

A***Decision-Making Roles and Processes.***

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

AI.

Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

Description

The basic guidelines for operation of Chabot College's shared governance and administrative structure are clearly detailed (Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process ([Evidence I-19](#))). The process is under revision. The College has worked to enhance its support of student success through its planning processes. The College revised its Mission Statement to refocus on measurable student learning outcomes.

They are supported by the Mission statement and values of the college. The Mission states that Chabot College responds to the educational and workforce development needs of the regional population and economy. As a leader in higher education, the college promotes excellence and equity in the academic and student support services. The College is dedicated to student learning inside and outside the classroom to support students' achievement of their educational goals ([Evidence RS-31](#)).

The college, through its PRBC, is responsible for formulation and communication on the college's goals and values. The PRBC with Faculty Senate guidance and support, governs the processes to overall improve student learning. The PRBC creates the goals of the college. It elicits projects itself to enhance student learning. It monitors how projects improve learning by assessing results, mostly by using the OIR data.

Communication on planning issues is through many venues. The PRBC members themselves are one communication venue. The Chair also communicates to the college. There are presentations at other governance committees and discussion of planning topics during Flex Days. "All constituencies have the right and opportunity to express their opinions, and that anyone may bring forth a position or idea that will be treated with respect and given reasonable consideration" stated President Susan Sperling. The Shared Governance document outlines staff roles in planning for the college. Also, work on the basis of all planning, the program reviews, are done at the level of disciplines and programs which is understood by staff. The consultative model holds from the bottom to the top of the College. The BOT, Academic/Faculty, Classified, and Student Senates all hold public comment sessions during their

meetings, empowering any member of the community to contribute to the governance of the college.

The college uses its committee webpages and well as “Chabot ALL” emails, presidential reports, College Hour “Brown Bag” presentations to inform that college staff of planning issues and to invite feedback. Minutes of meetings and attached documents are to be used to assist committee members in their decision making processes. All PRBC committee documents, including the program reviews are on the college website for anyone to view. Progress on the initiatives and projects are focus of the PRBC and through the Office of Institutional Research, the goal progress, is assessed.

The shared governance documents the opportunity for staff to participate in governance. Also, nonmembers are encouraged to participate at committee meetings regardless of the fact that they are not members. Individuals have many ways to bring forward ideas. Individuals can work through their governance group (senates) or through their programs (PR), come before the committee that may address their issue or work through their representatives on the senates of committees if they don't want to present themselves.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The College has a process and a culture that allows for discussion by the College community to achieve its goals. President Susan Sperling states that “a free exchange of ideas for all members of the community is essential and there must be opportunity for open, candid conversations without fear of retaliation.” An example of how this process can and does work occurred during the proposal, discussion, and adoption of the present allocation model. The President was outspoken and clear about disagreeing with the allocation model that was ultimately adopted by the Board. However, a number of administrators and faculty felt differently, and they voted in accord with their opinions (Evidence IV-1). They understood that they were free to vote their conscience openly, even if that meant voting against the President.

Another example occurred during the spring and fall of 2012. California was facing a horrific recession and community college budgets were taking a massive hit. In order to combat the suffocating economic malaise, Proposition 30 was proposed to raise taxes specifically for schools in California. Chabot was forced to make two schedules, one if Prop 30 passed and one if Prop 30 failed. If it failed, massive cuts to classes and staff would be made. The President led numerous meetings and discussions at all levels to create a worst case scenario schedule. In this process, the President engaged all elements of the work community in consultation to recommend class reductions that would best maintain the instructional goals and objectives and do least damage to student needs.

The College assesses its governance structure and revises it to meet its needs. The College, under 2009 ACCJC Recommendation #3 direction, first reviewed and changed the structure and charge of its main planning committee to the PRBC as

outlined in the Midterm Report. Other committees were also directed to change their charges. The College Council, PRBC and the Faculty Senate have all been involved in a new initiative to revise the entire governance document during the course of 2014-2015. This initiative will be continued into fall 2015.

Employee opinion remains virtually unchanged on this matter since the last Accreditation survey. In 2008, 42 percent agreed or strongly agreed with a question that they have “a substantive role in college governance and policy-making that relates to my areas of expertise.” In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, that percentage response is 39 percent an insignificant change ([Evidence OIR-21](#), p. 31).

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 that will revise Chabot’s shared governance structures and procedures. The president will present the proposal, based upon recommendations from the college 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 from the second reading, the president will recommend approval of the document to College Council at their final fall semester meeting. Following College Council approval, the final document will be shared with the Board and the new processes initiated in early 2016.

A2

The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

A2.a

Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

Description

Chabot has a written policy providing a decision-making process involving the major constituency groups. This policy is described in the Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process ([Evidence I-19](#)). First adopted in August 2004, it was revised in August of 2006, and it is under revision. It is the

defining document in the institution of the roles and responsibilities of all the major constituency groups regarding institutional governance and of all committees.

The introduction to this document summarizes the importance of the passing of California AB 1725 in 1988, which mandates the sharing of governance on community college campuses, and which is further supported by California Education Code, Title 5 regulations. The document's introduction states:

Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, which implements the legislature's intent in passing AB 1725, established relationships among the constituencies within California's community colleges to "ensure faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards."

The CLPCCD BOT has adopted policies that further define the relationship (Evidence IV-2, Evidence IV-3, Evidence IV-4, Evidence IV-5, Evidence IV-6). Additionally, the College's mission and value statements support the idea of shared governance. The College holds that collaboration by the major institutions of the college working together creates a better learning environment for students.

The Chabot Approach

Chabot College approaches Shared Governance internally in two primary ways. First, governance is a collaborative effort to gain consensus and/or input from the four major institutions: the SSCC (formerly, the Associated Students of Chabot College, ASSC), the Academic/Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, and administration, including the President, Vice Presidents and Deans. Second, there are structures that collect and disperse information through major governance groups using open meetings, staff development activities, ad hoc, and formal and informal committees. Policy and recommendations are ideally passed to the Chabot College Council, composed of key administrators and the Presidents of all three senates.

Operating Principles and Guidelines

According to the Chabot College Shared Governance Policy, any position or idea would be presented first to the appropriate committee, council, senate or other deliberative body ([Evidence I-19](#)). The BP states that—with the noted exceptions of Academic/Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, SSCC Senate, and the Curriculum Committee—College committees and councils operate on the principle of consensus and that when a committee or constituency is given the responsibility for developing a recommendation, or if a committee or constituency is generating a recommendation of its own, it will be done to serve more students and serve them more effectively; to give due consideration to the resources available; to establish a timeline for reaching their recommendations; to give stakeholders the opportunity to participate in discussions that will form the basis for making recommendations affecting them; and to be reviewed by the President prior to final action. The policy also notes that, while open

meetings are a key element in governance, there are some instances where the meetings of the governance body may be restricted to core members; and that College Council, Senates, and Governance Bodies must provide a list of core representatives, which is to be kept current.

Decisions by Consensus

To create an effective sharing of governance through the inclusion of many voices, numerous committees work on the basis of decision by consensus. The first step in this process is ensuring that all voices are heard; thus, with the exceptions listed previously, meetings are open, meaning that any individual may join and fully participate in the meetings of these groups designated as having open meetings. The art and essence of successful consensus decision-making can be described as a process of speaking up and not holding out. The guidelines for consensus demonstrate common best practices for decision-making and positive communication climate creation while in a group communication setting. This includes clarifying the problem or question; determining the criteria for a good solution (for example, cost, scale, scope, acceptability); ensuring that everyone agrees on the criteria; brainstorming a range of alternative solutions; generating a thorough list of alternatives; waiting to evaluate the alternatives until after they are generated; writing the alternatives in a format that can be seen by everyone; evaluating alternatives according to the criteria already developed; ruling out any alternatives that do not meet the criteria or are rejected by the group after reflection; determining if any alternatives require further research; and finally, making a decision.

General Operational Rules

The Shared Governance Policy stipulates open committees, and offers specific operating rules to ensure fairness and uniformity across campus. These operating rules include such points as how chairs are elected, when agendas are to be posted, when minutes are to be distributed, and typical length of terms.

College Committees

All of the governance committees and councils have their own websites, which includes their mission, goals, membership rules, and reporting requirements (Evidence IV-7).

Major Constituency Groups and Their Roles in Decision Making

The College Council, chaired by the College President, makes recommendations to the College President on policy issues, proposals from shared governance groups and serves as Chabot's final-stop policy body that forwards recommendations on shared governance issues. The College Council is the only body that includes all areas of administration: the College President and the Vice Presidents of Academic Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services.

The PRBC is a faculty/staff-led work group, charged with planning and resource allocation, including development, implementation, and assessment of plans, and resource allocation, short- and long-term. Each discipline, program or administrative

unit writes a PR annually, submits it to PRBC and the respective Dean and/or Vice President, where it is reviewed. Within the PR are the results of learning assessment, evaluation, recommendations for improvement, and resources requests, which are used to make decisions about resource allocations. The PRBC has, perhaps, the largest core representation, including administrators, chairs of committees, presidents of all shared governance institutions, and the institutional researcher. The PRBC is an open meeting that posts minutes and agendas.

