PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT

Chabot College
25555 Hesperian Blvd.
Hayward, CA 94545

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a Focused Site Visit to Chabot College from October 11-12, 2022. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its January 2023 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

Dr. Kim Hoffmans
Team Chair

Table of Contents

Chabot College
Peer Review Team Roster
TEAM ISER REVIEW

Dr. Kimberly Hoffmans*, Chair President Ventura College	Dr. Brenda Thames*, Vice Chair Superintendent/President El Camino College
ACADEMIC MEMBERS	
Mr. Howard Eskew, Jr. Associate Professor, Accounting San Diego Mesa College	Dr. Kathryn Nette Professor, Biological Sciences Cuyamaca College
Ms. Sarah Shepard Faculty - Business & Curriculum Chair West Hills College Coalinga	
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS	
Ms. Primavera Arvizu Vice President, Student Services Porterville College	Ms. Claudette Dain* Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services Citrus College
Mr. Leighton Vila Program Evaluator Windward Community College	Dr. Marina Aminy Executive Director California Virtual Campus (CVC)
Ms. Monica Chahal Vice President of Instruction Clovis Community College	
ACCJC STAFF LIAISON	
Dr. Kevin Bontenbal Vice President ACCJC	

*Persons who served as participants on the district review team should be noted with an asterisk.

Summary of Focused Site Visit

INSTITUTION: Chabot College

DATES OF VISIT: October 11-12, 2022

TEAM CHAIR: Dr Kim Hoffmans

This Peer Review Team Report is based on the formative and summative components of the comprehensive peer review process. In February 2022, a team of ten conducted Team ISER Review (formative component) to identify where the college meets Standards and to identify areas of attention for the Focused Site Visit (summative component) by providing Core Inquiries that the team will pursue to validate compliance, improvement, or areas of excellence. Ten Core College Inquiries and one District Inquiry were identified and are appended to this report.

A five-member peer review team conducted a Focused Site Visit to Chabot College on October 11th and 12th, 2022, for the purpose of completing its Peer Review Team Report and determination of whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and U.S. Department of Education regulations.

The team chair and vice chair held a pre-Focused Site Visit meeting with the College CEO on September 27, 2022, to discuss updates since the Team ISER Review and to plan for the Focused Site Visit. During the Focused Site Visit, team members met with approximately 80 faculty, administrators, classified staff, and students in formal meetings, group interviews, and individual interviews.

The team held two open forums, one in-person and one online, that provided the College community and others an opportunity to share their thoughts with members of the Peer Review team. The team evaluated how well the College is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement. The team thanks the College staff for coordinating and hosting the Focused Site Visit meetings and interviews and ensuring a smooth and collegial process.

During the team's review of the ISER and Site Visit, the collegial, respectful, and supportive nature of Chabot College was evident. Additionally, the inclusive governance framework utilizing a tri-chair model lead by a classified professional, faculty member, and administrator was impressive.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the
Peer Review Team Report

Team Commendations

Commendation 1: The team commends the College for inclusion and strong participation and leadership from classified staff in shared governance in support of innovation and institutional excellence. (IV.A.1, IV.A.3)

Team Recommendations

Recommendations to Meet Standards:

None

Recommendations to Improve Quality:

None

District Commendation:

District Commendation 1: The team commends the district for its comprehensive Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Plan, supported by a Budget Allocation Model that informs a long-range approach to capital planning. (III.B.4)

District Recommendations to Meet Standards:

None

District Recommendations to Improve Quality:

None

Introduction

In 1961, Chabot College became the first college in the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) and has remained a fully accredited, public community college since its first accreditation in 1963. The College sits on 94 acres with over 20 buildings, including the opening of two new buildings since the last accreditation visit: a new library and biology building. Since its inception, the College has educated the extraordinarily diverse populations of Alameda County and beyond through a historic commitment to a culture of equity and excellence in academics.

As Chabot serves the educational, career, job skills, and personal development needs of the community by providing culturally responsive, revitalizing, and sustaining learning and support services driven by a goal of equity. As part of a multi-college district, Chabot College operates under the jurisdiction of the Chabot- Las Positas seven-member Board of Trustees who are responsible for all policy decisions. Board members are elected from trustee areas by registered voters of nine communities: Castro Valley, Dublin, Hayward, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Leandro, San Lorenzo, Sunol, and Union City.

