Center) formerly known as the Math Lab, Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum (WRAC) Center, Language Center (ESL), World Languages Lab, Communication Studies Lab, and Learning Assistant program (peer tutors in classrooms) (Evidence I-9). These services support students in basic skills as well as transfer-level courses. Library services support the academic goals of the students through its collections, its reference and instructional programs.

Learning communities provide the academic and personal support many low- income, basic skills, and first-generation college students need. Chabot has long-established learning communities such as Daraja (basic skills and college English program for African-American students), Puente (Basic skills and college English program for Latino students), and PACE (program for working adults to obtain a college education). Newer learning communities include Change it Now! (CIN) (English and Communication program focused on social justice issues), Hayward Promise Neighborhood HPN (program for students in low-income

neighborhoods in Hayward) and Math Engineering Science Achievement MESA (program for underrepresented and disadvantaged STEM students. In addition to academic support services and learning communities, instructors in such diverse areas as Psychology, History, Fire Science, and Science have developed instructor-led study groups that provide scaffolding to help students learn how to study and understand that subject (Evidence RS-20).

In the last few years, college efforts to support low-income, first-generation basic skills students led to the development of academic pathways within supportive communities. Pathway programs are intended to assist new students in more quickly integrating into the college and their majors, so they will be more likely to persist and succeed. These communities include:

- First Year Experience (FYE): Creates supportive cohorts and provides pathways into college-level courses for new students in Athletics, CIN, STEM, Business, and HPN. Older cohort programs, such as Daraja and Puente have been aggregated with these new pathways. The college intends to expand the offerings in 2015-16 (Evidence I-7).
- Second Year FYE Expansion, fall 2015, includes new cohort pathways in Public Service/Law, Health and Community Wellness, and Creativity/Digital Media (Evidence I-10).

Numerous cocurricular opportunities help students engage in their education as well as “the civic and cultural life of the global community,” one of the college learning goals. These opportunities include student government, student clubs, speakers series (such as the annual Law and Democracy lecture to promote civic engagement), the Great Debate, Women’s History Month, Latino and African American-themed activities and programs, author readings and cultural events to promote cultural awareness, social justice events to engage students in the local community, entrepreneurial and business conferences and “pitching” competitions, honors societies in several disciplines, and many, many other activities.

The College uses various methods to assess how well it is meeting the needs of its student population. English, mathematics, and chemistry placement assessment results as well as student demand determine the balance of courses offered at the basic skills or transfer level. The OIR tracks student success and retention data, which is used to determine whether the assessment processes are effective in predicting student success and retention ([Evidence RS-12](#)). The OIR also analyzes how well the learning and student support programs are working. In spring 2014, the last 20 years of institutional research on Chabot programs were summarized in a report called, “Programs and Interventions that Work” ([Evidence RS-20](#)). The most successful programs and services in this report were used as the basis for the development of the FYE program. In addition, student satisfaction with the major college learning and student service programs is measured every other year in student surveys ([Evidence RS-6](#)).

The past six years has brought a heightened focus on student completion, and the College has used several benchmark assessments to determine if the college is meeting the mission to support student achievement towards completion of their educational goals. These include setting institutional standards for the overall outcome measures (Evidence I-11) and a

detailed analysis of the progress of student cohorts by educational goal through milestones to completion (Evidence I-11). The OIR provides periodic reports on college progress in these areas (Evidence I-12).

## Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Chabot College's student learning programs and services are aligned with the College's mission. Chabot College monitors and adjusts its offerings and services in accord with the educational and workforce needs of the local community and supports students from all backgrounds to learn, succeed, persist, and complete.

Using assessment, success, and persistence data as well as survey research, the College continually evaluates how well it is meeting the learning needs of the student population and modifies or adds educational programs and services as needed. A wide variety of proven learning support services, learning communities, academic pathways, and cocurricular opportunities address the need for support by low-income, first generation basic skills students. According to students, Chabot College is meeting their needs and addressing their learning. In the Fall 2013 Student Survey, 81 percent of the students responding were satisfied or very satisfied with their overall experience at Chabot, a 3 percent increase from the student satisfaction survey two years earlier (Evidence [OIR-2](#)). Seventy-two percent agreed or strongly agreed that they would encourage others to attend Chabot (Evidence [OIR-6](#)).

Students believe that they are learning and appreciate the help they get from campus learning support services. Eighty-three percent of the students felt they were learning something from their course(s) regardless of the grade(s) they were getting, and 75 percent felt the course work had adequately prepared them for the next level of instruction (Evidence [OIR-58](#), p. 3). Of those who used learning support services such as tutoring, WRAC, Math Lab, Communications Lab, Disabled Students Resource Center (DSRC), PACE, and the Library, 83 to 92 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with them (Evidence [OIR-58](#), p. 2). The majority (71 percent) of students agreed or strongly agreed that there is a college commitment to student learning.

## Actionable Improvement Plan

None

**IA.2.** | *The mission is approved by the governing board and published.*

### Description

The current Chabot College mission statement was approved in March 2014 by the CLPCCD BOT (Evidence I-13). The mission statement is published on the College website and in the *Catalog* ([Evidence RS-32](#)).

### Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The College has a Board-approved statement of mission that is published on the website and in the *Catalog*.

## Actionable Improvement Plan

None

**IA.3.** | *Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.*

### Description

Chabot College's current mission statement was approved in 2014. Between 2004 and 2013, the PRBC deemed the statement current, relevant, and a solid guide for the next strategic plan (Evidence I-14).

In the fall of 2013, during the routine review of the college's mission statement, the PRBC decided revisions were needed. The PRBC identified a task group to prepare and present a revised statement, which would then be reviewed by all shared governance groups by the end of the fall 2013 semester. The task group was composed of the faculty senate president, classified senate president, the faculty accreditation chair, institutional researcher, former PRBC chair, a representative from Student Services, and an administrator. The task group recommended to PRBC that the mission statement be revised to focus more on student learning and achievement and to make it more measurable and relevant to the needs of the community and workforce (Evidence I-14).

By the end of the fall 2013 term, the Faculty, Classified, and Student Senates and PRBC had approved the updated mission statement. It went to College Council on February 26, 2014 for approval (Evidence I-15). The College updated the statement on the website and in the *Catalog*, and the revised mission statement continues to be disseminated throughout the college.

### Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The College has an effective process in place for regularly reviewing and revising the mission statement. The development of the current mission statement was participatory and followed the College's governance and decision-making processes.

## Actionable Improvement Plan

None

**IA.4.** | The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.

## Description

The mission statement is used to guide the strategic planning process, and it is central for all institutional planning and decision-making endeavors.

Chabot College's mission is reflected in the *Strategic Plan* and the *Educational Master Plan* (Evidence I-17). The previous mission statement was the basis for the *2005-2015 Educational Master Plan*, and the new mission statement is being used in the development of the new educational master plan. The mission statement's commitment that—*We are dedicated to student learning inside and outside the classroom to support students' achievement of their educational goals*” is the central basis for the current 2012-15 Strategic Plan, which consists of one key objective: “to increase the number of students that achieve their educational goal in a reasonable time (Evidence I-17).

The mission statement inform decisions in multiple ways. Fulfilling the mission statement requires faculty and staff to form strategic partnerships with community, educational, and workforce organizations that will support the educational and workforce goals of the diverse student populations. The mission also promotes the development of academic and support programs that encourage students to participate in the civic and cultural life of the global community. This has led to funding and support for newer programs, such as Law and Democracy, CIN and STEM.

Since most students start at Basic Skills levels, English and mathematics courses include a balance of basic skills, degree-applicable, and transfer-level courses. Since the mission statement commits the College to providing for the educational needs of the local population and workforce, Chabot offers technical programs that prepare students for careers in occupations with the best wages and highest demand for skilled workers in the local labor market ([Evidence RS-31](#), [Evidence RS-32](#)).

## Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. A major purpose of the college as expressed by the mission statement—to help students succeed in their education—is embodied in the 2012-15 Strategic Plan Goal—to increase the number of students that achieve their educational goal (Evidence I-16). College planning documents demonstrate the use of the mission statement in developing and implementing the educational and student support programs provided by the College. The central tenet of the mission statement—commitment to student learning—is confirmed in recent student and staff surveys. The majority (71 percent) of students agreed or strongly agreed that there is a college commitment to student learning (Evidence [OIR-58](#), p. 4). An even higher number of faculty and staff (87 percent) felt that there is college commitment to student learning, a key aspect of the mission statement (Evidence [OIR-8](#)).

The majority of staff and faculty report using the mission statement in various ways for planning and guidance. In the survey, 82 percent of all staff (92 percent of FT faculty, Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 1) (Evidence [OIR-8](#)) were familiar with the Chabot vision/mission statement, and 71 percent of all staff (81 percent of FT faculty) reported using the vision/mission statement in some aspect of their work. About 60 percent of faculty and staff and 75 percent of administrators thought that institutional decision-making and planning were guided by the mission statement. All of these percentages are 10 percentage points

higher than six years ago, indicating an increased awareness and use of the mission statement in planning (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p.1, Evidence [OIR-32](#), Evidence [OIR-43](#), p. 1).