The Academic/Faculty Senate's primary function is to make recommendations with respect to ten specific academic and professional matters and to others as mutually agreed upon between the BOT and the Senate, as listed in California Code of Regulations, Title V and further elaborated in PB 2015 (Evidence IV-3), including institutional planning, budget development, curriculum, and education programs and policies. The BP 2015 also states that the BOT will rely primarily on the Academic/Faculty Senate's recommendations in the following areas:

- Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
- Degree and certificate requirements
- Grading policies
- Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports

As the body that represents the faculty, all voting members of this senate are faculty, including one part-time representative, with nonvoting, ex-officio representatives from the SSCC and the faculty union. Members of the Senate are voted in by their respective divisions and the President is elected by the full-time faculty at large. Additionally, all meetings are open and interested parties are encouraged to be present and contribute.

The Classified Senate represents the college's professional staff in the shared governance process (Evidence IV-8). Among its charges are participation in institutional planning and budget development, as well as its own staff development activities and the selection and evaluation of administrators. As a body that represents the professional staff, all voting members of this senate are professional staff, with nonvoting, ex-officio representatives from the SSCC and the classified union. The Officers and members of the Senate are voted in by their constituents. All meetings are open and interested parties are encouraged to be present and contribute.

The SSCC consists entirely of students and represents the student body in shared governance (Evidence IV-9), as provided by California Education Code, Title 5, which stipulates that students should be provided with the opportunity to participate in formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students and enumerates such policies and procedures, including institutional planning, budget development, and education programs and policies. The SSCC is composed of elected student senators. The President of SSCC appoints student representatives to College governance

committees. The roles and responsibilities of these constituency groups are listed in the shared governance structure document. The President, Members of the Senate, and specific positions are voted in by the students. All meetings are open and interested parties are encouraged to be present and contribute.

The Presidents of Chabot College, Academic/Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, and SSCC make reports to the BOT as standing items on its meeting agenda. In addition, BP 7003 establishes guidelines for the selection and role of a nonvoting Chabot student member on the BOT (Evidence IV-3).

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The College has created a positive, flexible, and clear structure for Shared Governance. The new mission statement, which was updated in the spring of 2014, approved by all 3 Senates, and Board Approved on March 18th of 2014 ([Evidence I-13](#)). This mission statement describes a community college in the truest sense of the word: a college that is dedicated to, listens to, and responds to its community. The value statements illustrate a need and desire to be reflexive to students and community needs through a self-evaluative process that includes all voices from both inside and outside the college. Thus, the lines of communication are clear, easy to find, and identifiable and are used to influence policy.

In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, 72 percent of all staff surveyed believe that faculty and staff input makes the college better in achieving its mission. 74 percent of all staff at Chabot believe faculty and staff input help student learning ([Evidence OIR-21](#), p. 31). These numbers remain unchanged from the 2008 survey, demonstrating a desire for shared governance due to a belief that it is an effective route to student success ([Evidence OIR-19](#)). Faculty in particular continued to feel that their voices are heard in the shared governance process. In 2014, 51 percent of full-time faculty answered that there is adequate participation in the development of institutional policy, up from 40 percent in 2008. Fifty-three percent of part-time faculty answered that part-time faculty members are encouraged to participate in decision-making in their areas, also up from 38 percent in 2008. Lastly, 54 percent of full-time faculty believe that Academic Senate effectively communicates faculty concerns to the administration. A majority of faculty continue to feel empowered in the governance of the college ([Evidence OIR-19](#)).

While the structures are in place, many members of the College feel the structures need to be used more effectively and efficiently. When asked if “I have a substantive role in college governance and policy-making,” only 39 percent of staff believed that they did. This is down from 42 percent in 2008 ([Evidence OIR-21](#), p. 31). Of those numbers, 60 percent of full-time faculty and 83 percent of administrators answer positively that they have a substantive role ([Evidence OIR-20](#), p. 15). There has been a substantial decrease in the belief that the current structure of councils and committees provides effective college participation in decision-making for all segments of the college community. In 2008, 46 percent responded positively ([Evidence OIR-21](#), p. 31). In 2014, only 34 percent have responded positively. Thus, while the structures for effective shared governance are codified, there may be a need to use them to create

a practical sharing of governance. A significant majority of staff members believe they know where to go to receive an answer about policy and procedure (66%), but this is a decline from 2008 when it was nearly ten points higher ([Evidence OIR-21](#), p. 31).

In the fall of 2014, College Council and the PRBC started a process of assessing the 2006 Governance Structure. Three “open to all” workshops were held to discuss the current structure, concerns with the structure and governance processes and new ideas were discussed. In spring 2015, the process of reviewing the structure and processes continued by widening the discussion to the three senates. Over the summer the President’s Office will consolidate the proposals and present a revised process to the three senates and College Council in early fall 2015, followed by two revision cycles, approval by College Council during the last meeting of fall 2015, and implementation in spring 2016 ([Evidence I-25](#)).

Beginning in spring of 2014, the College Council began meeting more consistently and posting minutes. It has proven an effective vehicle for discussions of policy and recommendations in several key areas. For example, in response to the recommendation to hire more counseling staff in response to SSSP and other College goals and objectives, the Council recommended hiring more counseling faculty. The College Council is the last stop in the Chabot model where policy decisions from committees and other governing bodies of the college are discussed and moved forward to the President, who is the chair of the committee. This enables the President of the College to make decisions or forward recommendations in an effective, efficient and timely manner.

We recommend the next Accreditation survey include questions about the effectiveness of College Council, as the College has not collected data to evaluate its ability to represent the interests of the College at large. Finally, a high number of committees were not posting minutes in public locations. While they are being taken, the lack of a central person to put minutes online has hampered reporting. However, The PRBC Chair and the College President have taken steps to support committees to better post minutes and to allow for more transparency.

Actionable Improvement Plan

See College Plan 1.

A2.b | *The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.*

Description

The policy spelled out in the Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process ([Evidence I-19](#)), and agreed to by the College, acknowledges that Chabot will follow the California Education Code, Title 5 regulations that ensure faculty primacy over academic matters, and that the BOT will “rely primarily” on the

recommendations of the Academic Senate in the areas commonly referred to as the “ten plus one.” Four of the eleven (curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, grading policies, and faculty roles in the accreditation process) are under the category of “primary reliance.” The rest (educational program development, standards for student success, governance structures as related to faculty roles, faculty professional development, program review, institutional planning and budget development, and “other academic and professional matters”) fall into the category “mutual agreement.”

The major college student learning committees are the Curriculum Committee, PRBC, SLOAC, COOL, and BSC. They are all faculty-driven with administrative representation. The roles of these committees are outlined on their websites (Evidence IV-7). At Division meetings, held monthly by the Dean, representatives from campus committees report and solicit input.

The District Curriculum Council (DCC) helps to coordinate district curriculum issues and degree requirements between the two College Curriculum Committees and to make recommendations to the Academic Senates at each college (Evidence IV-10).

The Academic Senate President, along with the Past President and a Presidential Designee are all standing members on the College Council, the main policy driver of the college. Additionally, the College President is a member of numerous district level committees, as are members of the Faculty Association Union.

Evaluation

One of the main charges of the PRBC is to align shared governance committee activities with program review, and strategic planning and budgeting. The shift from IPBC to PRBC was approved by the Academic Senate and the College Council in 2010. The PRBC includes the chairs of most major campus committees as standing members, the Accreditation Liaison, all three Senates, as well as the President, the Vice Presidents, and Deans, creating a clear, open forum for policy discussion. The committee reviews PRs every year from each discipline, creating a direct line from discipline to administration. The PRBC meets regularly and posts regular minutes online.

College administrators or committees can call subcommittees or task or work groups into being. Individuals with particularly expertise or interest may serve on such committees, or a general invitation may be issued. An example of such a committee is the Presidential Task Force on Learning Communities, which the President formed. This Task Force was open to all as are all Shared Governance committees. The Presidential Task Force reported directly to the President and to the College Council. This particular group met for most of academic year 2013-14, and the major outcomes of the Presidential Task Force were the creation of the FYE and the improved collaboration and integration of all learning communities at the College.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A3. *Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institutions constituencies.*

Description

The District and the College have established participatory governance structure is based on Board Policies 2014-2018 and the college's Shared Governance Policy. These board policies outline the ways that the different constituencies are involved in governance and how their voices are heard in governing the District and the College.

At the District, the newly adopted IPBM with its committees form the foundation of district discussions (Evidence IV-11). Members from the college constituencies and district personnel comprise the committees, each of which has unique charges and reports and makes recommendations to the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's Council. The IPBM includes three district committees, Budget, Curriculum, and Enrollment Management, which are composed of members from the same committees at each college. These three committees rely on input and recommendations from the college committees and discuss how best to meet the needs of the individual colleges as well as the needs of the District. Recommendations from the district committees are discussed and put forward as recommendations to the Chancellor. Recommendations from the district committees are communicated to the appropriate college committees by the representative members. District leadership is responsible for informing other district committee Chairs of recommendations that have been put forward to the Chancellor. An example of this process is the relationship between the CEMC and the DEMC. Representatives of each college's CEMC bring forward enrollment management plans including FTEF allocations for divisions, how to maximize resources, and how best to ensure that the college is meeting the agreed-upon FTES target. Strategies are discussed including scheduling plans, efforts to increase enrollments, and student recruitment and retention efforts.