The College offers associate degrees, certificates, and credentials designed to prepare students to succeed as they continue their education, enter the world of work, and engage in and support the civic and cultural life of the community. Roughly, three out of four students who begin or continue their postsecondary education at Chabot College are first-generation college goers. In Fall 2020, 41% of the college's student population identifies as Latino/a/x, 31% were residents of Hayward, and 28% were 19 years old or younger. In recent years, the Chabot student population has also become increasingly diverse, with Latino/a/x students emerging as the largest and fastest growing student group. In recognition of this trend, in 2008, Chabot College applied for and was awarded designation as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) by the U.S. Department of Education.

Chabot College boasts a wide array of curricular offerings including, but not limited to, preparation for transfer to a four-year university, associate of arts and associate of science degrees, liberal arts (emphasis in math and science), business administration, biology (emphasis in allied health), administration of justice, and liberal arts (emphasis in arts and humanities). Top majors awarding certificates include business administration, accounting technician, bookkeeping, early childhood development, medical assisting, management, and automotive chassis technology.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

Chabot College of the Chabot Las Positas Community College District is a two-year public community college authorized by the California Education Code and the California Community Colleges under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors to operate as an educational institution and to award degrees. The District is governed by a locally elected, seven-member Board of Trustees. The College has the authority to operate as a degree-granting institution based on its continuous accreditation with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, an institutional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

Conclusion: The College meets Eligibility Requirement 1.

2. Operational Status

The institution is fully operational and offers classes in fall, spring, and summer terms. In the fall of 2020, 12,945 total students took classes at Chabot College. Students are actively pursuing transfer, certificate, noncredit, and occupational degree programs. The schedule of classes and Catalog are published online.

Conclusion: The College meets Eligibility Requirement 2.

3. Degrees

Effective with the 2020-2022 Catalog, the College offers 22 Associate in Arts for transfer (AA-T) degrees, 6 Associate in Science for transfer degrees (AS-T), 39 Associate in Arts (AA) degrees, 24 Associate in Science (AS) degrees and 117 certificates. In 2019-2020, 1,005 degrees were awarded. All degree programs meet approval criteria as specified by Education Code and California Title 5 regulation and require at least 18 units in a major area of emphasis, a general education pattern, and electives totaling at least 60 units. Requirements for all degrees are published in the College Catalog.

Conclusion: The College meets Eligibility Requirement 3.

4. Chief Executive Officer

Dr. Susan Sperling was appointed by the CLPCCD Board of Trustees in 2012 as the ninth President of Chabot College. The president is responsible to the CLPCCD chancellor and maintains the policies, procedures, rules, and regulations as set forth by the chancellor, the Board of Trustees, the California Education Code, the Board of Governors of the CCCCO, and the laws of California and

the United States. During her 30-year career at Chabot College, Dr. Sperling has served in a variety of capacities, including as faculty member, faculty leader, administrator, and community liaison and roles as district wide Faculty Association president and Chabot College's first grant developer under the College's Title III grant. The president serves as the chief executive officer for the College and is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of all college programs and services, as well as for the administration and operation of the College

Conclusion: The College meets Eligibility Requirement 4.

5. Financial Accountability

The CLPCCD and its two colleges undergo an annual external financial audit of all funds, including auxiliary services, under the district's control. The audit is conducted by an independent, contracted certified public accountant, in accordance with the standards. The Board of Trustees reviews the annual district audit reports and makes them available to the public on the district's website. Financial aid audit information showing Title IV compliance is included in the audit. In addition to the audit, compliance with federal requirements can be found in the College's Annual Fiscal Report to Commission. Fiscal management is established according to Board Policy 6300. CLPCCD annual audits demonstrate the integrity of appropriate and effective fiscal management practices. Additional financial information is available in Standard III.D.

Conclusion: The College meets Eligibility Requirement 5.

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

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

Public Notification of a Peer Review Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive review visit.
☒	The institution cooperates with the review team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights, Responsibilities, and Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions* as to third party comment.

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The team determined that Chabot College made an appropriate and timely effort to publicize the peer review team visit and to solicit third-party comment beginning prior to the comprehensive review visit. Comments were to be sent directly to the ACCJC. The Commission did not receive any third-party comments

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission. (Standard I.B.3 and Section B. Presentation of Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards)
☒	The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers. (Standard I.B.3 and Section B. Presentation of Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards)
☒	The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements. (Standard I.B.3, Standard I.B.9)
☒	The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level. (Standard I.B.4)

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team found that the College has defined elements of student achievement aligned to its College Mission and established performance standards. These standards guide the College's broader planning efforts and resource allocation and are annually reviewed at a Planning Resource and Allocation Committee meeting.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