### Actionable Improvement Plan

None

## ***IB.*** ***Improving Institutional Effectiveness.***

*The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student*

### Description

Chabot College consistently demonstrates commitment to student learning across all areas of the college, aligning outcomes assessment with institutional planning, decision-making, and resource allocation via a regularly evaluated cyclical process. Of particular note this cycle are revisions in institutional processes and delivery of services, revisions that have produced multiple innovative programs and structurally integrative practices that in the upcoming years will continue to revolutionize the college's approach to student learning. Made in response to qualitative and quantitative assessment, though established, transparent processes, the implementation of a continuous evaluation and revision cycle to student assessment and planning and budgeting processes demonstrates Chabot's institutional commitment to assessing identified student learning needs and integrating the outcomes into budgeting and planning.

During this cycle the College has made the following ongoing improvements to student learning assessment and institutional planning and budgeting processes:

- Integrated student learning and service area assessment fully into PR to be used as the basis of evaluation, recommendations, and decision-making
- Integrated the Strategic Plan Goal fully into PR
- Transitioned the Institutional Planning and Budget Committee (IPBC) to the PRBC as the primary Shared Governance recommending body. PRBC integrates and assesses college planning, including revising the PR processes and forms; integrating student learning outcomes and service area assessment into PR as the basis of decision-making; drafting the College Strategic Plan, including goals; regularly reviewing data to ascertain progress; reading and integrating PRs across campus, coordinating the



- Educational Master Plan*, using PR for recommendations to the Budget and hiring prioritization committees, and assessing institutional effectiveness
- Increased institutional funding support for Chair of PRBC to support institutional planning and effectiveness
  - Integrated PRBC into District's Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) to align with district processes
  - Revised and updated College Mission, Goals and Values
  - Updated Chabot's institutional process and policy committee charges. In process of updating document, *Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process* in response to assessment of institutional effectiveness
  - Aligned *Educational Master Plan* with *Mission Statement* and Strategic Goal Plan. Started process for the new *Educational Master Plan*.
  - Updated College Council charter as the final approving body for college strategic planning and budgeting
  - Assessed and reviewed the PR process annually, including integrating Course Level Outcomes (CLOs) assessment reflections into PR, evaluating and integrating the use of SAOs in PR, transitioning from eLumen to Curricunet to more effectively and efficiently manage data, and revising the process for assessing GE outcomes using the results from first cycle evaluations
  - Initiated hiring of a Dean of Academic Programs and Student Success to support learning outcomes assessment, accreditation, and program alignment.

Detailed below are particulars as supported by evidence.

### ***IB.1. Improving Institutional Effectiveness.***

*The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes*

#### **Description**

Chabot College maintains an ongoing dialogue around continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes at all levels of the organization and in both informal and structured settings. Informal discussions around both student learning and institutional effectiveness range from one-on-one hallway discussions to campus ongoing email dialogues on current topics. Structured dialogue happens in discipline and division meetings, program faculty, and all-college committees in accordance with Chabot's policy document, the *Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process*, (2006) and revisions to committee charges since 2006 on the committees' respective webpages (Evidence I-19).

## Improvement of Student Learning

*The PR and Student Learning Outcomes:* Dialogue around student learning takes place at all levels of the institution with PR as the central organizing mechanism. All disciplines and programs assess learning outcomes, reflect on their assessments, and review their programs, tying program development and needs, including resource requests, to identified student learning needs and the college's strategic plan goal. The PR submissions are submitted to the PRBC and each area's administrator. Discipline, Program, and Service Area Submissions are made publicly available and provide the basis of college discussion and planning (Evidence I-20).

Details for each phase of this process include:

- Programs assess learning and discuss results. The College allocates time during Flex Days.
- Programs may elect to hold additional retreats or to hold additional meetings to consider learning outcomes and potential program revisions and recommendations. For instance, the Mathematics Subdivision in response to its assessment of SLOs held a multiple retreats to revise philosophy, consider the assessment process, and make needed improvements to its program (Evidence I-21).
- Program, discipline, and service area dialogue is documented in PR and submitted to the PRBC and the appropriate supervisor, the PR Submission is made publicly available (Evidence I-20).
- Deans and other administrators read PR submissions and synthesize the results for the division or service area. They submit summaries to PRBC, and these summaries are made publicly available. Together with the PR submission, they form the basis for college planning and budgeting (Evidence I-14).
- The PR submissions are integrated into the process to create both the new College *Educational Master Plan* and the new District Strategic Plan. For example, in 2014 each program was asked to include long-term vision statements with submissions. Deans submitted a synthesis and the writers of the *Educational Master Plan* read both, identifying common themes and roadblocks for the colleges and district to consider. Additional forums were held where faculty and staff could speak to the learning needs of students. Recommendations made at these forums were organized into the categories of Facilities, Student Support, and Technology.
- Senior administrators discuss the results of PR in meetings and hold administrative retreats for evaluation and planning purposes. For example, following the submission of PR, the Vice President of Academic Services held a strategic planning retreat.
- The PRBC reads and synthesizes PR submissions, then makes recommendations to appropriate shared governance committees on identified areas of need.
- The PRBC routinely discusses the PR submissions and data provided by the OIR to guide college planning. Over the past four years, using these data sources, the college committed to multiple college initiatives. This process and commitment demonstrates

Chabot's commitment to assessment, evaluation, and integrated planning and budgeting in order to improve student learning.

- Progress towards meeting college student learning and success initiatives are measured and regularly reviewed.

All of these discussions and recommendations are documented in the minutes of the PRBC (Evidence I-14).

The cyclical process described has developed over time. Each year, the college has made improvements. This past year, the Budget Committee and personnel prioritization committees formally revised their processes to include receiving input from the PRBC and using OIR data.

The PR process formally and explicitly locates SLOs assessment in PR. Thus, reviewing the Chabot's history with SLOs will be helpful. The dialogue about SLOs began at Chabot in 2003. Between 2003 and 2005, faculty leaders attended workshops on SLOs. In spring 2004, the College Mission and Vision statements were revised to include commitments to student learning. In Fall 2004, Institutional Learning Outcomes, which would become the College-Wide Learning Goals (CWLGs) were developed in a series of campus forums. On Convocation Day in fall 2005, the SLO assessment cycle was introduced to the College as a whole, and the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC) was formed.

Since then, the SLOAC and PRBC have guided the dialogue about SLOs across campus and within disciplines at Convocations, on Flex Days, and in other forums (Evidence I-22). Between fall 2007 and spring 2009, faculty wrote the first SLOs for each course in their disciplines and designed rubrics for assessment. Since then, the assessment cycle of writing, assessing, discussing, and revising SLOs has been incorporated into the iterative processes of program planning and curriculum review. Faculty assess learning outcomes every three years in each course, meet with colleagues to discuss the results of the assessments, and 'close the loop' of continuous improvement by recording any insights or next steps to improve student learning. Since 2010, reporting on course and program student learning assessment, including recommendations and resource needs, has included in annually submitted PR as described previously. Since 2012, the PRBC has read and synthesized the results of PR and, which forms the basis for resource allocation recommendations. Recent recommendations have included: hiring of staff support in the LC, recommendations for additional administrative staffing, implementation of program pilots, including the FYE and Peer Mentoring program, and the development of Pathway programs.

### **College Committees and Groups and Student Learning Assessment**

Student learning similarly centers the work of committees and work groups, many of whom report to or are members of PRBC. These committees include the Basic Skills Committee (BSC), with its associated FIGs, The Presidential Task Force (a PRBC work group), and the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Committee. Each of these plays a vital role on PRBC, representing interests focused on improving student learning and success. During the past six years, these groups have played a leadership role in conducting research and designing academic activities intended to make a difference in student learning, success and persistence in support of Chabot's Strategic Plan Goal and Institutional Outcomes. They have

further extended the dialogue about student learning to all faculty and staff by providing presentations, activities, and workshops during Convocation and Flex Days, as well as holding regular meetings (Evidence I-23).

The BSC has led a long-term dialogue on the factors that help students, who are 85 percent basic skills students, to learn, succeed, and progress at Chabot. In 2009-10, the BSC developed a strategic plan that mapped out a path to provide students with the support to progress through basic skills to college-level courses (Evidence I-24). Using a wealth of OIR data that has carefully monitored what works and what does not, the committee has overseen the use of Federal Title III funds and State Basic Skills Initiative funds to encourage faculty to pilot and institutionalize practices that encourage student learning and success (Evidence I-23, [Evidence RS-20](#)).