The Chabot approach towards Shared Governance is stated in Standard A1. This is a College where employees and students make decisions through various groups, committees, and meetings. Many of these groups and committees have clear lines of communication from employee/faculty member to administrator. All Senate meetings as well as Board meetings are open to the public and must post minutes and agendas in public places. Standard A2 of this document delineates the lines of communication at the college, as well as recommendations so that Shared Governance could work more effectively.

Evaluation

The college meets the Standard. The new District IPBM and its committees have been operational for less than a year. Assessments of their effectiveness should be conducted soon. The College governance structure has already been evaluated,

revisions to be approved in fall 2015, and implementation in spring 2016.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A4. *The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.*

Description

Chabot College has responded to the recommendations made by the Commission in the last self-study cycle (2008) with a Progress Report in October, 2009 and a Midterm Report in 2012. The accreditation website has links to the Standards, the self-study and responses to the Commission's recommendations, progress reports, surveys, and other documents related to accreditation (Evidence IV-12). The College has submitted all reports as required and maintains an excellent reporting relationship with the U.S. Department of Education and the State System Office. The College complies with all reporting requirements for the multitude of categorically funded programs and to agencies providing grants to the College. Agreements with external agencies are documented in MOUs and approved by the Board. Faculty sometimes revise curriculum in response to external agencies or state mandates, for example in the re-evaluation and creation of AA-T/AS-T degrees, a response to California SB 1440. Other programs, such as Early Childhood Development and Nursing, adjust curriculum to meet the prescribed licensing requirements of their respective professional organizations.

President Sperling instituted a college-focused foundation, *Friends of Chabot Foundation*, in 2011. The Foundation is the face of the community and has a very well respected and connected Board, including City Council members from the cities in the service areas. The President has raised awareness for the new foundation through community outreach. The Foundation and the BOT have an agreement in place as an Auxiliary Organization, pursuant to Education Code section 72670(e). This agreement was approved by the Board in August of 2013 (Evidence IV-25).

The College continues to partner with the City of Hayward, California State University, East Bay, and various nonprofit groups. These are seen through activities such as *The Great Debate*, a collaboration between community and city that invites students to demonstrate communication skills and policy recommendations while working alongside numerous nonprofit agencies, City Council Members, and mayoral candidates. A second example of collaboration with the community is the HPN, a joint effort among educational institutions, community members, and nonprofit groups in an effort to raise education standards and levels in some of the lowest scoring areas of

Hayward. Both Administrators and Faculty are actively involved in this work.

Evaluation

The College interacts well with its community and responds to its needs in a collaborative and positive manner. Additionally, the BOT, President, faculty, and staff are all work with Accreditation in mind. The last four Flex Days had time dedicated to Accreditation and its work, including a session that all faculty were required to attend.

The College is in compliance with the Accrediting Commission's guidelines and works openly and expeditiously with external agencies. This includes a Citizens oversight committee for Measure B funds, a ballot initiative passed in 2004 (Evidence IV-14). The District responds to the ACCJC in timely and thorough evaluations of the process and procedures necessary for Accreditation (Evidence IV-15).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A5. *The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.*

Description

The College mission, vision, and values statements are posted on the College website and can also be found in the *Chabot College Catalog*, making them available not only to College students and employees but also to the community at large. These statements refer to a participatory environment within which ideas for improvement can be brought forward in order to ensure student success and institutional effectiveness and a commitment to excellence and innovation.

The College adopted its current Chabot College Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process in 2004, and it was formally reviewed in 2006 by the College and Academic Senate Presidents. Proposed revisions to the policy go to the governance groups, senates and the College Council for approval and, when appropriate, to the BOT for approval ([Evidence I-19](#)). In 2014, the College updated its vision, mission statement, and values. The new Mission Statement was approved by the three senates, the PRBC and the College Council in December. The BOT approved the new Mission at their March 18, 2014 meeting. The Shared Governance Process is under revision with expected implementation in spring 2016.

Listed in the current *Educational Master Plan 2005-15* are goals to be achieved between 2005 and 2015, including working toward the implementation of learning-centered practices throughout the institution, the promotion of an environment supporting the development of the College's human resources, and the achievement of institutional excellence through effective visionary leadership, communication, and planning for continuous improvement. In 2012, the PRBC also created a Strategic Plan

whose main goal was stated as to “Increase the number of students that achieve their educational goal within a reasonable time by clarifying pathways and providing more information and support” ([Evidence I-16](#)).

College Committees are revised periodically to reflect their charges. The Distance Education (DE) committee now known as the COOL Committee. The IPBC became the PRBC to better achieve an integral link between program review and planning and budgeting. New committees are formed to meet the needs of the campus such as the Equity Committee, and committees that relate to student cohort such as CIN.

As noted in the Shared Governance Document, Chabot's approach to Shared Governance is to create a structure wherein

“...everyone governs the college. The fundamental philosophy is one of openness. This means that all governance committees and councils conduct open meetings. Each body has a core group of representatives, who are appointed in the ways described below. Anyone, however, may attend most governance meetings and participate”

([Evidence I-19](#)).

On Convocation Day each August, the College President discusses what has happened in the previous year and plans for the upcoming year at an all-college meeting. Other opportunities for her to share information with the College as a whole occur during Flex Day activities and in regular email communications to the College community. Additionally, the President publishes a “President's Corner” blog, and holds periodic Brown Bag meetings during College hour.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Spring 2014 Staff Survey, has demonstrated that a significant majority of staff know about the Mission Statement, an 11 percent increase (71 percent in 2008 to 82 percent in 2014) ([Evidence OIR-1](#)). However, when asked whether important recommendations/decisions made through shared governance are implemented by the College administration, only 38 percent answered affirmatively. While this is an increase from the 2008 survey (33 percent), a gap still exists between administration and staff's desires when it comes to policy and implementation ([Evidence OIR-21](#), p. 33). Additionally, only 24 percent of Chabot faculty, staff and administrators agree or strongly agree that “The division between District and College operational responsibilities is clearly communicated.” For classified professionals, the numbers are 20 and 37 percent (PT/FT), for faculty, 32 percent and 12 percent (PT/FT) and 25 percent for administrators ([Evidence OIR-18](#)).

There are two main issues to note, however, in this area of Accreditation. First, as mentioned previously, the Shared Governance Process is being updated. The outcome of that review will have to be approved by the shared governance committees, including the College Council and the BOT. As of the spring 2015, the *Educational Master Plan* is under development by a consultant group, which should be complete by December 2015 (Evidence IV-16).

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 that will revise Chabot's shared governance structures and procedures. The president will present the proposal, based upon recommendations from the college 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 from the second reading, the president will recommend approval of the document to College Council at their final fall semester meeting. Following College Council approval, the final document will be shared with the Board and the new processes initiated in early 2016.

B.

Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

Description

The CLPCCD has a well-established BOT (Evidence IV-17) that is elected biennially (Evidence IV-18) and includes two student trustees (nonvoting) who are elected annually by students at each of the colleges (Evidence IV-3). Board members are elected from trustee areas by the registered voters of nine communities: Castro Valley, Dublin, Hayward, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Leandro, San Lorenzo, Sunol, and Union City. The role and responsibilities of the Board are outlined in BP 2200 and include, "represent the public interest, establish, review, and revise policies, assure fiscal health and stability, monitor the institutional performance and educational quality, hire and evaluate the Chancellor, and delegate power and authority to the Chancellor to effectively lead the District."

The BP 2012 outlines the relationship of the Colleges to the District (Evidence IV-19). The District and College organizational roles are outlined in the Function Map. The Function Map delineates the (P) "primary," (S) "secondary," and (SH) "shared" responsibilities of the district and the colleges. The District Task Map outlines the departmental responsibilities for college and district functions. The District and College organizational charts also define the roles and responsibilities of district and college personnel. See Tab *District/College Functions*.

The Chancellor communicates relevant information and solicits input from the Chancellor's Council, a group that meets monthly to review and discuss issues that

may impact the colleges and the constituency groups (Evidence IV-20). The Chancellor's Council includes the leadership from the classified and faculty associations, student associations, and classified and academic senates. All appropriate items are forwarded to the Chancellor as recommendations and taken to the Board for a vote. These items include curriculum decisions, including new and discontinued programs, budget items, purchases of and changes to facilities, hiring and termination, acceptance of contracts, and a host of other items designated as the responsibility and authority of the Board.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard by ensuring that policies and procedures are reviewed and updated. In 2014, the district employed services through the CCLC to review and recommend changes to policies and administrative procedures. All policies and procedures are being brought into compliance. The old policies, grouped by into seven series are being converted into seven new "Chapters". Chapters 2 and 4 have been board approved and posted on the District website. The rest of the policies are in process of evaluation, revisions, and approval.