☒	Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure). (Standard II.A.9)
☒	The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution). (Standard II.A.9)
☒	Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition). (Standard I.C.2)
☒	Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice. (Standard II.A.9)
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team reviewed policies and procedures to confirm the College credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are consistent with good higher education practices. Tuition is consistent across programs as evident in the College catalog.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

☒	Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public. (Standard II.A.10)
☒	Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer. (Standard II.A.10)
☒	The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team reviewed the College catalog and website to confirm policies are in place and information related to Transfer Policies is appropriately disclosed to students and the public.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

For Distance Education:	
☒	The institution demonstrates regular and substantive interaction between students and the instructor.
☒	The institution demonstrates comparable learning support services and student support services for distance education students. (Standards II.B.1, II.C.1)
☒	The institution verifies that the student who registers in a distance education program is the same person who participates every time and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.
For Correspondence Education:	
☐	The institution demonstrates comparable learning support services and student support services for correspondence education students. (Standards II.B.1, II.C.1)
☐	The institution verifies that the student who registers in a correspondence education program is the same person who participates every time and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.
Overall:	
☒	The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings. (Standard III.C.1)
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the Institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The college does not offer Distance Education or Correspondence Education.

Narrative:
The team reviewed 50-online classes and found that the institution demonstrates regular and substantive interaction between students and their professors for the majority of the sample.

The team reviewed the online availability of learning support services including admissions and records, counseling, and library and found that the institution demonstrates comparable learning support services and student support services for distance education students.

The team reviewed the student authentication policies and processes and found that the institution has multiple acceptable methods of student authentication.

The College does not offer correspondence education.

The team reviewed the technology infrastructure needed to support distance education and found that the infrastructure is sufficient to sustain DE activity.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
☒	The student complaint files for the previous seven years (since the last comprehensive review) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
☒	The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
☒	The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities. (Standard I.C.1)
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team verified that the College has policies and procedures in the catalog and on its website for addressing student complaints. Files are maintained for the previous seven years. Two complaint file examples were reviewed by the Team and found no issues indicative of the College's noncompliance with Accreditation Standards. Names and associations of accreditation agencies are posted online, including contact information for complaints.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies. (Standard I.C.2)
☒	The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment*, and *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status*.
☒	The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status.(Standard I.C.12)

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1))(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The team verified that the College provides accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, location, and policies through its electronic catalog, website, and published paper documents. Through these channels, the team also verified that the College complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, student Recruitment, and Policy on Representation of Accredited Status*. The College website and the paper and electronic catalogs display the required information concerning its accredited status.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

☒	The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). (Standard III.D.15)
☒	If applicable, the institution has addressed any issues raised by ED as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements. (Standard III.D.15)
☒	If applicable, the institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by ED. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range. (Standard III.D.15)
☒	If applicable, contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required. (Standard III.D.16)
☒	The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

☒	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
☐	The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:
The College provided evidence of Title IV compliance. USDE reports indicate that the College's student loan default rate of 19.5% is below the 30% threshold.

Standard I

Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

I.A. Mission

General Observations:

Chabot College demonstrates commitment to its mission, emphasizing career/job skills and cultural responsiveness. Chabot College uses data to inform the effectiveness of its mission statement through use of data and collaborative processes. Chabot College's key programs and services are aligned with the mission of the college through its integrated planning and resource allocation process.

Supporting documentation indicates dynamic discussions about the mission statement occurred. Board of Trustee meeting archives also indicate discussion and ratification of the mission, as does the college's website, which posts the mission in an easily accessible location. The Educational Master Plan (EMP) was updated in 2021 to reflect current data and revised mission statement. There is evidence that faculty and classified members came together to align goals related to the Vision for Success and the college's mission statement. Chabot EMP has a process for revisiting the mission of the college and aligning priorities. The strategic planning and resource allocation processes are tied to the EMP, which is revised at least every six years according to Board Policy 3250. There is also an effort to survey employees and students to show progress.