The BSC is a key example of how a focus on learning, assessment, and data-driven decision-making is used in strategic planning and budgeting. In 2011-12, the Chair of Basic Skills Committee synthesized OIR data and other data on basic skills students into a narrative about barriers to new student success and presented it to the BSC, PRBC, the Student Services Advisory Committee, and CEMC. A joint PRBC/Basic Skills working group formed to continue the dialogue about the issues and make recommendations. This group made recommendations to Student Services and PRBC that became part of the strategic plan, drove the commitment to a single strategic plan goal, and contributed to the development of strategic plan initiatives to improve student learning (Evidence I-14).

Chabot uses FIGs as a mechanism for encouraging faculty to use student learning assessment to generate a question intended to achieve improvement. This question then becomes the focus of a shared research inquiry. All FIGs are focused on some aspect of how to improve student learning and success. Research inquiries have included Reading Apprenticeship, Habits of Mind, English Assessment, Equity, mathematics curriculum, learning support, etc. In addition to supporting dialogue on student learning within the FIG, these groups broaden the conversation across the campus by leading conversations and presenting findings at Flex Day.

In the fall of 2013, President Susan Sperling convened a campus Task Force to focus on strategic plan initiatives designed to improve student learning, specifically, she intended to bring dispersed and diffuse efforts across the campus into dialogue with one another. The Presidential Task Force met regularly for a year to broaden the conversation around student learning and synthesize initiatives under development with the objective to “*coordinate initiatives designed to create an infrastructure and environment that directly supports students to move from entry to engagement to achievement; aligning services, learning support, academics, and community to function in an integrated and intentional manner.*” As a work group reporting to PRBC, this task force coordinated efforts in terms of campus outreach, alignment, implementation, and institutionalization.

The SSSP Committee has met the last few years to discuss student learning and support. While much of the focus has been on implementation of legislatively mandated programs and services, this new categorical program has facilitated much dialogue about student needs and support for learning within Student Services. Representatives of the SSSP serve on the Presidential Task Force and PRBC. In each case, these representatives have played vital roles

in the work to align programs and services, to read and synthesize PR, and to make strategic and budget recommendations.

Individuals who serve on PRBC regularly review data on student learning and success. As a consequence, the PRBC has become marked by a particularly student-learning focused perspective, which has in turn shifted campus culture towards a continual use of qualitative and quantitative data (beginning with student learning assessment). The outcome has been in a deeper understanding of students' challenges to reach their educational goals, which triggered still further shifts in processes and the development of initiatives to meet identified student and institutional needs. Student learning assessment is the foundation for these efforts.

### **Continuous Improvement of Institutional Processes**

The PRBC meets regularly twice a month, with additional meetings schedule as necessary. The agenda regularly contains the topic of institution effectiveness. Significant improvements in processes have continued as each year, the PRBC evaluates the process from the previous year and makes recommendations for improvement, for example:

- In fall 2010, the PRBC discussed at length the three year cycle of PR, clarifying the work of each year.
- In 2012, the PRBC discussed how to better document the results of learning outcomes assessment reflections, which led to the inclusion of SLO assessment reflection in PR.
- In spring 2012, the PRBC chair and a faculty colleague led a retreat to improve the effectiveness of shared governance and decision-making at Chabot. The PRBC and other campus leaders reviewed and discussed shared governance, reporting and committee structures, how decisions are made and should be made, and suggested changes in the reporting or committee structures. This retreat provided a forum to discuss major issues of governance and decision-making, and the recommendations were shared with PRBC. While this retreat did not result in any major changes to the governance or committee structure, it began the dialogue about the priorities of the college and how to make decisions among them, which led to an atmosphere of mutual trust and respectful dialogue that would continue into the next year when the current strategic plan was developed.
- In fall 2013, after extensive discussion, the submission date for PR was revised to align with personnel prioritization and budget planning processes. Additional dialogue continued on what decisions or recommendations PRBC makes, how it makes them, and to whom the recommendations are made.
- In spring 2012 and again in fall 2014, campus committees reviewed their charters and membership, as did PRBC.
- Building on previous retreat work, in fall 2014, three retreats were held to solidify recommendations to amend college committee reporting structure, including proposals to alter PRBC membership to include division representatives; more clearly delineating the roles and responsibilities of PRBC versus Academic Senate; and streamlining lining communication between committees (Evidence I-25). These retreats

were followed in spring 2015 by review of the proposals by committees and individuals across campus to provide feedback.

- Dialogues on institutional effectiveness occur in committees, councils, and in all-college forums, whenever data on student learning outcomes, curriculum, and college structure are reviewed and discussed. Committees regularly review their charters and update membership.
- The PRBC initiated a series of workshops and meetings in 2014-2015 to consult with all shared governance constituencies regarding assessment of and recommended changes to Chabot's shared governance policies and procedures. This institutional self-reflection yielded a number of thoughtful recommendations on strengthening structures and processes of college shared governance procedures in order to improve their overall effectiveness. Major issues engaged were refining and lessening the proliferation of committees, the improvement of communication between committees, better delineation of committee charges, and strengthening the nexus between strategic planning and resource allocation.
- The Faculty Senate convened a subcommittee in spring of 2015 to review these recommendations and to produce a document reflecting Faculty Senate perspectives and recommendations. These consultative processes are documented in the 2014-2015 minutes of the PRBC and Faculty Senate as well as in additional documents summarizing the recommendations of the 3 day shared governance workshops.

All of these discussions, evaluations, and processes are documented in the minutes of the PRBC (Evidence I-14).

## Evaluation

Chabot meets the Standard. Self-reflective and broad-based dialogue around student learning and institutional effectiveness occurs on an ongoing basis. It has resulted in practices that increase student learning and an integrated program review, including student learning assessment and strategic planning and budgeting process. Over the past six years, the College believes that solid gains have been made towards increased student learning, success, persistence, and completion. The most important work has been in assessing student learning outcomes then using that data to show strengths and weaknesses in student learning, success, persistence, and completion patterns. Using the information in this way has provided important insights about classroom pedagogy, discipline and program patterns, college policies, processes, and resources, which in turn led to change throughout the institution. While current changes in state policy are accelerating movement to close achievement and opportunity gaps, Chabot College had already identified the need to increase access to matriculation services, to improve access to key course sequences, to support students in identifying pathways and programs, and to provide increased support, counseling, and mentoring.

In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, 86 percent of full-time faculty reported participating in dialogues about improving student learning in college committees, and over 90 percent had these conversations in each of the other identified settings—during Flex Day activities (92 percent), in discipline and division meetings (95 percent), and with one or more colleagues

(98 percent), and, informally, in the hallways (95 percent) (Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 3). About 90 percent of full-time faculty said that they “participated in thoughtful, reflective dialogues about the improvement of institutional effectiveness” most often in “meetings with one or more colleagues.” Even more faculty had participated in such dialogue in division and discipline meetings or “informally in hallways or offices.” A significant majority of faculty had dialogues on institutional effectiveness on college Flex Days (87 percent) and in college committees (86 percent). An average of 90 percent of full-time faculty and 93 percent of administrators participated in these dialogues across each of these settings.

### Actionable Improvement Plan

**College Plan 1:** The College commits to completing the work on the shared governance committee structure and document in the 2015-2016 Academic Year. The College commits to widely communicate and share the completed structure and document. In July 2015 the Office of the President will organize the recommendations into a proposal for revision of Chabot’s shared governance structures and procedures. The president will present this revision 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 will be resubmitted for a second reading in fall semester 2015. Following feedback in response to the second reading, the president will recommend approval of the document to College Council at their last fall semester meeting in December. Following College Council approval, the final document will be shared with the Board and the new processes initiated in early 2016.

### **IB.2.**

*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.*

### **IB.3.**

*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 analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.*

### Description

Chabot College sets measurable goals and widely discusses results. The college determines its institutional goals and objectives during the development of its three-year Strategic Plan Goal, and through a yearly priority-setting exercise. The goals, objectives, and strategies for the Strategic Plan are set by PRBC during strategic planning retreats and meetings. Before developing or revising the Strategic Plan, PRBC members have reviewed the vision and mission of the college, the *Educational Master Plan*, progress on previous Strategic Plan goals and objectives, updated internal and external environmental scan data, read PR

submissions, and student and staff surveys. The objective is to choose goals and objectives that support the mission of the college and move forward educational programs and services that support students in achieving their educational goals.