Index of Revised Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (as of 5/20/15)

Revised Board Policies	Revised Administrative Procedures
Chapter 1: The District approved and posted	Chapter 1: The District in progress
Chapter 2: BOT approved and posted	Chapter 2: BOT approved and posted
Chapter 3: General Institution approved and not posted	Chapter 3: General Institution in progress
Chapter 4: Academic Affairs approved and posted	Chapter 4: Academic Affairs approved and posted
Chapter 5: Student Services approved and not posted	Chapter 5: Student Services in progress
Chapter 6: Business and Fiscal Affairs approved and posted	Chapter 6: Business and Fiscal Affairs in progress
Chapter 7: Human Resources 1 st reading by Board on 5/19/15	Chapter 7: Human Resources in progress

In addition, the Chancellor's Senior Leadership team reviewed the District Function map. The college's accreditation liaison officers and the faculty accreditation chairs

were asked to attend two senior leadership team meetings where the function map was assessed. At the conclusion of the second meeting, the District Function Map was revised based on the model from the ACCJC, which relies on the accreditation Standards. A second “Task Map” was created to better outline the tasks or functions that the colleges performs and the ones the district performs. Both of the maps were presented to the College Council and the maps were approved. (See Tab *District/College Functions*.)

Actionable Improvement Plan

District Plan 2. The District commits to complete the process of revising all Board Policies into the new Chapter format.

B1.

The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

Description

The responsibilities of the Board are outlined in BP 2200 (Evidence IV-17). The Board adheres to its policy and procedures for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor as outlined in BP 2431 and 2435 (Evidence IV-21, Evidence IV-22). Notice of initial offers of employment to new executive staff and evaluation of the Chancellor are noted on Board agendas as items for closed session. The Board and the Chancellor develop goals in consultation as part of the Chancellor’s evaluation process. Those goals are consistent with the mission, vision, and values. The Chancellor’s evaluation was completed in spring 2015.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. The Board adheres to its policies and procedures governing the recruitment, selection, and evaluation of the Chancellor. The Board understands that it must work in consultation with the Chancellor when developing goals and priorities.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.a.

The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

Description

The role of the BOT is outlined in board policy (Evidence IV-17). Board members understand their responsibilities in representing the public interest by developing policies that support the broad interest of the community to ensure student access and success. The Board's mission statement approved on July 15, 2014 and posted on the district website states (Evidence IV-23): "The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) prepares students to succeed in a global society by challenging them to think critically, to engage socially, and to acquire workplace knowledge and educational skills."

The Board understands the significance of reaching a decision and acting as a whole. Members ascribe to the ethical behaviors as outlined in BP 2715 (Evidence IV-1). The Board advocates for the district and the colleges to ensure that the core values, mission, and vision as articulated through the college websites and planning committees are evident in decision-making. Board meeting minutes show that the Board most often achieves unanimous decisions (Evidence IV-25).

Evaluation

The BOT meets the Standard as evidenced by Board Policies 2010-2750 and corresponding Administrative Policies (AP) 2015-2740 (Evidence IV-26). Additionally, significant professional development is provided to Board members during their orientation and throughout their tenure on the Board to ensure that they are clear regarding their responsibilities and scope of authority (Evidence IV-27). The Board makes decisions as a whole and each member upholds decisions understanding the importance of working together to support the district's interests.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.b.

The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

Description

All policies set forth by the BOT are consistent with its mission, the mission of the College and established priorities. The Board approved the new College mission

statement in March 2014. In summer 2014, the Board evaluated and revised the District Mission Statement to better reflect the goals of student success in education endeavors (Evidence IV-23), and the priorities were established in 2013 (Evidence IV-28). Both are published on the District website, The Board is made aware of the college's progress toward student learning goals through information shared at Board meetings, information from the College's Score Card, and in the College's Student Success and Student Equity Plans. The Board supports resource allocation for the continuation of student learning programs and services and has allocated funds to support expansion of specialized student programs that provide excellence and equity.

Chapters 4 and 5 in BPs and APs detail areas that apply to instruction and student services (Evidence IV-29, Evidence IV-30, Evidence IV-31). The BP 2200 identifies the general objectives for the BOT including monitoring institutional performance and educational quality; establish, review, and revise policies that define the institutional mission and set prudent, ethical, and legal standards for college operations aligned with appropriate state and federal policies affecting community colleges; and assure fiscal health and stability. Board decisions are made in accordance with federal, state, and local policy and guidelines (Evidence IV-17).

The Board reviews and regularly approves curriculum recommendations from the Curriculum Committees of both colleges as well as recommendations on student success activities such as those documented in the Student Equity Plan and SSSP, and plans that are developed through the District ESS Committee. The Board regularly receives presentations from faculty and staff from various college programs, reviews reports including those from the OIRs, and attends campus and community events. Institutional mission statements and goals are reviewed during the annual planning retreat and at workshops throughout the year.

Evaluation

The BOT meets the Standard. Decisions are made by the Board based on the mission and priorities and the Board ensures that resources are available and used to support learning programs and services as evidenced in Board meeting minutes. Updates on programs, services and budgets are regularly provided to the Board (Evidence IV-25).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.c. | *The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.*

Description

The District Mission Statement affirms its commitment to educational quality for all students, and the priorities reiterate its commitment to fulfilling its financial, legal, and operational obligations and to support educational programs developed by the Colleges (Evidence IV-23).

The Board is accountable for all legal and fiscal matters including litigation, contracts, settlements and property matters. In considering a decision, the Board is required to comply with the California Code of Regulations Title 5, the California Education Code and all of the federal, state and local codes in addition to BP. The BOT acts independently of all other entities and its responsibilities for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity are described in BP 2200 (Evidence IV-17). Actions at the college, from hiring staff and faculty to initiating a new program, require Board approval, as do all legal contracts and MOU. The Board receives budget updates throughout the year, in January, May, July, and September, The Board also reviews and approves the District Tentative Budget in June, the Adopted Budget in September, and the Budget as submitted to the State (Evidence IV-32, Evidence IV-33, Evidence IV-34, Evidence IV-35, Evidence IV-36).

Evaluation

The BOT meets the Standard.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.d.

The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

Description

The BOT publishes the policies and the administrative procedures that address these areas. Over the past two years, all BOT' policies regarding Board size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures have been evaluated and updated. The accompanying Administrative Procedures have also been reviewed and updated. Chapter 2 of BPs (BP 2010-2750) provides specifics regarding the size of the board, its duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures and these policies are posted on the District's website (Evidence IV-37). Chapter 2 also addresses the organization and authority of the governing Board, including a list of officers, the selection of student trustees, district elections, and meetings. The BP 2410 stipulates that Board Policies will be evaluated every six years (Evidence IV-38).

The Board complies with the Brown Act by posting the schedule of Board meetings, agendas, and minutes. The Board receives reports from the Chancellor, the College President, the Faculty Association, the Classified Bargaining Unit (SEIU), the Academic Senate, and Classified Senates, and the SSCC President at regular (nonstudy sessions) meetings. The BP 2345 (Evidence IV-39) outlines the way in which members of the public can address the board. Anyone who completes a comment card prior to the beginning of the meeting is allocated three minutes to address the Board on any matter of interest. The Board President notes that no action will be taken at that

meeting on any item brought forward during Public Comment

Evaluation

The BOT meets the Standard as evidenced by the online BPs and APs that address these responsibilities.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.e. | *The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.*

Description

The District posts agendas and minutes of Board of Trustee meetings in accordance with the Brown Act and its policies and procedures. Board policies are reviewed and revised on a regular basis. In 2012, the BOT approved the hiring of a representative from the CCLC Policy and Procedure Service to work with CLPCCD staff to review all District BPs and associated APs and recommend revisions as needed. The BPs were routed through the Chancellor's Council for review and recommendations for updates by the appropriate constituent groups through the shared governance process. Following a review by the shared governance committees, the BOT received the BPs for a first reading, then for a second time for final adoption. The BPs and APs are posted on the District website under the Board/Chancellor heading (Evidence IV-40).

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. The BPs and APs are reviewed and revised as necessary and in consultation with the appropriate constituencies. Once the Board adopts the policies and procedures, it operates in accordance with the policies and procedures. The BOT meets this Standard as evidenced by its continued adherence to and revision of Board Policy every six years. The District publishes online BPs and APs that address all areas of governance including the duties and responsibilities of the Board. The subject matter for each BP is listed on the District Website (Evidence IV-40). The BOT is completing the revision of BPs and APs. (See Standard 4B above).

Actionable Improvement Plan

District Plan 2. The District commits to complete the process of revising all Board Policies into the new Chapter format.

B1.f.

The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

Description

The BOT has several vehicles for orientation and development. All new Board members participate in new member orientation, and the rotating Board President is provided with a training binder specific to that role. A copy of the binder is available in the Chancellor's Office. The BP 2100 assures the continuity of this training by requiring a staggered election cycle (Evidence IV-18).

Individual Board members have opportunities for development through the CCLC workshops for board members and board presidents. The Board President, for example, enrolled and attended workshops in 2013 in preparation for this leadership role. Additionally, members attend retreats throughout the year to focus on special concerns such as changes in state law or accreditation. The student members also attend student trustee training, are provided with a Student Trustee resource packet, and may attend a two-day training session. They work with District office staff throughout their tenure.