Findings and Evidence:

The Chabot College mission statement defines the College's purpose, its intended student population, the types of degrees and credentials it offers and its commitment to student learning and achievement. The Mission Statement, along with the College's vision and values statements form the foundation for the College's commitment to fostering success through academic excellence, equity and personal support. (I.A.1)

Chabot College uses data to determine how effectively it accomplishes its mission and to examine whether the mission guides institutional priorities in response to the educational needs of students. The mission guides all aspects of planning, data analysis and evaluation starting with the EMP through to individual program and service areas. The College recently updated their EMP, and incorporated data from an internal and external comprehensive scan, longitudinal data of Vision for Success goals, the college mission, and campus strategies and priorities. These goals helped to inform the college's mission critical priorities for the next 5 years. (I.A.2)

The College mission was found to align with the college's integrated planning, budgeting, and resource allocation processes. The EMP is revised at least every six years and sets five critical priorities in support of the mission. These priorities guide Program Review and Strategic Goal Planning. The Strategic Plan Goal specifies shorter term operational objectives and strategies in order to achieve the priorities of the mission and EMP. Additionally, the Program Review

process has areas examine data in order to determine how their programs and services can be changed to better serve the College mission. (I.A.3)

The mission statement is published widely and is regularly reviewed and updated. The current mission statement was updated by the College in August 2020 and adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 15, 2021. The review and revision of the Mission Statement every five years is the first step in the development of an updated EMP which informs overall planning for the College. The Mission Statement, Vision and Values are widely published across the College, including in the College catalog, the College website and within major planning documents such as the EMP. (I.A.4)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

I.B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

The College demonstrated extensive use of data to inform student outcomes, equity, academic quality, intuitional effectiveness, and continuous improvement. Processes are evaluated and involve substantive and collegial dialog aimed to improve student learning and achievement. Participation of College constituency groups in shared governance was found in the ISER evidence as well as conversations during the team visit. The College notably increased the compliance percentages related to PLO (Program Learning Outcomes) assessments from 56% to 92% since the ISER review.

Findings and Evidence:

Chabot College demonstrates sustained, substantive, and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. Dialog occurs with the support of the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) in multiple College governance committees, department/division meetings, planning events, and forums regarding learning outcomes. (I.B.1)

Chabot College defines and assesses student learning outcomes (SLOs) for most instructional programs. At the time of the team visit, 99% of SLOs were reported as assessed. Assessments are housed in CurricUNET, and the curriculum committee reviews Course Outline Records on 5-year basis and published the master list of courses that need to be updated. Student Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are assessed on a five-year cycle, which are tracked. The Program and Area Review (PAR) is on a three-year cycle. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are assessed for instructional programs, which it tracked by the College. (I.B.2)

The College established institution-set standards (ISS) approved by the Planning Resource and Allocation Committee (PRAC), which consists of faculty, administrators, and classified personnel. The College PRAC recently evaluated its ISS methodologies and updated the

calculation to one SD for the past five years of data and subtracted one SD from the most recent year's data measurement. The PRAC determined this change will strengthen its processes and improve alert mechanisms for catching decreases in key metrics for timely review into areas warranting further investigation and actions from the College. (I.B.3)

The College uses assessment data in institutional processes to support student learning and achievement. The program review process uses enrollment data, success metrics, and student success surveys to make data-informed decisions regarding budget and process improvements for student learning. (I.B.4)

The College utilizes its program review process to evaluate SLOs and service area outcomes (SAOs) using quantitative and qualitative data in a five-year cycle. SLO data is disaggregated by program type, mode of instruction, and race, all of which is made available by dashboards and static reports. These reports are used to facilitate dialogue on institutional and mission effectiveness. (I.B.5)

The College provides student achievement data disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, and measures, but would benefit from incorporating SLOs into the discussion of subpopulation success. The Student Equity and Achievement Plan provides overview data, and supplemental reports provided by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). The College has established an equity taskforce to address black student equity gaps, and the Student Access, Success, and Equity Committee is charged with evaluating these gaps. The College would benefit from incorporating SLOs into the discussion, as these equity initiatives focus on student achievement versus student learning. (I.B.6)

The College evaluates its policies and practices to assure effectiveness, academic quality, and alignment with its mission. The OIE conducts annual surveys of its shared governance committees. As a result, the PRAC recently revisited its resource allocation model, and a revised plan has been developed in consultation with shared governance bodies (e.g., Faculty Senate). Following two consultative Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative grants, the Institution has grown its OIE and developed a new Institutional Innovation and Effectiveness Plan, which supports the College's review processes. (I.B.7)

Chabot College shares its assessment data and evaluation results through its webpages, reports, and discussions at shared governance committees. The College collects data from a variety of sources including surveys, institutional research reports, and town hall meetings. The College publicizes data in the PRAC, curriculum committee, online learning committee, and facilities committees, and presentations to the President and Board of Trustees. Surveys show that the College is tracking its engagement, use of data, and utilization of effective programming. (I.B.8)

The College engages in continuous, broad, and system evaluation and planning. Program Review is the primary form of evaluation and planning, which is assisted by the PAR and PRAC committees. This is supplemented by surveys and data provided by the OIE and OIR, and shared governance committees. (I.B.9)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

I.C. Institutional Integrity

General Observations:

Chabot College provides clear, accurate information related to its mission, learning outcomes, educational programs, student support services, accreditation status, policies, and procedures both in print and online. The College's website, catalog, and program websites inform students of the variety of fields of study available and program costs at Chabot.