**2012-2015 Strategic Goal Plan:** In May 2012, the newly elected chair of PRBC initiated a process to revise the Strategic Plan for 2012-15. In light of severe budget constraints and threats of more cuts, she also proposed that PRBC lead an effort to “Establish a framework for prioritizing transfer programs, vocational programs, and courses; discuss Basic Skills and ways to help students define and achieve their goals; establish a framework for prioritizing learning support and students engagement programs” (Evidence I-14). In preparation for a May 2012 retreat to begin this process, PRBC members reviewed a long list of available data and resources to inform the planning and prioritizing process. For the retreat, the following materials were prepared and presented by the PRBC Chair and the Coordinator of Institutional Research:

- Chabot Student Characteristics, particularly educational goals, assessment levels, and income levels
- Research on career and educational pathways (Evidence I-1, Evidence I-2), in particular: Chabot student transfer majors, and how they compared to the largest majors in the CSU and UC campuses that most transfers attend, and the local jobs and salaries of Bachelor’s graduates, and Chabot student career and technical education majors, and the local jobs and salaries available for students with an AA degree or certificate in those programs
- Research on Chabot Basic Skills students, their assessment levels, their success and persistence, and what the College know about what they need to be successful.
- Cost and FTES or service data for all disciplines and for learning support, student engagement, and student services programs
- Chabot College 2009-12 Strategic Plan Goals, Strategies, and Objectives
- Strategic Plan Goals from other colleges

At two PRBC retreats in May and August 2012, PRBC members examined these resources to draft a Strategic Plan, based on the institutional research data that was presented at the retreats (Evidence I-14). The retreats led to the development of a proposed 2012-15 Strategic Plan.

The proposed Strategic Plan for 2012-15 was shared with the college at the Fall 2012 Convocation. Additional input was gathered from faculty and classified staff on that day. From this feedback, PRBC held one more retreat, and the 2012-15 Strategic Plan was finalized and approved in August 2012. It was then distributed to faculty and staff to inform PR for the 2013-14 academic year. The 2012–15 Strategic Plan is an expression and implementation of the Chabot College mission as a comprehensive community college committed to student learning. The vast majority of students come to Chabot to achieve an educational goal. Research at Chabot and other community colleges indicates that students that identify an educational goal early and start on that pathway are far more likely to complete. To that end, Chabot College has committed to a single goal for the Strategic Plan.



That goal is to: “Increase the number of students that achieve their educational goal within a reasonable time by clarifying pathways and providing more information and support.”

Chabot’s strategic goal plan aligns with the college’s mission statement, which concludes with a commitment to student learning: “We are dedicated to student learning inside and outside the classroom to support students’ achievement of their educational goals” ([Evidence RS-31](#)). Any improvement in students’ achievement of their educational goals is based on the improvement of student learning. To ensure that students are prepared at program completion with the skills and knowledge to succeed in employment or transfer to a four-year program, the college is committed to considering student learning first in every decision, policy, program and practice. The College goal also aligns with the CCCO System Strategic Plan as well as the ARCC and Scorecard Reports, which were all focusing on outcomes.

In addition to setting an overall goal, PRBC committed to nine strategies for meeting its goal and mapped initiatives across campus that were developing projects that supported the effort. These initiatives arose from extensive dialogue across the campus in multiple committees (Evidence I-14). The President then formed a task force reporting to PRBC to coordinate and align efforts designed to meet the strategic plan goal, including: obtaining needed grants, building infrastructure, and designing program components. These efforts eventually lead to Chabot’s FYE, a grant to support pathway development, and the alignment of student support programs and projects across campus.

### **Measuring and Assessing Progress**

Soon after the 2012-15 Strategic Plan and Initiatives were adopted, the OIR was charged with finding a way to measure progress on the strategic plan goal. The OIR formed a subcommittee called the PRBC Strategic Plan Goal Measurement Team for this purpose. While the goal seems straightforward, measuring progress, in particular progress related to initiatives, is challenging: what education goals, what is progress, do all student follow the same path. The OIR quickly realized that there are several groups of students, each with specific characteristics. The team realized that they wanted to recognize that students have different educational goals, different starting places in academic preparedness, and different speeds in moving towards their goals, depending on how many units they are taking. To address these differences, the OIR proposed grouping new students by educational goal and other variables and identified 10 distinct groups of students among the incoming fall cohorts of 2,000 or more first-time college students ([Evidence RS-23](#)). The groups were defined by their educational goal, level of assessment in English, and the number of units they were taking their first semester. Based on long-term data collected by the OIR, these ten groups were distinct in both student characteristics and outcomes across many cohorts.

Tracking the educational goal groups through a series of progress milestone, the OIR is able to determine the progress the college is making on increasing the number of students who achieve their educational goals. Each educational goal group is compared to how well it has done in the past, not only on the completion of their goals, but on milestones they reach along the way, such as progression through the English and mathematics sequences. Milestones are reported for each cohort in their first semester, first year, and every year after that. Long before students can reach their degree or transfer goals, the milestones provide an early indicator of whether this cohort will be more likely to achieve their goals than previous

cohorts. Comparisons with earlier cohorts within each educational goal group provide a baseline that is appropriate and realistic for that group.

The OIR uses Educational Goal groups to not only track progress on the overall goal to increase the number of students who meet their educational goal, but to measure effectiveness of the various strategic initiatives. We can compare by educational goal group students who participate in these programs and those who do not, to inform program development. The OIR reports this progress to PRBC and at Flex Day workshops. Discussions focus on the activities that helped increase the numbers and which groups of students need the most support to achieve their goals (Evidence I-26). Preliminary results in fall 2014 show that Chabot increased the numbers attaining English milestones in year 1, but that the mathematics milestones remained a bottleneck, so this might prevent the overall numbers from increasing.

The college also uses the educational goal groups to focus existing and new grant resources on the student groups that need the most support to succeed. No matter what the outcome, the small (7 percent) Laser (FT) college-ready group is always the most successful group, with all other groups substantially less successful. Consequently, new programs are focused on supporting the larger Laser (FT) Basic Skills (19 percent) and Seeker (PT) Basic Skills (23 percent) student groups, since they are mostly likely to benefit from more support. Increasing the numbers of these students who reach their goal will increase the overall numbers of the college. Hence, measurement leads to program revision. For example, OIR data clearly shows that students who participate in the “early decision” process reach their education goals more than students who do not, so the College has increased its high school outreach efforts to encourage more students to participate in Chabot’s Early Decision process.

In addition to using the educational goal groups to monitor progress on the strategic plan and attendant initiatives, Chabot also set institutional goals for major student outcomes, that is, course success rates and number of degrees, certificates, and transfers. These goals are monitored and compared to the benchmarks, the average of the previous five years.

Qualitative data compliments OIR data on educational goal groups. Student responses are gathered in interviews and surveys that inform all the work and galvanize the community to address issues related to student learning. For instance, the Habits of Mind FIG recently administered campus surveys, presented the results to PRBC in fall 2014, then presented at Flex February 12, 2015. Similarly, Chabot’s “Making Visible” team continues to produce documentaries that provide student perspectives on services and programs. These documentaries not only inform Chabot’s work, but have been distributed across the state, bringing student voices to the forefront of education. One of the more recent videos, “The Passion Project” was shown and widely discussed on campus fall 2013 (Evidence I-27). The video follows students’ journey finding direction as college students. The film lead to the development of a new course, “Passion and Purpose,” which all students, including those in FYE, may take. Both of these projects are initiatives that developed from the work of PRBC on the strategic goal plan and are measured by educational goal groups.

The use of qualitative and quantitative data were what finally enabled Library faculty and staff to successfully make the case for the revitalization and renovation of library and student support needs. For years, library and academic support faculty and staff unsuccessfully

argued to centralize learning support services and bring the library technologically up-to-date, citing outcomes and service use data in PR. To support the effort, academic support services produced a documentary assessing current support and student support needs. Shown to the entire campus and in more than one forum, the video sparked needed discussion across campus on what it meant to support student learning, and resulted in the prioritization of funding, that could have been used elsewhere to renovating the library and learning support centers.

### **Continuous Cycle of Evaluation, Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation, and Implementation**

In collaboration with college shared governance committees, the PRBC oversees and coordinates the institutional planning process. The PRBC brings administrators, faculty and staff together to integrate planning and evaluate programs and processes, as discussed previously.

As previously described, programs and services at Chabot are reviewed in a three-year cycle with PR playing the primary mechanism. The OIR presents data analyses to the College community on a regular basis. Reports of survey results, student characteristics and outcomes, census data, and faculty/staff characteristics are regularly provided on the OIR website (Evidence I-28). These reports might include raw data as well as highlights and analyses of trends.

In addition to data provided for preparing PR, the OIR regularly provides data to members of the College community. The PRBC reviews internal and external environmental scan data annually to inform the planning cycle. Conclusions about progress on strategic plan goals as well as trend data needed to set future priorities are discussed. The PRBC monitors progress on initiatives to improve student learning through regular reporting by the leaders of the initiatives. At the beginning of each year, the highest priority initiatives are selected by the membership, and at the end of each year, PRBC lists the initiatives that have been accomplished. During the PRBC's reading and synthesis of PR submissions, campus needs related to achieving the strategic goal plan and improving student learning are prioritized. At the same time, the PRBC identifies roadblocks and supports efforts to address them. Based on all of this quantitative and qualitative data, the PRBC makes recommendations to the relevant shared governance committees. Those committees use the strategic plan goal and the recommendations to prioritize resource allocation. For instance, the Faculty Prioritization Committee requires programs to include data related to the strategic goal plan in their request for faculty and uses substantial data provided by the OIR.