Board development and new member orientation includes ethics training as well as guidance on meeting protocol consistent with the Brown Act. The Chancellor works closely with the Board to ensure compliance with the Brown Act and other state laws as well as best practices for Board members. Board retreats and study sessions provide members with the opportunity to focus on specific topics, for example, SSSP and Student Equity funding and mandates or accreditation process updates. These sessions are open meetings and fully compliant with the Brown Act. The most recent board retreat was held on March 3, 2015. Board members have participated in a number of trainings offered by statewide associations including CCLC, CCCT, and ACCT. Several Board members attended the Government Institute on Student Success (GISS) conference in March 2014. Following the GISS session, a Board Action Plan was developed. The Board members receive significant training and ongoing development on the role and responsibility of California community college Board Members by attending the CCLC training for new Board Members, the annual Trustee Conference, the Effective Trustee Workshop, and by reviewing the CCLC Trustee Handbook and participating in professional development offered through ACCT. Board study sessions are offered throughout the year and serve as a means for focused discussion on specific topics related to the District and the Colleges (Evidence IV-41).

Evaluation

The BOT and the Chancellor are fully aware of and committed to Board development and training. The BP 2740 specifies board education, and BPs 2010 through 2750 outline specifics regarding elections, board elections, terms of office, and board self-evaluation (Evidence IV-37).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.g. | *The governing board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.*

Description

The BP 2745 outlines the self-evaluation process for the BOT (Evidence IV-42). The purpose of the self-evaluation is to identify strengths and weaknesses in Board performance. The evaluation addresses Board operations and policies, instructional and student services programs, institutional planning, Board-Chancellor relations, and community relations. This policy was evaluated and updated in April 2013 and January 2014. A change in the format of the Board meeting agenda was a result of a recent self-evaluation process. Board members complete an online, anonymous survey that includes seven categories. The results of the survey are provided in summary and discussed.

Evaluation

The BOT meets the Standard. A summary of the Board self-evaluation is presented and discussed at a Board retreat in open session (Evidence IV-43). The Board identifies their accomplishments for the past year and discusses goals for the coming year and how they can successfully meet those goals. The online survey tool used for the self-evaluation was provided to the trustees at the GISS session in March 2014. The BP 2745 clearly outlines the requirement for Board self-evaluation (Evidence IV-42). Materials from the self evaluations are available in the Chancellor's Office.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.h. | *The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.*

Description

Following CCLC Recommendations, in April 2013 the Board revised its ethics code. The BP 2715 outlines the Board's code of ethics and the process for dealing with ethics code violations (Evidence IV-24). The policy specifically outlines the steps that will be taken to address misconduct. Each Board member signs a Code of Ethics statement, and a copy is filed in the Office of the Chancellor.

Evaluation

The BOT meets the Standard. The Board is fully committed to upholding its policies and procedures that ensure compliance with regulations and laws. The BP 2715 addresses the Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice and provide for due process for a Board member who may be referred to an ad hoc committee to address complaints or allegations of misconduct.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.i. | *The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.*

Description

The BOT policies and practices assure its awareness of and involvement in the accreditation process. The Board is knowledgeable on the stages of accreditation through presentations given by the Colleges on the self-study standards, ACCJC recommendations, the One-Year Follow-up Report, and the Midterm Report.

The Board is informed about the accreditation process and regards it as an important aspect of ensuring quality in the District and at the colleges. The Accreditation Liaison Officers (ALO) and the Faculty Accreditation Cochair provide presentations leading up to the final draft of the self-study to ensure Board involvement in the accreditation process. Drafts and the final self-study are presented to the Board for a first reading and then for approval prior to the document being sent to ACCJC. The Board has received a number of presentations by the colleges' ALOs and Faculty Accreditation chairs including updates in October 2014 and April 2015 (Evidence IV-44, Evidence IV-45).

Evaluation

The BOT meets the Standard. The Chancellor keeps the Board informed on the progress of the colleges' self-studies and has asked the ALOs in their more recent presentation to identify any potential concerns and to share those with the Board.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B1.j.

The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively. In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Description

The BP/AP 2430 address delegating authority to the Chancellor while BP/AP 2435 address the evaluation of the Chancellor. The BP 2431 addresses the process for searching for a Chancellor and BP 2432 addresses appointing an Interim Chancellor. The policies and procedures were updated in March and April 2013 in response to the CCLC's recommendations. The Chancellor serves as an advisor to the Board on policy formation and is responsible for administering policies adopted by the Board (Evidence IV-37).

The Chancellor is selected by the Board using a fair and open search process in accordance with its policies and state law. The Chancellor Search Committee includes appointees of all constituency groups who contribute to the development of the job description and conduct interviews of eligible candidates. The Committee develops screening criteria to ensure a broad selection of candidates and develops interview questions consistent with the position responsibilities. The Search Committee recommends to the Board eligible candidates, and finalists participate in a number of forums held at the colleges and the district office. Written feedback is solicited from the forum attendees and provided to the Board who also meets with finalists and selects the Chancellor.

The Chancellor and the Board jointly agree to the evaluation process and consider the goals and objectives submitted by the Chancellor to the Board in addition to the Chancellor's job description. The Chancellor's evaluation is conducted in closed session and is noted on the agenda under "Public Employee Performance Evaluation" (Government Code Section 54957).

The BOT also participates in the evaluation and selection of the college presidents, including interim presidents. Both college presidents were selected using the District's presidential search process. One search included assistance from a consulting firm, while the other search was conducted by the Vice Chancellor, HR. In both cases, the presidential search committees consisted of appointees of all constituency groups, all of whom gave recommendations for the job description which was finalized by the Chancellor and the Board. After conducting interviews, the search committees identified candidates put forward as finalists. Forums were held at the appropriate college and written feedback was solicited from forum attendees. The finalists were

interviewed by the Chancellor, who, in collaboration with the BOT, made the hiring selection.

The College President is evaluated in accordance with the District's two-tiered evaluation system, consisting of an Annual Performance Evaluation Process and a Comprehensive Evaluation Process every three years. The Chancellor is accountable for the administration of the Administrator Performance Evaluation Process. As part of the evaluation, the President establishes goals tied to the priorities, mission, and values of the college. The Chancellor and President annually assess the progress toward their goals. The Chancellor briefs the Board on each President's progress as part of the annual evaluation.

Evaluation

The Board meets the Standard as it applies to the search, selection, and evaluation process of the Chancellor and the College Presidents. All constituent groups are included in the search and interview process for both the Chancellor and the College Presidents. Forums for finalists are accessible to district employees and the community and are video recorded and video streamed. A timeline for evaluating administrators is included in the Human Resources' collection of documents. This timeline specifies timeframes and parties from whom feedback should be collected.

The President of Chabot College is evaluated in accordance with the District's two-tiered evaluation system, consisting of an Annual Performance Evaluation Process and a Comprehensive Evaluation Process every three years. The College President was evaluated in 2013 and awarded a three year contract. The Chancellor is accountable for the administration of the Administrator Performance Evaluation Process.

The District has experienced turnover in the Chancellor and both College Presidents during the past six years. Continuity of evaluation information is, therefore, scant. However, evaluations are performed in accordance with policy. Chancellor Jackson, for example, was evaluated during 2014-15 and was awarded a new three year contract at the board meeting of April 21, 2015.

Faculty and staff have expressed a low sense of involvement in the administrative evaluation process, with just 20 percent either agreeing or strongly agreeing that, "Current evaluation procedures for administrators solicit and consider my opinion in assessing administrator effectiveness." The process provides that evaluator and evaluatee mutually agree on the names of faculty, classified staff, administrators, and clients selected to participate in Multirater Feedback Assessment Survey. The low sense of involvement may result from the *confidential* nature of the evaluation (results are not shared with the College) and/or the fact that the evaluation process, run by the district, *does not include Chabot faculty and staff*. According to President Sperling, the district is in full compliance with the administrative evaluation cycle at Chabot College.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B2.

The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

B2.a.

The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

Description

The BP 4115 outlines the responsibility for management of the college to “direct and assign the work of management personnel to the chancellor and the college president” (Evidence IV-46). The BP 2012 (Evidence IV-19) states that

- Each college shall be a comprehensive institution
- Each college shall develop its own character, uniqueness and loyalties
- Outlines the Board and the Chancellor’s roles
- The Board and the District management shall give general direction and coordination to the programs and operations of the college and shall provide centralized services and controls
- Presidents of the colleges shall report directly to the Chancellor

The Chabot College administrative structure involves three areas led by Vice Presidents: Academic Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services, which all report directly to the President. Reporting directly to the Vice Presidents are Directors and Division Deans. Additionally, the OIR falls under the umbrella of the President’s Office. The President has the responsibility of filling and determining the need to fill all administrative staff and faculty vacancies. The administrative organizational chart was most recently updated in April 2015. (See Tab: *Institutional Organization*.)

The Vice President of Academic Services, Stacy Thompson, oversees each instructional divisions (that is, Applied Technology and Business, Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Health and Physical Education and Athletics, Language Arts, Science and Mathematics), including Deans, faculty, and staff. The office keeps track of curriculum changes, Flex Day planning and obligations, academic calendar and scheduling, and faculty orientation. Other academic programs, such as the Library, and various entities housed under the LC are also in this area (. (See Tab: *Institutional Organization*.)

The Vice President of Student Services, Matthew Kritscher, oversees Counseling, Special Programs and Services, Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, and Student Life. These areas are headed by a Dean or Director. (See Tab: *Institutional Organization*.)