Findings and Evidence:

The team reviewed the ISER, the College website, and multiple publicly accessible data dashboards and document repositories, all of which demonstrate Chabot College's institutional integrity and production of accurate information that is available to students, staff, and the general public. The Mission Statement, vision, and values are widely published. Information flowing from the Mission Statement, including the EMP, accreditation status, student learning outcomes, instructional programs, degrees and certificates, student support services, and student costs are published in multiple locations, including the College Catalog, the College website, program review webpage, and CurricUnet. Accreditation information is easily accessed on the College website. The College website includes ACCJC accreditation documents (e.g., accreditation decisions, past ISERs, and midterm reports). Additionally, documents for specialized programs that require additional accreditation such as automotive technology, nursing or dental hygiene are also available through this site. Accreditation information is also shared in the College Catalog. (I.C.I)

The College publishes an annual catalog that is available both online and in print and is mailed yearly to all households in the community. A team from the college regularly updates the catalog to ensure that information is accurate and up to date. Addendums are published as necessary to help ensure that the most current information is available. (I.C.2)

The team reviewed evidence related to assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement and found the College uses the information to communicate academic achievement to stakeholders. The College submits an annual report to ACCJC that includes required metrics including course success rates, degree and certificates awarded, and job placement rates. Institution-set standards and stretch goals are posted on OIR website each year. The College also reports and verifies data to the US Department of Education IPEDS Data System and to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The OIR provides interactive interfaces to allow college and community members to search for student success and outcome data. SLOs are assessed on a 5-year cycle at the course, program and institutional level and assessment results are made available online. Data is reviewed as a part of the program review process and these reviews, along with college-wide summaries are available on the college website. ILOs are assessed through surveys and the data is available through the OIR website. (I.C.3)

Chabot College describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements and student learning outcomes. The college catalog and website publish information about degrees for each academic program including the area of study, career options, course requirements and program learning outcomes. Some programs provide print brochures for students with additional overviews of some aspects of these programs. The college is also in the process of creating user-friendly maps for each degree and certificate. (I.C.4.)

The College regularly reviews its policies, procedures, and documents to ensure they accurately represent the College's mission, programs, and services. The review cycles vary, with some components revised on a continuous cycle (e.g., websites, shared governance documents, and district board policies) while others are updated on two to four-year cycles (e.g., College Catalog, EMP and Strategic plan). (I.C.5)

The team reviewed evidence from the catalog, class schedule, website, and other formats, and found that Chabot College accurately communicates tuition, fees, textbook costs, and other costs and expenses for students. In addition to costs, the refund policy for tuition and fees is also explained. Cost information for textbooks and supplies is accessible through the bookstore website or through Class-Web. Classes using zero cost or low-cost books are marked with specific logos that help students easily identify courses/sections using low-cost materials. The College has a workgroup that supports faculty in the development of classes that use low- or zero- cost materials. (I.C.6)

Chabot College uses and publishes both Board-level and College-level policies that address institutional and academic integrity in the context of faculty, students, and administrators. Board policy 4030, related to academic freedom, is published on the District website and in the College catalog. The faculty contract enumerates faculty rights to Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom. Over 85% of faculty in a recent survey agreed that academic freedom is upheld at Chabot. (I.C.7)

The team reviewed evidence from the College catalog, website, board and college policies, and class syllabi. Board Policy 5500 outlines the Student Code of Conduct. Chabot College establishes and publishes clear policies regarding honesty, responsibility and academic integrity that apply to all students and faculty. The College publishes guidelines on its website for addressing any violations of the policy and contains an FAQ section that addresses how these policies are applied. Due process procedures for students are addressed in the College catalog, and course syllabi include policies on academic honesty to ensure that students understand the College policies. (I.C.8)

Chabot College creates an environment wherein faculty are able to distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in the discipline to present information fairly and objectively. The College has an Academic Senate professional Ethics Statement that is adopted from AAUP documents/reports that contain guidelines for faculty to distinguish between personal conviction and personal views. The fairness, objectivity and intellectual honesty of faculty are supported by regular evaluations and classroom observations by students, faculty peers and administrators where each of the groups has the opportunity to comment on the instructor. (I.C.9)