In relation to the strategic plan goal, course completion bottlenecks are analyzed at PRBC and presented to the CEMC to inform decisions related to Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF). For example, Chabot piloted FYE with FTEF allocated through regular processes informed by PRBC recommendations, initiatives, and the Strategic Plan. Similarly, during statewide cutbacks, PRBC and CEMC held a series of open, joint meetings and developed a plan for communicating with faculty and staff, identified priorities, and developed criteria for making decisions. During the meetings, input from college staff and OIR data, specifically on student enrollment patterns were used. Data to the entire campus was presented and areas were asked to prioritize courses accordingly.

## Evaluation

Chabot meets the Standards. The 2012-15 Strategic Plan consists of one strategic plan goal and nine major strategies. Progress of the initiatives is monitored and documented by the PRBC. Measurable progress on the strategic plan goal is monitored and reported to the PRBC by the OIR using cohorts of new students grouped into meaningful educational goal groups. Because the Strategic Plan goal is focused and well integrated into PR, it has become widely known and embraced by the college.

In the most recent staff survey, a majority of the faculty and staff (58 percent) were familiar with the college's strategic plan goal (Evidence [OIR-8](#)). This is an 18 percent increase from the 2008 survey and shows the wide awareness and use of that goal to develop and implement initiatives (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 2). Similar increases were also noted since 2008 in faculty participation in the development of institutional policy, 44 to 55 percent, (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 35), and in faculty perception of the usefulness of PR for identifying priorities for improvement or support, 41 to 59 percent, (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 3). These increases reflect the improvement in the planning and PR process.

Chabot's integration of its Strategic Plan Goal into PR and strategic planning and budgeting is noteworthy. Programs that increase student learning and meet the strategic goal plan are prioritized. Evidence of this is seen in prioritization and allocation trails, including the renovation of the Library and Learning Support building, hiring of a Dean to support student success, and the funding of initiatives and positions that support the strategic goal plan. The College assesses progress towards achieving its goals using both quantitative and qualitative data and allocated resources accordingly. Chabot's institutional process are regularly evaluated in an ongoing process that continues to yield a number of effective revisions. Its focus on achieving its strategic goal plan has galvanized the campus and led to programmatic alignments as well as solid alliances between academic and student support services.

A well-organized cycle of planning is in place at Chabot, and the institution understands and embraces that cycle. Survey results show that 93 percent of full-time faculty contribute to PR (Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 1). Sixty-two percent of the staff believe institutional research results are used in the planning, development, evaluation, and revision of programs and services, which is an increase from 53 percent in 2008 and 45 percent in 2001 (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 2). Administrators are among the largest consumers of institutional research data, with 82 percent of Chabot administrators using institutional research data, followed by 69 percent of full-time faculty and 45 percent of full-time classified professionals who use it (Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 2).

Survey results revealed less understanding of college planning and budgeting, especially how the two are related. Although the Budget Committee uses the Strategic Plan Goal and initiatives and PR to guide funding allocation, only 58 percent of staff felt that "college-wide and unit planning are linked to resource allocation" (Evidence [OIR-9](#)). Thirty percent of the staff expressed no opinion either way, which suggests that communication between the PRBC and the Chabot community may need improvement. Regarding the role of PRBC in college planning, one of the planning agenda items from 2007 was to increase the awareness of the role of the PRBC in the college planning and budgeting process. The overall awareness of the role of PRBC by all staff improved, from 22 to 35 percent, showing that there was

wider dissemination of the process (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p.3). Half of full-time faculty and most administrators were aware (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 2).

The need for a new shared governance policy/procedure document has been highlighted in the 3 retreats mentioned above and discussed in both the PRBC and College Council. While individual shared governance committees have updated their charges as directed by the PRBC and the College Council, issues around overall decision making flow, membership, representation by different college groups and the efficiency of the current governance processes are still seen as needed revision. At the writing of this report, this process is still being pursued by the College.

### Actionable Improvement Plan

None

## **IB.4.**

*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.*

### Description

The cycle of planning process detailed in Standard I B1.2 and 3 describe the mechanisms that exist for broad-based participation in college planning. The PR and shared governance process ensure that participation occurs at the program, division/area, and institutional levels.

In situations where there are funding shortages, the College identifies and leverages additional resources from external funding sources. These include bond monies, VTEA, state and federal grants, as well as grants from private businesses and community organizations. As part of the planning process, a PR response might include the intention to seek funds for new initiatives from outside sources. In addition, the college employs a full-time grant writer to support proposals for funding and also has an active foundation that raises funds to support college activities.

In addition to the formal PR, there are other opportunities for faculty and staff to provide input during Convocation and Flex Day sessions. Although the content of these sessions varies from year to year, they typically include focus group discussions, recruiting meetings for college governance committees, and workshops learning assessment (Evidence I-23). The PRBC also holds periodic college retreats, special meetings, and focus groups when a larger participation is necessary. For instance, over the years, focus groups have been held for updating the mission statement and periodic retreats have been held to work on the Strategic Plan and determine Priority Objectives/Themes (Evidence I-14).

Further, the collaborative governance model encourages participation in college planning. Shared governance committees include representatives from all constituent groups: administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students (Evidence I-19). In addition, all governance committee meetings are open meetings; that is, anyone can attend a meeting or join a committee at any time. At the first division meeting of the academic year, faculty members choose representatives to college committees. Classified and Academic/Faculty

Senates also facilitate this process by inviting senators and other faculty and staff to join under-enrolled committees.

Chabot's planning processes encourage and facilitate improvement in every area of the campus.

## Evaluation

Based on the Spring 2014 Staff Accreditation Survey, 58 percent of respondents believe that college planning and unit planning are linked to resource allocation, which is a 8 percent increase from the last survey in 2008 (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 3). The planning process at Chabot is broad-based and occurs at every level in the institution. Sixty-one percent of full-time faculty indicated on that they have had sufficient opportunity to provide input into the college planning process (Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 1) while 48 percent of all staff reported having the same opportunity (Evidence [OIR-8](#)). This suggests that the College needs to improve mechanisms for ensuring the participation of all constituencies. This is especially true for classified staff (full-time and part-time) and part-time faculty members who have fewer opportunities to participate. Both faculty and staff frequently have conflicts with standing committee meeting times and participating regularly in committees requires extensive time commitments (precludes many staff). In the development of the new shared governance committee structure, the College is addressing this issue. (See College Plan 1.)

Data from the OIR documents plentiful opportunities for college constituencies to participate in the planning process. Seventy percent of responders confirmed their direct participation in the development of their area's PR, an increase of 5 percent from 2008 (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p.1); 55 percent agreed they have an adequate opportunity to participate in the budget development process for their area, almost 9 percent improvement compared to 2008 (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 4). Additional data show the planning processes, particularly the PR process, allocates necessary resources and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness. Fifty-six percent of staff believe the PR process resulted in improvements in their areas, which is a three percent increase from 2008 (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 1). Fifty-two percent of survey respondents saw new resources being allocated to their area due to the PR process, a small gain from 2008.

## Actionable Improvement Plan

None.

### ***IB.5.***

*The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.*

## Description

### Collecting and Disseminating Assessment Data

Chabot College collects a wide variety of assessment data through the OIR, standing committees, and individual programs. The College communicates the collected assessment data both internally and externally to appropriate constituencies in the form of reports, summaries, data tables and graphs, one-page handouts, presentations, email, newsletters, and the OIR website.

### **Office of Institutional Research**

The OIR collects, summarizes, and provides substantial data from outside and inside sources for the college. All of its work is documented, and the vast majority is posted on the OIR website. The OIR collects and provides data about student characteristics, enrollment trends, student performance outcomes (e.g., success, persistence, degrees, transfers), student learning, student engagement in learning, student satisfaction, staff satisfaction, and trends in local economy, labor market, and education. The OIR also compiles the data needed for the Environmental Scan, which is used for strategic planning. Student outcomes data are updated and monitored each semester in order to assess student learning and progress through the college. Outcomes data include course success rates, semester to semester persistence rates, success and persistence through course sequences and transfer pathways, and grade point averages at the college, program, discipline, course, or section level. Course sequence analyses track cohorts of students who enroll in a particular sequence of two courses to see how many successfully complete the sequence within two years. These analyses are updated each fall for English, mathematics, and ESL courses, and for all disciplines with course sequences that involve prerequisites.