The Vice President of Administrative Services, Connie Willis, has Directors report to her in the areas of Campus Safety and Security, Media Services, and the contracted services of Fresh and Natural Cafeteria and the Chabot College Bookstore, which began operation under Follett in Dec. 2011. (See Tab: *Institutional Organization*.)

Evaluation

The President delegates the appropriate authority to those reporting directly to her. Administrative staffing at community colleges has been particularly challenging during the past few years, as each vacancy was scrutinized for financial necessity, and there is a lengthy process to post interim and permanent positions. On behalf of the College, the President moved as quickly as possible to post, recruit, and appoint respected faculty and administrators from within the College to serve on an interim basis. Currently, only two administrative positions are held by interims, and the new dean's position is posted and will close July 31, 2015.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B2.b.

The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities; ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
- ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes;
- establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

Description

Under BP 2012 and 4115 the College President is authorized create a

“comprehensive institution ... Each (College) shall offer a wide range of educational opportunities to include transfer programs, technical-vocational education, general education, continuing education, community services, and student services.”

After the current President, Dr. Susan Sperling, took office in Feb. 2012, she easily transitioned into various areas of the presidency due to her long-term familiarity with the Chabot College community. She was able to engage the college community in dialogue, to capture their needs in written documents, and to utilize those documents for the allocation of resources. She regularly sends email to the College community in which she communicates her observations and reflections. She holds periodic “Brown

Bag” college forums to discuss and get feedback on college issues and operations. Since Dr. Sperling was already familiar and involved in the shared governance process at the college, she had no difficulty in effectively expanding her participation in all areas of the campus.

Dr. Sperling recognizes the need for data to inform the operations, programs, and performance of the College. She directs the OIR to collect data that clarifies performance and the education needs of the student body. The OIR also collects data to support PR, the key component of College planning. The PR responses are submitted to the PRBC, which also develops the Strategic Plan. The Budget Committee recommends a budget to the College President at College Council. The Budget Committee works with data from the OIR, recommendations made by the PRBC, and the resource requests made through PR.

The College continue to work with consortium partners on the large HPN, TAA, and CPT Grants. The College will be applying for a Title V Grant (Hispanic Serving Institution) to further the strategic goals and objectives (Evidence IV-47). With all of this activity, the infrastructure for the Grants and Development Office will continue to need strengthening.

Evaluation

The results from the Spring 2014 Staff Survey showed that there has been an improvement in satisfaction with Chabot College’s Administration since the last Faculty/Staff Survey in 2008. The Spring 2014 Staff Survey showed that 62 percent of the respondents support the college’s mission, up from 49 percent in 2008. Also, 70 percent feel that the Administration has effectively encouraged excellence in instruction and a positive learning environment, up from 62 percent and 66 percent in 2008 respectively ([Evidence OIR-41](#)).

Faculty and staff sometimes note that the planning process requires lots of paperwork for little effect, at least partly because the result of their planning work has not been publicized. The President has made an effort to change this perception by communicating more emphatically the results of budget allocation and facilities planning via email and an online communication. As every college discipline, program, or service area participates in the PR process, and the deadlines, content, submissions, and reviews of the PR submissions are communicated more widely; the posting of all submissions on the PRBC website, and the publication of resource allocations, faculty and staff will improve this perception ([Evidence I-20](#)).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B2.c. | *The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.*

Description

The President is involved at every level with the implementation of policy. Through the management structure and faculty and staff leadership, the practices of matriculation, enrollment of students, provisions for financial aid, development of curriculum, assignment of required courses for degrees and certificates and other functions are implemented in accord with statutes, regulations, and board policy. By staying accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators, she ensures that the College addresses problems as they arise.

Through the management structure and through the shared governance process, the President empowers the administration, faculty and staff leaders to implement, review, and revise, as appropriate, the practices of the matriculation and enrollment of students, provisions for financial aid, development of curriculum, assignment of required courses for degrees and certificates, development and implementation of a collective academic, student services, and administrative PR process, development and practice of student grievances policies, institutional planning and budgeting, development of a budget, maintenance of accreditation standards, and all other major functions in accord with statutes, regulations or BPs.

The President chairs the Administrative Staff meetings, confers regularly with the Presidents of the Academic, Classified, and Student Senates, and chairs the College Council in a collegial and inclusive manner. College Council functions as the “last stop” body that accepts recommendations from other governance groups and task forces; disseminates and interprets policies and procedures to the appropriate constituent groups; makes recommendations on proposals from major shared governance groups (PRBC, Academic, Classified, and Student Senate); organizes, tracks, and exchanges information among College governance groups, and facilitates the communication and involvement of all constituencies.

Although the President is ultimately responsible for ensuring that all statutes, regulations, and policies are implemented appropriately, she delegates the responsibility for day-to-day operations to the Vice Presidents and Deans. She meets with the Vice Presidents regularly to ensure the smooth operation of the College. Dr. Sperling is an advocate of modeling academic freedom and democracy in the College. She encourages an environment where opinions are honored and candid conversations take place without fear of retaliation. For example: Dr. Sperling was outspoken and clear about her disagreement with the allocation model that was ultimately adopted. Interim Vice President’s felt differently and voted their opinion at DBSG. They understood that they were free to vote in accord with their best thinking and openly voted in favor of it in front of her. It is common for open and often vociferous dialogue to occur at shared governance meetings with many different perspectives voiced. While the process can be long and challenging, the College works toward establishing common frameworks and consensus relying on the President’s strong

model of and support for an open, reasoned shared governance process. (See, for example, PRBC Minutes Fall 2013, [Evidence I-20](#).)

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The President is conducting a rich dialogue with the campus community about the strengths and challenges of the College. Through the shared governance process as well as through the administrative structure, the President provides leadership and direction in the implementation of regulations, policies, and measures of institutional effectiveness for the benefit of the students and community. Developing a trusting and engaged culture takes time and continuous work. Dr. Sperling has demonstrated a long-standing commitment to the mission, vision, and values of the College and reason in her efforts to engage the college community in participatory governance. Encouraged to participate, the constituencies elect representatives to the College governance committees who project respect, trust, flexibility, and engagement, so that the implementation of prescribed regulations and BPs yields the best practices in the field.

In the areas of assessment and institutional effectiveness, she has strengthened and empowered the Office of Academic Services with additional administrative and classified staff. Among other duties, the new Administrative Dean will shepherd the processes of PR and Student Learning Assessment. She encouraged streamlining PR and integrating course and program evaluation with improvement, planning, and resources allocation requests.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B2.d.

The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

Description

The CLPCCD distributes resources according to the Board-approved BAM. The Vice President of Administrative Services reports directly to the President regarding all matters related to the College's resources, its budget, and its expenditures. The President delegates authority to the Vice President of Administrative Services to supervise budget preparations and management, oversee fiscal management of the college and contract for purchase, sell, lease property in accordance to Board policy.

Given that a large part of the budget allocation is related to personnel or is categorical, there is little discretionary money available for other expenses. Division Deans and other managers are charged with presenting their requests based on the PR responses submitted by faculty and staff to PRBC, which forwards the relevant portions and recommendations to shared governance committees, such as the Budget Committee, the personnel prioritization committees, and the CEMC.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Dr. Sperling has the final college authority over budget allocation, but she collegially consults the shared governance structure in exercising that authority. She believes in decision-making transparency, including the Budget. Historically, this an area where many felt transparency was lacking, particularly when severe financial constraints existed. Therefore, the President and the College are committed to continued improvement in making priorities, decision-making processes, and decisions clear and public. The College has evaluated the Shared Governance Policy, which includes budget allocations. This review, which started in fall 2104, will be complete by end of fall 2015.

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 that will revise Chabot's shared governance structures and procedures. The president will present the proposal, based upon recommendations from the college 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 from the second reading, the president will recommend approval of the document to College Council at their final fall semester meeting. Following College Council approval, the final document will be shared with the Board and the new processes initiated in early 2016.

B2.e. | *The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.*

Description

Dr. Sperling communicates by email to the College community about what is occurring on campus, detailing her observations and reflections. Dr. Sperling is very visible in the external community and throughout the Chabot College Service Area. She is active in the community, attending events, meetings and greeting groups on campus. She is a frequent speaker about the strengths of the College and how the programs and services benefit the community. Through correspondence and in person, she presents the College as a beacon of learning as well as an economic engine in this community.

One of the Chabot College Strategic Goals is to expand its community partnerships. To this end, Dr. Sperling is involved with the HPN outreach. She has contributed to the "My Word" pieces published by the Bay Area News Group, and she was interviewed by local television stations following the editorial written by Tom Hanks, which was published by the *New York Times* in which he mentioned Chabot College.

In the fall 2014, Chabot College began collaborating with the Hayward Area Historical Society on a book project that documents the history of Chabot College (Evidence IV-48).

The President's vision to revive the Foundation became reality at the beginning of 2014. The new Friends of Chabot Foundation was formed, led by Director, Dr. Maria Ochoa. The Friends of Chabot Foundation's 501(c)3 status has been secured for various fundraising initiatives. In addition, the Chabot College Alumni Association will operate as part of the foundation. Dr. Sperling coordinated the solicitation of members for the Board of Directors, including elected officials for the foundation (Evidence IV-48).