Chabot College does not require staff, faculty, administrators, or students to conform to specific codes of conduct or beliefs beyond codes of conduct required by accreditation. (I.C.I0)

Chabot College has no operations in foreign locations. (I.C. 11)

The team reviewed evidence in the current ISER, communications with the ACCCJC, and other reporting documents posted on the College's website in the Accreditation section. Chabot College demonstrates a commitment to comply with ACCJC eligibility requirements and is accredited by ACCJC. The college demonstrates compliance and timely response to communications and requirements made by the ACCJC. (I.C.12)

The team reviewed evidence related to external accreditation agencies and found the College demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships. The College offers and maintains professional and accreditation relationships pertaining to its automotive, arts, dental, early childhood education/development, emergency medical services, nursing, and music programs. In addition, Chabot College maintains relationships of integrity with the California Community College Chancellor's Office, and the Title III, Hispanic Service Institution, Offices. (I.C.13)

Chabot College prioritizes high quality education, student achievement, and student learning in its decisions. The Mission Statement, Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan goals form the basis of the College's priorities which support student success at the College. The EMP is based upon the Mission Statement and the goals of the EMP either directly or indirectly support student success at the College. The Planning and Resource Allocation Committee aligns budget and planning with the Strategic Plan, EMP and College Mission Statement. The formation of the Black Excellence Collective demonstrates the College's responsiveness to student voices at the college. (I.C.14)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

Standard II

Student Learning Programs and Support Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

Chabot College instructional programs, library and learning support services, and student support services align with the College's mission of offering pre-collegiate, general education, degrees for transfer, and career technical education courses and preparing students for college-level coursework, career entry, job skills, and transfer to four-year universities. The College offers over 90 Associate degree programs and over 70 certificate programs.

Findings and Evidence:

Chabot College offers instructional programs consistent with the college's mission. Program review occurs on a three-year cycle with annual updates to ensure continued alignment with the mission, appropriateness to higher education, and student learning outcome attainment. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are assessed on a three-year cycle for all active courses. The college catalog lists available degrees and certificates, and program descriptions include program learning outcomes. (II.A.1)

Faculty have primary responsibility for curriculum and regularly engage in ensuring academic standards through the college's curriculum process. The team reviewed evidence of review schedules, clearly outlined practices, and robust support materials for practitioners. Comprehensive program reviews are scheduled on a regular cycle with annual updates. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides student achievement data, which is incorporated into the reviews. Data and insights gleaned from individual reviews, the Program and Area Review Committee (PRAC) creates synthesis statements which are used to inform college planning. The team found evidence of adherence to the review cycle and faculty dialogue as part of the continuous improvement process. (II.A.2)

Chabot College has a documented SLOs cycle for courses. Program learning outcomes (PLOs) are evaluated during the program review process. The assessments are consistent with local board and Academic Senate policies. The College has approved current course outlines that include SLOs for every course and require instructors in every class section to provide students with the learning outcomes for their course on the syllabus. Each semester, faculty submit course syllabi to the college and learning outcomes are required per the local bargaining agreement. During the site visit, the team reviewed evidence that confirmed that the College recently established a comprehensive process for verification and documentation of alignment between SLOs on approved CORs and on syllabi. A review of the Fall 2022 COR Syllabi Verification Process indicated that a considerable number of SLOs appearing on syllabi for Fall 2022 courses reflected alignment with the SLOs on approved CORs. In addition, reports on

compliance have been incorporated as a standing agenda item on the Chabot Office of Academic services Team (COAST) agenda as a practice to increase and maintain compliance. The team reviewed evidence that confirmed that this practice includes the presentation, review, and discussion of a spreadsheet organized by course, division, and semester. Deans and the Vice President of Academic Affairs provide direct follow-up with faculty with syllabi found to be out of compliance. Areas of unverified alignment persist in a few instructional areas secondary to turnover in deans over the past year. The Vice President of Academic Affairs continues to work with newly appointed deans and/or interim deans to address these issues. The team encourages the college to continue to institutionalize this new verification practice as part of continuous improvement in ensuring integrity, continuity, and consistency in SLO documentation and communication processes. (II.A.3)

Chabot College distinguishes pre-collegiate level curriculum in its College Catalog. The catalog details the course numbering system and describes basic skills course limitations. Flowcharts for courses in English, math, and ESL clearly outline student pathways for success and advancement to college-level curriculum. College-level curriculum includes requisite skills required for success, which are the outcomes of pre-collegiate courses. The team reviewed evidence of catalog statements, pathway flowcharts, and course outlines. (II.A.4)