As described previously, the OIR is also tracking new student cohorts based on their educational goal, full-time/part-time status, and assessment levels in English. Outcomes are tracked for each group starting in their first semester and at the end of each year for up to four years. Results from these analyses are presented and discussed in PRBC, published on the OIR website and wherever initiatives are being planned.

Between 1999 and 2009, benchmark data on cohorts of new first-time students were tracked for four years. Benchmark data included information on the number and percentage of new first-time students who successfully completed college English and mathematics, became transfer-directed and transfer ready, and earned a degree or certificate. These benchmarks were reported for the first semester, the end of the second year, and the end of the fourth year, allowing comparisons between cohorts. Benchmarks were shown by various student characteristics, such as educational goal, full-time/part-time status, assessment levels, high school, gender, ethnicity, and age. Results from these cohort studies formed the basis for the development of the educational goal groups, and they were discontinued after the educational goal groups were started, because the educational goal groups provided a much more meaningful way to follow cohorts of students.

Student surveys are conducted biennially in a random sample of course sections, stratified by discipline and time of class, with a participation rate of almost 100 percent. Since 1994, the surveys have asked about student satisfaction with Chabot academic and student services and programs and with the campus climate. In addition, items have been added about student progress in the college learning outcomes and about their engagement in learning activities. The stability of the items in these surveys has allowed changes in satisfaction, student

learning, and student engagement to be monitored over the years. The year before the accreditation self-study, the survey is expanded to address accreditation-related topics in more detail. This cycle's student accreditation survey was conducted in fall 2013 in time to include the results in the self-study. A staff survey, distributed to all staff, is conducted every six years. This survey coincides with the accreditation self-study. All faculty, classified professionals, and administrators have the opportunity to evaluate all aspects of the college in reference to the accreditation standards. Although the standards have changed, many items have been continued from survey to survey, so that changes and improvements over the years can be monitored. This cycle's staff accreditation survey was conducted in spring 2014 in time to include the results in the self-study.

The OIR also helps faculty conduct customized student surveys in selected programs or courses as part of PR or evaluation. Topics include students' past and current learning experiences in the field, their engagement in active learning in the class, the usefulness of various learning support tools and services, and their participation in civic engagement in a city debate event. The findings of these surveys become the basis of dialogue about improving student outcomes. Each semester, the OIR also provides assessment data for more about 100 ad hoc research requests. Most of these requests are initiated by faculty who want to evaluate the efficacy of a change in a program or course, or often in support of PR. Other requests consist of evaluation research for ongoing learning communities, for example, Daraja, Puente, and CIN, grant-funded projects, learning support services, or FIGs. In addition, the grant developer/writer uses targeted assessment data in assembling grant proposals.

The state Chancellor's Office is an external source of college data. They provide an interactive database for simple data queries based on the College's own database. Some faculty go directly to DataMart for program data, while most faculty rely on the OIR to collect and compile reports.

The OIR disseminates its data analyses and research results in several ways. Routine yearly data on student characteristics, local high school students who attend Chabot, and basic student outcomes used to be compiled into several bound reports and distributed to Chabot administrators, faculty, offices, the Library, District administrators and the BOT. Since 2011, these data and reports have been divided into one-page handouts that are posted on the OIR website. These summaries are updated as new data become available. Most OIR presentations are produced using PowerPoint, which are then turned into PDF files for posting on the OIR website. In addition, ad hoc research analyses are disseminated on single pages in the form of labeled data tables from the OIR software program, or as formatted tables and graphs in Excel, sometimes with a written analysis. Research handouts of common interest are posted on the OIR website.

### **On-Campus Committees**

College committees also collect and publicize assessment data. The PRBC collects yearly accomplishment evaluations from standing committees that address set priority objectives (Evidence I-14). The Curriculum Committee collects course/program proposal rationales and checklists to certify quality assurance (Evidence I-1).



The Committee On Online Learning collects Online/Hybrid Course Delivery Proposals from faculty planning to teach a course in online or hybrid delivery mode to help ensure the incorporation of proven pedagogical techniques (Evidence I-29). The Facilities Committee collects progress reports on construction at Chabot (Evidence I-30). The committees also publicize their assessment data internally and externally. The PRBC reports accomplishment evaluations via email, handouts, and on their website. The Committee on Online Learning provides a detailed list of Online/Hybrid Course Proposals and the current status of each on their website. The Facilities Committee reports construction status updates on its website.

### **Applied Health Programs**

Two applied health programs at Chabot College collect performance data on their students. The Chabot Dental Hygiene Department tracks how well their second-year students do on the National and State Dental Hygiene Board Exams (Evidence I-31). Likewise, the Chabot nursing program collects information on the outcomes of their students on the State Licensing Exam. The Nursing program communicates with its students extensively (Evidence I-32). This evaluation information helps in evaluating the quality of these programs. The results are communicated to the campus community by email.

### **College President and Board of Trustees**

The Office of the President regularly reports institutional research findings to the public, such as student success and retention statistics, as well as updating the public on facilities renovation/construction using timetables, costs reports, and other information.

Members of the BOT disseminate the assessment data they receive from the campus at other meetings, conferences, and educational institutions that they attend.

### **Evaluation**

The College provides documented assessment results from many sources on campus. A highly productive OIR regularly generates and disseminates routine student characteristics and outcomes data for monitoring, periodic and comparable survey results for evaluation purposes, ad hoc research analyses for PR and evaluation purposes, cohort data analyses that provide comparative longitudinal data, custom surveys for PR inquiries, and compilations of state data. Surveys conducted by the OIR and the District indicate readily accessible data and continued appreciation and support for Chabot College both on and off campus.

Campus surveys show that assessment information is effectively communicated. Eighty-five percent of faculty and staff believe that the OIR provides data for college and program evaluation (Evidence [OIR-9](#)) while 62 percent believe that institutional research results are used in the planning, development, evaluation and revision of programs and services, an increase from 45 percent in 2001 and 53 percent in 2008 (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 2).

In sum, the College does an excellent job of producing documented assessment results and communicating quality assurance information internally and externally to faculty, staff, students, and the public via email, websites, presentations, and newsletters. Positive feedback from students, staff, and the public indicates that quality assurance is being communicated.

## Actionable Improvement Plan

None

**IB.6.** *The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.*

### Description

As discussed in Section B.1, the College continually and systematically reviews and modifies all parts of the cycle. All participants in planning and resource allocation processes are responsible for assessing and improving the effectiveness of their efforts. The Budget Committee looks at whether it has had sufficient information to fairly allocate resources. The Facilities Committee asks if the Facilities Plan is on time and on budget. The SLOAC evaluates the level of student assessment and whether the tools for completing that assessment are effective. The OIR tracks the number of research requests it completes and how that information is used in decision-making. Division Deans synthesize PR from year to year to be sure that programs are improving student learning and making progress towards meeting the college wide goals. Each group makes recommendations about improving not only the decisions they are making, but how to improve the decision-making process. The PRBC is responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the entire cycle, as described previously. The PRBC assesses the effectiveness of the entire cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, and reevaluation from several different angles—amount of information flowing, usefulness of information, participation in the process, and the results of the process—each using different sources of information (Evidence I-14).

To assess whether its planning processes are effective, PRBC reviews how information is flowing from disciplines and programs to the Deans and to the appropriate shared governance committees. The PRBC also examines how that information is used by the PRBC. Throughout this process, feedback is provided by the deans, faculty, staff, and members of other committees. In addition, PRBC reviews the content of PR submissions and the Deans' summaries to see if the information evaluation, recommendations, and resource requests. The PRBC carefully considers how the process can be made more effective and efficient. The PRBC also carefully uses the submissions to identify strategic planning goals and appropriate resource allocation. Finally, the PRBC takes note of whether PR findings and resource requests made a major contribution towards developing or revising the Strategic Plan. In conjunction with the Budget Committee and personnel prioritization committees, the PRBC can then determine whether final resource allocations were made using strategic planning priorities.

Each year, the PRBC regularly reviews and seeks to improve the planning and resource allocation process. Extensive time has been taken each year to revise and refine PR, including at what point in the year it should be submitted so that the key resource allocation committees have resource requests in a timely way. The table below displays the dates and

topics of meetings held during the late spring and early fall of 2014 in preparation for this year's PR (Evidence I-14).