Evaluation

The college meets the Standard. Dr. Susan Sperling accepted the position as Chabot College President on Feb. 22, 2012. She has been a member of the Chabot College community since 1987. During her career she has served in as a faculty member, faculty leader, administrator and community liaison. Dr. Sperling was Chabot College's first grants developer and has successfully negotiated college funding partnerships with both the private and public sector and developed innovative projects involving the range of diversity in the college's service area. As one of the few presidents who started as a faculty member and moved up through the ranks to become president of the same college, Dr. Sperling has a unique, long-term relationship with the college as well as the surrounding community.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B3.

In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

Description

The District's governance structure is outlined in several board policies and includes policies that designate faculty as primary in the development of academic programs. The consultation process is also outlined in policy. The district and colleges have worked collaboratively to develop effective shared governance committees included in the recently adopted IPBM, the model that informs how recommendations are provided to the Chancellor working through the shared governance committee structure. District committees within the scope of the Vice Chancellor, Educational

Services and Student Success, include ESS, DEMC, and the DCC. Meetings for all three committees are held monthly and include representatives from various constituencies. Additional district committees with constituent representatives include the Chancellor's Council, which meets monthly with bargaining unit and senate leadership and administrators, the TCC, and the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), which meets monthly to facilitate the strategic planning process.

Evaluation

The District provides appropriate and effective leadership and communicates expectations for excellence in programs and services. District and College leaders work together to ensure that the best interest of students maintains a primary focus. Efforts to ensure effective operations at both the district and colleges continue and are part of an ongoing dialogue. The Chancellor serves as the liaison between the colleges, district employees, and the Board.

The DBSG, which existed from 1991 to 2014, had a large membership that included representatives of three senates, unions, and key administrative offices. The achievements of this committee include the BAM and the IPBM. In 2009-2010, the Committee undertook an assessment of the allocation model that was created in 1996. The assessment revealed the possibility that over time the model had created inequities between the colleges. Over the next two years, the DBSG performed a comprehensive analysis of the allocation model, proposed and discussed a series of possible revisions, and sought the guidance of an academic budget allocation model consultant. Once a committee consensus had been reached, the DBSG forwarded its recommendations for a new allocation model to the Interim Chancellor, who took it to the Board for approval in May 2013. The Chancellor and DBSG worked collaboratively to develop the new planning and budget model, which was approved then implemented in fall 2014. The DBSG has been subsumed within the new IPBM model, which has a four-committee structure: ESS, TCC, Facilities Committee, and the PBC. The success of the model will depend on the commitment of the constituent committees and offices to the delineated processes.

The District Function Map and new task map discussed above are also examples where the Colleges and the District have worked to better describe the defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B3.a. *The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.*

Description

The District has a Function Map, a Task Map, and BP 4115 (Evidence IV-19) outlines

the delineation of the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges. The two maps have been revised and/or created within the past academic year. The District is creating a new District Strategic Plan, while the colleges are working to create new educational master plans.

The DBSG recommended an organizational evaluation of District and Maintenance Offices in May 2013. The District hired School Services of California to conduct this evaluation. They performed a comparative staffing analysis to other colleges and presented their recommendations to the BOT in April 2014. In response, the Chancellor reorganized senior leadership at the District office.

The College's 2009 Accreditation self-study identified the goal of annually evaluating the District Strategic Plan in terms of how well the District and the College were collaborating in the plan's implementation. This has been partially accomplished. Developing the 2012-13 District Facilities Plan, the District solicited feedback from the College community as well as from the Academic, Classified, and Student Senates before presenting the final proposal to the BOT.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. Since the last Accreditation site visit, the District and Colleges have updated and clarified delineation of the functions and operations of the College and District. In 2012, The District created an updated Functional Map. (See Tab *District/College Functions*.) The map was reviewed by the Chancellor's Senior Leadership Team in September 2014 and with members of the colleges' Accreditation Steering Committee members in November 2014. The new function and task maps were approved by the College Council in April 2015.

The Spring 2014 Staff Survey reveals that College faculty and staff do not fully understand the organizational roles of the District and College. Only 24 percent of respondents reported that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "The division between District and College operational responsibilities is clearly communicated" ([Evidence OIR-18](#)).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B3.b | *The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.*

Description

In May 2013, the DBSG recommended an organizational evaluation of District and Maintenance Offices. The District hired School Services of California to conduct this evaluation. They did a comparative staffing analysis to other colleges and presented their recommendations to the BOT in April 2014. In response, the Chancellor reorganized senior leadership at the District.

In spring 2014 the Chancellor proposed a new IPBM to coordinate district planning. In

fall 2014, the committee created a mission statement for the committee that integrated the mission statements of the District and both colleges.

Evaluation

The District and College partially meet this standard. The District received an analysis of District services by the School Services of California group. The Chancellor reorganized the management structure, recommended and implemented new strategic planning committees. The District hired a new Vice Chancellor of Educational Services, and M&O developed and has begun implementing a staffing plan (Evidence IV-49). District departments have internal evaluations to guide their strategic planning; however, there are no regular, published, program or service area reviews for district services. The College has program reviews in areas that are its responsibility.

In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, only 24 percent of the staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The division between District and College operational responsibilities is clearly communicated” ([Evidence OIR-19](#), p. 18). Generally, 34 percent of Chabot staff/faculty/administrators agreed with the statement, “District services are responsive to Chabot staff/faculty/administrators.” Whether faculty and staff felt that District services are administered to meet the needs of Chabot College varies by District services ([Evidence OIR-19](#), p. 18):

Maintenance and Operations	35%
ITS	40%
Human Resources	55%
Purchasing	42%
Warehouse and Receiving	55%

Actionable Improvement Plan

District Plan 3: In order to fully meet the Standard, the District and the Colleges will create a collaborative assessment process (PR) of District Services that is available to the public.

B3.c. | *The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.*

Description

Since the last Accreditation site visit, the District has made significant effort toward fair distribution of resources. The participatory governance committee charged with the evaluation of the District Allocation Model from 2009-2014 was the DBSG. In fall 2014, this committee was renamed the PBC. The charter of the PBC includes (Evidence IV-50).

The PBC is part of the integrated planning and budget process, which will be implemented beginning in the spring term 2014 through the 2015 academic year. At the end of the initial period, the process will be reviewed and evaluated, and any needed improvements will be put forward for review and adoption.

Evaluation

The District and the College meets the Standard. The College participated in the DBSG and now in the PBC.

To address the 2009 Report District and College Recommendation #2:

“To meet the standards, the team recommends that the district and the college complete the evaluation of the resource allocation process in time for budget development for the 2010-2011 academic year, ensuring transparency and assessing the effectiveness of resource allocations in supporting operations. (Standard III.D.I, III.D.3, IV.B.3)”

The DBSG worked for three years to develop a new allocation model to support the functions of the Colleges and the District. In 2012-13, the District contracted an academic budget allocation model consultant for additional support in creating a new model. Once the model was formulated, it was reviewed and discussed in College Senates. In spring 2013, the DBSG reached a consensus to recommend the adoption of a new allocation model to the BOT. The Board approved the new model in May 2013.

This model should resolve the main inconsistencies perceived in the old model. This will depend, however, on the transparency of processes and commitment to the model in practice. There are multiple areas, even with the new model, where mutual understanding of concepts and definitions and how they are to be applied, will shape implementation. Assessments of and improvements to the model will be proposed by the PBC as part of their charge.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B3.d. | *The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.*

Description

The District has controlled its expenditures. The District Office of Business Services is responsible for tracking expenditures as well as projecting variable costs, for example, of RUMBL and health care. Audits for the last several years have produced no adverse financial findings, and the District has consistently maintained an ending balance and reserves, with the exception of 2011-12, when the District borrowed from the RUMBL fund to cover budgeted expenditures. Those funds have been repaid. This action was recommended by the DBSG and approved by the Board (with one dissenting vote). Special accounts, such as the monies from the Measure B Bond, are also the responsibility of the District, which manages the bond accounts with the Bond Oversight Committee. The District has developed a proposal for and has begun moving staff positions currently funded by bond funds into general funds in preparation of Measure B ending.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. The District has no audit issues ([Evidence RS-46](#)).

The District sends the ACCJC an annual fiscal report for each college (Evidence IV-51). Included in this report is the Required Evidentiary Documents for Financial Review ([Evidence RS-29](#)).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B3.e.

The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without his/her interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.

Description

The Chancellor gives the Presidents the authority to implement delegated policies and holds the Presidents accountable for the operation of the Colleges through an annual performance evaluation process, as provided in BP 2012 and 4115 (Evidence IV-19, Evidence IV-46). As part of the evaluation, the Presidents establish goals tied to the priorities, mission, and values of each college. The Chancellor and Presidents annually assess the progress toward these goals. As part of the annual evaluation process, the Chancellor also briefs the Board on each President's progress.

Less formal, ongoing delegation and evaluation occur at weekly District Senior Leadership Team meetings, which are attended by the Presidents, the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Student Success, the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, and the Vice Chancellor of Business Services. The Presidents also attend Board meetings and report on College initiatives, programs, and various college expenditures in compliance with District policies and procedures.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B3.f.

The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.