Established policies and procedures ensure college degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The Curriculum Committee adheres to standards and regulations set forth in Title 5 and follows CCCCO and ASCCC guidelines for degree and program development and revision. The College catalog details associate level degree requirements, including minimum units and GPA. Associate degree requirements are codified in board policy. (II.A.5)

Chabot College ensures students are able to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time using its College Enrollment Management Committee. Evidence reviewed illustrates the use of data such as core class scheduling patterns and completion rates. Academic deans are charged with creating schedule plans for their respective divisions. The college is currently in the process of creating program maps which will further advance Guided Pathways efforts and student completion through thoughtful and intentional scheduling patterns. (II.A.6)

Chabot College uses intentional instructional delivery modes, teaching methodologies, and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students. Courses are offered in traditional face-to-face, distance education (DE), and hybrid modes. An Online Tools Box is provided to faculty as a resource for those teaching or interested in teaching DE courses. The Chabot Committee on Online Learning (COOL) reinstated a revised process to help instructors create student focused, quality DE courses. The COOL process provides a Canvas Course Site Checklist, the Peralta Equity Rubric, the CVC-OEI Course Design Rubric, and the previous COOL Course Site Review Checklist. COOL also offers ongoing support with faculty mentors to ensure distance education courses meets student needs. The College's Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness provides success and retention data every semester to academic departments for discussion and analysis. The College offers several Learning Community programs such as Puente, Umoja, Adult College Education, The First Year Experience, and The Change it Now Learning Communities. The team reviewed evidence that

confirmed the college uses a variety of learning support programs that reflect the diversity of its student body to support the success of its students. (II.A.7)

The College validates the effectiveness of department-wide course/program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. Chabot College students may apply for Credit by Examination outlined in the College Catalog and specific division/program webpages (for example Chemistry and Nursing). The College introduced self-guided placement for English and math. The College Catalog lists the detailed College's policies regarding college level examinations and Credit for Prior Learning policies. The College uses a combination of self-assessment and testing to place students into a range of courses and has policies and procedures in place to allow for credit for prior learning. (II.A.8)

The College awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. SLOs and PLOs are identified for courses and programs. The information is available in the course outline of records as well as in the Outcomes and Assessment Committee documents. Policies and Procedures relative to transfer courses and articulations are documented in Board Policies, Administrative Procedures, and College Catalog. The College provides its catalog and Outcomes and Assessment webpage to affirm Program Level Outcomes. The Curriculum Handbook is a resource and tool the college uses to ensure all Course of Records include SLOs. Additionally, the College does offer late-start and fast track courses based on clock hours following the federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversations. (II.A.9)

The College makes available to its students transfer-of-credit policies that are made available to students via multiple sources, including Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, the Counseling webpage, the website, and the Catalog. Information on articulation agreements with area high schools and four-year institutions is available in the College Catalog as well as the College website. The transfer articulation agreements are included in the transfer articulation webpage. (II.A.10)

The College requires for all its programs appropriate student learning outcomes. The College has also established Institution-Level Outcomes (ILOs) in five areas: Communication, Information and Technology Literacy, Critical Thinking, Civic and Global Engagement, and Development of the Whole Person. Student and program learning outcomes are included on course outlines of record, program review, Curriculum Committee documents, and Outcomes and Assessment Committee documents. The College course SLOs are mapped to the College's ILOs. (II.A.11)

The College's catalog highlights a section on degree requirements which articulates the philosophy for Associate Degrees Offered, as do Board Policy 4025 and Administrative Procedure 4025. General Education (GE) courses are listed in the College Catalog. The Curriculum Committee oversees the process whereby faculty set degree requirements and determine appropriateness of courses to be listed as GE based on documented criteria. The College's catalog clearly lists all the general education criteria for an associate degree and associate degree for transfer. General Education courses have clearly identified SLOs, which are mapped to ILOs. Faculty have a leading role in the development and approval of courses, degree requirements, and to determine the appropriateness of each course. (II.A.12)

The College's degree programs include "a focus on study in some field of knowledge" and area listed in CurricUnet and the College Catalog. Faculty use the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) and the Faculty Program Development process to write all programs of study. The Curriculum Committee ensures evaluation of key competencies, including SLOs and PLOs. (II.A.13)

The College's CTE programs are established and maintained following the requirements outlined for CTE programs in the PCAH and Title 5. Advisory committees comprised of industry professionals inform program practices and protocols. External licensure and certification requirements are met. (II.A.14)