Date	Topic
August 22, 2012	"Closing the loop" on last year's PR a. summary feedback report to the college b. Communicating budget allocations from Bond funds, Perkins funds, and the general fund
August 29, 2012	Incorporating new Strategic Plan into PR
November 28, 2012	Finalizing Academic PR forms to incorporate CLO reports and strategic plan
December 5, 2012	Streamlining PR forms, Administrative and Student Services
January 25, 2012	Retreat on shared governance and strategic plan Implementation
February 6, 2013	Recommendation to President on College Council charge
March 20, 2013	Shared governance self-evaluation process for this spring, Committee Effectiveness survey, proposal to move PR to fall, process for reading PR
April 10, 2013	PR resource requests
April 24, 2013	PR-consensus on report back to the college and next steps in resource allocation, consensus on recommendation to move PR to the fall
May 8, 2013	Assess progress on goals
May 15, 2013	Evaluation of effectiveness, evaluation approved
September 4, 2013	Recommendation of vision for PRBC
October 2, 2013	PRBC initiatives reviewed
October 23, 2013	Formation of Presidential Task Force to support PRBC Initiatives
November 6, 2013	Role of College Council
December 4, 2013	Mission Statement update
January 29, 2014	Review PRBC Charge and goals for the semester
March 20, 2014	Dean's summaries of PR
March 26, 2014	Questions to Deans on PR Summaries, use of Curricunet for PR
April 23, 2014	Vote of electronic module of SLOs in Curricunet

August 20, 2014	PR Survey
August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2014	Shared governance: charter review, retreats cosponsored by Academic and Classified Senate with PRBC PR forms update
September 10 <sup>th</sup> 2014	Review and Update PRBC Initiatives
September 24 <sup>th</sup> 2014	Incorporating the Educational <i>Master Plan</i> into PR
October 22 <sup>nd</sup>	Revision of prioritization process: Incorporate direct PRBC input into Prioritization (sent to College Council)
November 5 <sup>th</sup> 2014	Reading PR submissions
November 19 <sup>th</sup> 2014	Statement to Faculty Prioritization based on PR results
December 10 <sup>th</sup> 2014	Statement to Classified Prioritization based on PR results
January 28 <sup>th</sup> 2015	Results from PR Survey, shared governance draft: shared governance retreat recommendations
February 4 <sup>th</sup> 2015	Statement to the Budget Committee based on results from PR, sent to College Council, shared governance Academic Senate Resolution
February 18 <sup>th</sup> 2015	PR Revisions to spreadsheets for Budget Committee
March 18 <sup>th</sup> 2015	Strategic Plan Goal
April 15 <sup>th</sup> 2015	Shared governance feedback from committees on retreat recommendations, including flow chart and tying resource allocation to college planning

The Spring 2014 Staff Survey, which is conducted every six years, solicits staff understanding and awareness of the planning, resource allocation, and evaluation processes ([Evidence RS-27](#)). Results from this survey are used to identify areas of the planning process that need more illumination for the staff.

## Evaluation

The PRBC annually assesses the entire cycle of planning and resource allocation processes. The survey ([Evidence RS-27](#)) showed that although there have been increases since 2008, many faculty/staff do not understand the links between planning and resource allocation processes, or the roles of the various committees. Too few faculty/staff agreed that “in the college planning and budgeting process, I have a clear understanding of the role of the PRBC (35 percent), the Faculty Prioritization Committee (36 percent), the Budget Committee (27 percent), and Enrollment Management Committee (34 percent).” In comparison to the

previous survey, all responses except the Budget Committee increased by about 10 percent in the last 6 years, which is a solid improvement (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 3) In addition, while only 58 percent of faculty/staff agreed that “college-wide and unit planning are linked to resource allocation,” this is more than the 50 percent who felt that way six years ago (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 3). In addition, over half (56 percent) agreed that program review has ‘led to improvement in their area’ (Evidence [OIR-8](#)).

Only 37 percent of staff surveyed agreed that “the college planning process responds within a reasonable time to changing factors such as student characteristics, labor markets, or course demand,” so although the structure and processes are in place, the staff perception is that improvement occurs slowly (Evidence [OIR-3](#)). The Spring 2014 Staff Survey also showed that 32 percent of staff agreed that “the planning of educational programs, student services, staffing, and the use of physical and financial resources is sufficiently integrated,” which is about the same as it was in 2009 (Evidence [OIR-21](#)). In response, all shared governance committees are reviewing their charge in order to better integrate the work of the councils and committees.

The PRBC has been examining the governance structures, roles, processes, and reporting responsibilities and is making recommendations for change that should clarify how decisions are made and by whom. The survey showed that the majority of staff are engaging in “thoughtful reflective dialogues” about improving institutional effectiveness at the discipline and division level, but only fulltime faculty and administrators are involved at the college levels (Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 3). The participation of part-time faculty and staff is a long-term challenge.

As part of the evaluation of institutional and other research processes, survey results showed that the majority of staff (65 percent) did believe that the College “evaluates how well its mission and goals are accomplished” (Evidence [OIR-9](#)). In addition, most (85 percent) staff felt that the OIR “provides data for college and program evaluation.” Half of all staff had used institutional research data “in the planning and evaluation of their courses/program/unit,” and about two-thirds of full-time faculty and more than 80 percent of administrators had used it (Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 2).

### **Actionable Improvement Plan**

None.

***IB.7.*** | *The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support.*

### **Description**

Chabot College evaluates the effectiveness of its instructional programs, student support services, library, and other learning support services in a variety of ways. These evaluation processes contribute to improvement in the programs and services offered to students. The College assesses the effectiveness of these evaluation processes.

Instructional programs are evaluated overall at the college level, at the individual program level, at the course and section level, within degree and transfer pathways and course sequences as part of PR. The effectiveness and efficiency of PR is evaluated by the PRBC.

The biennial student satisfaction survey provides student feedback about their experience with Chabot in general, their impressions of instructors, their progress towards their educational goals, and their preparation for transfer or employment. In addition, students are asked how engaged they are in learning activities, and how much progress they have made on the college learning outcomes. In the more detailed Accreditation survey, students also evaluate more detailed aspects of courses and instructors, at the all college level (Evidence [OIR-13](#)).

This information is used to evaluate instructional programs in a very general way by comparing student-reported levels of satisfaction, engagement, and learning from year to year. Before the student survey is conducted, the OIR reviews the survey items to determine which ones have been used by the faculty and staff to prompt improvements in services. Items are continued if they provide useful evaluative data. The college learning outcomes remain on the survey. In addition, they yield benchmark data for all students that are used to evaluate student engagement in learning communities because they provide valuable trend data in these areas ([Evidence RS-22](#), Evidence [OIR-9](#), Evidence [OIR-11](#)), as well as the learning progress made by degree and certificate graduates (Evidence I-8). At the program level, PR is used to evaluate instructional offerings. Working together within each discipline, the faculty use institutional research data on student success and persistence, results of surveys of student satisfaction and engagement, SLOs, and other student and course information to identify barriers to student learning and propose solutions. Through the three-year cycle faculty can identify problems, propose research or implement changes or new initiatives, and request resources to address problems. The effectiveness of the PR process has been evaluated continually since the current process was initiated in 2003, and the PRBC annually reviews and refines the process.

The evaluation process for faculty is described in Articles 14 (Untenured), 15 (Tenured) and 18I (Adjunct) of the *Faculty Contract* (Evidence I-34). Tenured Faculty evaluations takes place every three years. Untenured faculty go through a 4 year evaluation process in order to receive tenure. Adjunct faculty are evaluated in their first semester of employment and subsequently at least once every 3 years.

A peer evaluation team collects and reviews relevant class materials, including syllabi, assignments, and exams, visits class meetings and records observations on a prescribed form, and conducts a survey of the students in attendance. These form the basis for subsequent discussions with the faculty member and a written report to the division dean. The effectiveness of these evaluations is assessed by the Faculty Association and the deans as part of ongoing review of the *Faculty Contract*. Student services are evaluated overall at the college level, at the program level, and sometimes at the point of service level.

The biennial student satisfaction survey was designed specifically to evaluate how satisfied the students were with major student services (Evidence [OIR-12](#), pp. 8-15). It also measures how many of the students have heard of or use each service, in order to evaluate how well the service is making itself known. This survey is given to a representative sample of all

students, and it can also be analyzed for major groups of students, such as fulltime, evening only, or by race/ethnicity, so it can be used to evaluate services for specific groups. As noted before, prior to conducting the survey, an item-by-item evaluation of the survey is conducted, which can lead to changes in the survey or evaluation and change by the services. For example, this survey shows changes in student satisfaction with these services over the years, with most showing high levels of satisfaction that are sustained or have increased.

In addition to the all-college survey, some other departments such as the Library, the Learning Connection and the Special Student Services Programs (for example, EOPS, and ASPIRE) either run their own surveys or ask the OIR to develop and administer satisfaction surveys of their own to evaluate their programs. The surveys are evaluated and revised before they are administered.

Student services programs are evaluated during PR, using in-house data to evaluate whether improvements are needed, and often some changes are made. In addition, student services personnel are evaluated using processes specified by contracts, and those process are reviewed during contract negotiations. Library faculty and staff evaluate their own services by participating in the annual in-house censuses, which create an annual snapshot of service activity and needs. This effort looks at numbers of reference questions answered, amounts of books circulated as well as usage statistics from the databases. Informally, the library staff gauge student needs based on the interaction of students, professional literature, and conference and workshop attendance to gain insight to present and future needs of students. Also, the Library participates in the State Chancellor's Annual Data Survey and uses data from those longitudinal surveys to compare itself with other like libraries. The Library is evaluated at the college level by both students and staff through the student and staff satisfaction surveys. In the biennial student surveys, three to five questions are always dedicated to the students' access to Library services and the adequacy of orientation and research materials. During the evaluation of the survey, Library staff to determine whether questions need to be revised.