Description

The organization of the District's governance effectively facilitates information sharing between the Board, the District, and the Colleges. The Chancellor holds monthly meeting of the Chancellor's Council, whose membership includes representatives of all constituency groups. These representatives then transmit

information from the Council to the Academic, Classified, and Student Senates, and the President's College Council. Other district committees with important information-sharing roles include PBC, Facilities, TCC, ESS, and DEMC. The new IPBM committees report to the Chancellor's Council according to their charges.

The District and the Colleges use effective methods of communication in a timely manner to relay information to Board members and others regarding upcoming agenda items. In advance of a Board meeting, agenda items are distributed electronically through the Board packet to Board members, college administrators, both Senates' representatives, union leadership, student leaders, the press, and other interested community members. Board packets also contain Board reports that will be reviewed by the Chancellor.

The Presidents, the Vice Presidents, and the Presidents of the Academic Senates, Classified Senates, and Student Senates all attend Board meetings and report to the board and to their constituencies. The BOT includes a student trustee who voices the concerns of students. Agendas and minutes of Board meetings and workshops are posted on the District website.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. The Chancellor has prioritized timely, effective communication between the colleges and the governing board. The colleges use the district structures to communicate through the Chancellor to the Board. Within the monthly Board meetings, Agenda Item 2 includes reports by the Faculty, Classified and Student Senate Presidents. The College President and the Chabot College Student Trustee report in Agenda Item 10.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B3.g.

The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Description

District systems and role delineations are stipulated by board policies. They are shown on the District Function and Task Maps and are reflected in the IPBM structure. Relevant BPs include 2012, 2015-18, 4115. The District and the Colleges are working together on the *District Strategic Master Plan* and the colleges' educational master plans, which may impact district/college roles.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. The District hired School Services of California to conduct an organizational review of the District Office and M&O department. The objective of the review was to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the current organization structure and to provide a basis for management decisions and actions (Evidence IV-52). They did a comparative staffing analysis and presented their recommendations to the BOT in April 2014. In response, the Chancellor reorganized senior leadership. The M&O Department created a report on staffing with recommendations while the Chancellor hired a Vice Chancellor for Educational Services.

All BPs and Aps are being updated and revised. At this time, identified BPs that relate to roles, 2012, 2015-18 and 4115, are still old policies and have been cited as evidence in this report. As new policies are approved, the policies affecting the constituent groups are discussed in the Chancellor's Council, and the representatives take them back for comment. The District Function and Task Maps were presented and approved by the District Leadership Team and the College Council in April 2015. A process to evaluate the Functional and Task Maps needs to be assigned to an IPBM committee. The IPBM came out of a work group led by Chancellor Janette Jackson. The committees started work in fall 2014 and according to their charters will assess their effectiveness annually.

An example of how the Board, District, senior college administrators, faculty and staff work together to facilitate discussion and effective communication is the recent major planning meeting held as part of the development of the new *District Strategic Plan*, and the *Educational Master Plans*. In February 2015, a planning charrette was held. During this event, faculty, staff, and administrators from both colleges, along with staff from the District, Board members, and external stakeholders, assessed the opportunities and challenges presented in the Environmental Scan (conducted in 2014). Strategies and specific actions were proposed in response and the draft documents are currently under review by the colleges. The district expects to complete the preliminary administrative draft portion of the District Strategic Plan and the Colleges' *Educational Master Plan* by August 2015.

Actionable Improvement Plan

District Plan 3: In order to fully meet the Standard, the District and the Colleges will create a collaborative assessment process (PR) of District Services that is available to the public.

Evidence

Evidence IV-1. DBSG Meeting Minutes,
<http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/MinutesverbatimRevA.pdf>

Evidence IV-2. BP 2014, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2014Policy.pdf>

Evidence IV-3. BP 2015, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2015.pol.pdf>

Evidence IV-4. BP 2016, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2016.pol.pdf>

Evidence IV-5. BP 2017, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2017.pol.pdf>

Evidence IV-6. BP 2018, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2018.pol.pdf>

Evidence IV-7. Chabot College Website, Listing of Committees,
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/facultystaff/index.asp>

Evidence IV-8. Classified Senate Website,
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/ClassifiedSenate/>

Evidence IV-9. SSCC, <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/ASCC/ascc/index.asp>

Evidence IV-10. District Curriculum Committee,
<http://www.clpccd.org/education/Districtcurriculumcouncil.php>

Evidence IV-11. IPBM Website, <http://www.clpccd.org/ipbm/>

Evidence IV-12. Accreditation Website, <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation>

Evidence IV-13. Approval of Chabot Foundation,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2013_August_20_Minutes_Official.pdf

Evidence IV-14. Measure B Website,
<http://www.clpccd.org/bond/OversightComm.php>

Evidence IV-15. District-ACCJC Communication,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2013_0328SpecialReport.pdf

Evidence IV-16. New Educational Master Plan Development,
<http://www.clpccd.org/education/EducationalMasterPlans.php>

Evidence IV-17. BP 2200, Board Duties and Responsibilities,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2200BoardDutiesandResponsibilitiesRev.4-16-13Adopted.pdf>

Evidence IV-18. BP 2100, Board Elections,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2100BoardElectionsRev.4-16-13Adopted.pdf>

Evidence IV-19. BP 2012, General Policy for the Relationship of Colleges to the District, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2012Policy.pdf>

Evidence IV-20. Chancellor's Council Website,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/ChancellorsCouncil.php>

Evidence IV-21. BP 2431, Chancellor Selection,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2431ChancellorSelectionRev.4-16-13Adopted.pdf>

Evidence IV-22. BP 2435, Evaluation of the Chancellor,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2435EvaluationoftheChancellorRev.4-16-13Adopted.pdf>

Evidence IV-23. Board Adoption of the Mission, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/>

Evidence IV-24. BP 2715, Code of Ethics,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2715CodeofEthics->

StandardsOfPracticeRev.4-16-13Adopted.pdf

Evidence IV-25. Board Minutes,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/BoardAgendaArchives.php>

Evidence IV-26. Board and Administrative Policies,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/bprevisedchapter2.php>

Evidence IV-27. Board Retreat Agenda,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2015_0303_Board_Retreat_Agenda_Official_000.pdf

Evidence IV-28. Board Priorities, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/BoardPriorities.php>

Evidence IV-29. Board Policy, Chapter 4, Instruction,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/bprevisedchapter4.php>

Evidence IV-30. Administrative Policy, Instruction,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/APRevisedChapter4.php>

Evidence IV-31. Board Policy, Series 5000, Students and Student Services,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/BoardPoliciesIndex.php>

Evidence IV-32. January Budget Briefing,
<http://www.clpccd.org/Business/documents/BudgetinBrief-January21BoardMtng.pdf>

Evidence IV-33. May Budget Briefing,
<http://www.clpccd.org/Business/documents/BudgetinBrief-May20BoardMtng.pdf>

Evidence IV-34. Final Budget, <http://www.clpccd.org/Business/20104-15BUDGET.php>

Evidence IV-35. First Quarter 2013-14 Budget Report,
<http://www.clpccd.org/Business/documents/ccfs3111stqrt12-13.pdf>

Evidence IV-36. Third Quarter Budget Report 2013-14,
<http://www.clpccd.org/Business/documents/311Q2013-142nd..qtr.pdf>

Evidence IV-37. Board Policies, Chapter 2,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/bprevisedchapter2.php>

Evidence IV-38. BP 2410, Board Policy and Administrative Procedure,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2410BoardPolicyandAdministrativeProcedureRev.4-16-13Adopted.pdf>

Evidence IV-39. BP 2345, Public Participation at Board Meetings,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2345PublicParticipationatBoardMeetingsRev.4-16-13Adopted.pdf>

Evidence IV-40. Index of Revised Board Policies and Administrative Procedures,
<http://www.clpccd.org/board/bprevisedchapter2.php>

Evidence IV-41. BOT Study Sessions,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2015_BoTs_Mtgs_2015_0223_Retreat_Time_Added.pdf

Evidence IV-42. BP 2745, Self Evaluation,

<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2745BoardSelf-EvaluationRev.4-16-13Adopted.pdf>

Evidence IV-43. Summary of Board Evaluation,

http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/Minutes_July31_2013_Retreat_Official.pdf

Evidence IV-44. October 7, 2014, Accreditation Presentation to the Board,

http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/10_7_14_Chabotaccreditationpresentation.pdf

Evidence IV-45. April 21, 2014, Accreditation Presentation to the Board,

http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/04_21_15_ChabotaccreditationpresentationtotheBoardofTrustees.pdf

Evidence IV-46. BP 4115, <http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/4115.pol.pdf>

Evidence IV-47. First Wednesday Report, March 2014,

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/presidentscorner/docs/ChabotCollegeFirstWednesdayReportMarch2014.pdf>

Evidence IV-48. First Wednesday Report, April 2014,

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/presidentscorner/docs/ChabotCollegeFirstWednesdayReportApril2014.pdf>

Evidence IV-49. District M&O Custodial Staffing Plan, Evidence IV-49

Evidence IV-50. PBC Charter,

<http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/FINALPlanningBudgetComm3-10-14web.pdf>

Evidence IV-51. Annual Fiscal Report to the ACCJC 2015,

<http://libraryguides.chabotcollege.edu/Accreditation>

Evidence IV-52. School Services Report,

<http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/Chabot-LaPositasCCD-DistrictOfficeandMandOOrgReviewFINAL.pdf>