Learning support services (Learning Connection) are also evaluated at the college level by both students and staff through the student and staff satisfaction surveys. General tutoring, the WRAC, and STEM Center (previously Math Lab) are part of the list of student services that are evaluated in the surveys—from the students' perspective of whether they are satisfied, and from a staff perspective of whether they were satisfied that the student they referred was taken care of. In addition, the learning support communities, such as EOPS and PACE are included in the surveys. Moreover, the learning support services are the subject of ongoing evaluations using IR data to show whether students with these services had higher student learning, success, and/or persistence rates than those who did not have the services. Learning support pilot projects using peer student assistants, peer instructional leaders, and study skills labs in the classrooms are also scrutinized using student learning, success, and/or persistence data to evaluate their effectiveness. Since the goal of all of these services is to improve learning, these evaluations effectively indicate ones which should remain. The tutoring labs and services also evaluate their own services with the numbers of students who use them and thus find the service valuable; this information is also collected in the student survey. Faculty and staff involved in these services are given the opportunity to evaluate and revise questions in the survey.

## Evaluation

Chabot College uses a myriad of evaluation methods to collect evidence about the effectiveness of its instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services. Staff members in instructional programs, student services, library, and learning support services all have strong incentives to review and discuss this evidence and use it for improvement. They also have a formal mechanism to use if the evaluation shows that a program or service is not doing well and a plan of action is needed to work towards improvement. The evaluation methods are evaluated by the OIR and the areas being evaluated. During this evaluation, the OIR and personnel consider whether the survey is gathering useful, accurate, and relevant data, and whether revisions or additions are needed.

The PRBC annually reviews the PR process for improvement. The PR processes are designed to ensure that academic, student, and administrative services reflect on their data and development and implement plans for improvement. The Library and the Learning Support Services must use their evaluative data for feedback about whether they are satisfying their customers, the students; if they are not, they will lose their customers. Two key surveys, the faculty/staff and student surveys receive a careful and thorough evaluation prior to administration. All of these evaluation mechanisms are informally assessed for effectiveness by the groups who use them, and the work of the PRBC is to provide a formal review of the mechanisms at the all-college level.

Staff perceive that the mechanisms are effective. In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, faculty and staff reported that the appropriate sources of data are being used for evaluation purposes. Most (85 percent) agreed that “the Office of Institutional Research provides data for college and program evaluation (Evidence [OIR-19](#), p. 2). In addition, about half felt that institutional research results (62 percent) and PR results (52 percent) are used “in the planning, development, evaluation, and revision of programs and services” (Evidence [OIR-19](#), p. 1). This indicates an increase in the use of institutional research data for these purposes from 37 percent in 1995 to 45 percent in 2001 to 53 percent in 2008, and 62 percent in 2014 (Evidence [OIR-21](#), p. 2).

While about half (51 percent) of all staff had actually used OIR data “in the planning and evaluation of their courses/program/unit,” about 69 percent of fulltime faculty had, a likely outcome, since many staff do not evaluate courses or programs (Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 2). However, only 44 percent of full-time faculty found the academic PR process helpful for evaluating student learning (Evidence [OIR-20](#), p. 1). Only 57 percent of full-time faculty found it helpful for identifying priorities for improvement or support, while over 60 percent of part-time faculty found it helpful each of these purposes. This feedback in the survey led in part to the most recent changes in the academic PR process (as described above). The changes indicate that data are being used to assess and improve effectiveness, and the PR process is being evaluated and revised to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness.

## Actionable Improvement Plan

None



## Evidence List

- Evidence I-1. Curriculum Committee Minutes,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/curriculum/Agendas%20&%20Minutes.asp>
- Evidence I-2. OIR Environmental Scan,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/EnvironmentalScan/Environmental\\_Scan\\_Spring2011.pdf](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/EnvironmentalScan/Environmental_Scan_Spring2011.pdf)
- Evidence I-3. Fall 2014 Student Characteristics,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/StudentCharacteristics/Chabot\\_StCh\\_Fa14-Sp15\\_Final.pdf](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/StudentCharacteristics/Chabot_StCh_Fa14-Sp15_Final.pdf)
- Evidence I-4. Fall to Spring Persistence Data,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/StudentSuccess/Persist-demos\\_CC\\_F00-F13.pdf](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/StudentSuccess/Persist-demos_CC_F00-F13.pdf)
- Evidence I-5. Special Programs, <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/SpecialPrograms/>
- Evidence I-6. Faculty Inquiry Groups and Pilot Initiatives → needs to be posted
- Evidence I-7. First-Year Experience,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/Counseling/FYE/index.asp>
- Evidence I-8. Learning Interventions—OIR data,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/StudentSuccess/Grads\\_Vs\\_All\\_CollWideLrngGoals.pdf](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/StudentSuccess/Grads_Vs_All_CollWideLrngGoals.pdf)
- Evidence I-9. Learning Connection, <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/LearningConnection/>
- Evidence I-10. Second Year FYE Expansion, Fall 2015,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/Counseling/FYE/FYE%20Flyer%20and%20Application%20Fall%202015%20FILLABLE.pdf>
- Evidence I-11. Chabot College 2015 Annual Report to ACCJC,  
[http://libraryguides.chabotcollege.edu/ld.php?content\\_id=9621252](http://libraryguides.chabotcollege.edu/ld.php?content_id=9621252)
- Evidence I-12. OIR Reporting on Student Success,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/success.asp>
- Evidence I-13. Board Minutes, 18 March 2014,  
[http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2014\\_March\\_18\\_Minutes\\_Official.pdf](http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2014_March_18_Minutes_Official.pdf)
- Evidence I-14. PRBC Website with Minutes,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/Agendas\\_Minutes.asp](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/Agendas_Minutes.asp)
- Evidence I-15. College Council Website with Minutes,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/council/AgendasMinutes.asp>
- Evidence I-16. PRBC Website, Strategic Plan,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/StrategicPlan/StratPlan\\_Initiativess2012-15.pdf](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/StrategicPlan/StratPlan_Initiativess2012-15.pdf)
- Evidence I-17. *Educational Master Plan*,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/about/MasterPlan\\_2005-2015.pdf](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/about/MasterPlan_2005-2015.pdf)

Evidence I-18. Not used

Evidence I-19. Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/governance/Chabot%20CollegeSharedGovernance\(8-15-06\).pdf](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/governance/Chabot%20CollegeSharedGovernance(8-15-06).pdf)

Evidence I-20. PRBC Website, 2015-16 PR Submissions,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/2015-16programreview.asp>

Evidence I-21. Mathematics Subdivision 2015-16 PR Response,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/2015-16%20Program%20Reviews/Academic%20Services/Science%20&%20Mathematics/2015-16%20Math%20Program%20Review.pdf>

Evidence I-22. History of SLOs, <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/history.asp>

Evidence I-23. Flex Day Agendas, <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/staffDevel/FlexDay.asp>

Evidence I-24. BSC Strategic Plan,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/basicskills/Meetings/2014-2015/BSC\\_StrategicPlan.pdf](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/basicskills/Meetings/2014-2015/BSC_StrategicPlan.pdf)

Evidence I-25. 2014 PRBC-Shared Governance Retreats Notes,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/2014-15Minutes/Shared%20Governance%20Retreat%20Notes%20Final.pdf>

Evidence I-26. OIR Report on 2012-2015 Strategic Plan Goal Progress,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/success.asp#Measuring\\_Progress\\_on\\_the\\_Strategic\\_Plan\\_Goal](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/success.asp#Measuring_Progress_on_the_Strategic_Plan_Goal)

Evidence I-27. Student-Created Video on Passion,  
<https://sites.google.com/site/passionandpurposechabotcollege/>

Evidence I-28. The OIR Website, <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/>

Evidence I-29. Committee on Online Learning website <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/cool/>

Evidence I-30. Facilities Committee Website <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/facilities/>

Evidence I-31. Evidence I- 31. Dental Hygiene Board Exam Results,  
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/dhyg/>

Evidence I-32. Communication sent to Nursing Students,  
[http://www.chabotcollege.edu/NURS/Program\\_Announcements.asp](http://www.chabotcollege.edu/NURS/Program_Announcements.asp)

Evidence I-33. PRBC Agenda Related to Evaluating, Streamlining, and Restructuring Planning Processes, Evidence I-33

Evidence I-34. Link to District Website Employee Contracts,  
<http://www.clpcdd.org/HR/HRContactsandSalarySchedules.php>