The College has an Administrative Policy (AP 4021) through the Chabot-Las Positas College District Board and Administrative Policies that addresses Program Revitalization/Discontinuance and guides the Colleges procedures to ensure enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner if a program is discontinued or a program has a significant change. The policies and procedures the College has in place are to ensure that eliminated or significantly changed programs are phased out to avoid disrupting student completion. The College has not eliminated any programs in its recent history. (II.A.15)

The College regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered. The Program and Area Review's (PAR) are on a three-year cycle for comprehensive and annual reviews. The Outcome and Assessment Committee (OAC) follows a five-year cycle for the review of SLOs, PLOs, and SAOs. The Curriculum Committee is responsible for the review of Course Outlines of Record (CORs). The team reviewed a sample of course outline of record and several course syllabi as evidence. (II.A.16)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

II.B. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

Chabot College demonstrates support for student learning through library and learning support services, and to the staff/employees who provide that support. The quality, quantity and currency of the educational programs is adequate.

Findings and Evidence:

The College demonstrates a commitment to high-quality library and learning support services to students. Educational materials, equipment, and services offered by the library are evaluated routinely to ensure they are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety. Annual library surveys indicate that there is a growing number of the library's digital and print collections and

laptop lending. Circulation statistics reveal robust use of the library's print and digital resources, but there is somewhat of a decline in these numbers from 2017-2020. (II.B.1)

The College relies upon the expertise of librarians and other professionals in the evaluation, selection, and maintenance of appropriate resources that support student learning and the institution's mission. The library offers a variety of support materials and services in person and online to enhance student success. Processes are in place for systematic review and selection of new materials and equipment. (II.B.2)

The College evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. A bi-annual library survey is provided to students that supports regular evaluation of library and learning support services to inform continuous quality improvement. In one example, the survey results indicated students desire to have extended library hours in which the College responded with expanded access in the morning, weekends, and online. (II.B.3)

When relying upon external agencies/sources to help in the provision of library and learning support services, the College maintains formal contractual agreements. Services from external vendors, such as the Council of Chief Librarians (CCL) and Mobil Beacon, learning Services contracts with TutorLingo and TutorTrac, are continuously evaluated to ensure effectiveness, usability, and accessibility. (II.B.4)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

II.C. Student Support Services

General Observations:

Chabot College provides a multitude of student support services in a variety of modalities to assist students in successfully meeting their educational goals. Student Support Services align with the College's Educational Mater Plan, Mission, and Strategic Plan. Support services are provided in-person and virtually. The College transitioned services, forms, applications into an online format including implementation of a Chat Bot to assist students. On-going training and professional development are provided with videos, workshops, and with step-by-step processes.

Findings and Evidence:

Chabot College regularly evaluates the quality of student support services regardless of location or delivery. All student support services are evaluated through the Colleges' program review process and incorporate alignment with the Mission, Educational Master Plan, and Institutional Learning Outcomes. Programs are reviewed in a three-year comprehensive and annual review planning cycle; year one is the comprehensive review and planning year, years two and three are annual updates. (II.C.1)

The College conducts regular assessments of service areas to ensure effective learning support to students. Based on the assessment data, the College makes changes for continuous improvement. One example for the Puente Program found students were not completing the required program contact visits. As a result, Puente implemented a plan for improvement by increasing the number and variety of outreach communications (phone, text, email, and Canvas messages) to students. (II.C.2)

The College has a wide variety of student support service that are equitably accessible to all of its students regardless of location or delivery method. The College provides support through face-to-face interactions and virtual services through electronic forms, chat bots, updated webpages, and Canvas Resource Hubs. (II.C.3)

The College provides athletic and co-curricular opportunities that are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. Co-curricular programs such as the Able-Disable Club, Barangay Chabot, Umoja Black Student Union, Association in China, Chabot Dreamers Club are examples of student clubs that use the equity lens and work towards contributing to the social and cultural aspects of the student educational experience. The Office of Student Life provides a Student Orientation Recognition Packet, provides support and guidance through Inter Club Council, the Student Senate and follows the outline administrative policies. The College provides athletic opportunities to the student population through 16 intercollegiate athletic programs. Programs receiving co-curricular funds are subject to college financial oversight and controls and comply with relevant requirements applicable by law and regulations (II.C.4)

The College provides counseling and academic advising services both in-person and online to support student development and success. Online orientation is available to students with additional workshops for support throughout their educational journey. Psychology Counseling courses (College Study Skills, University Transfer Planning, The College Experience, Strategies for College Success, etc.) also support student completion and success. There are on-going professional development and training opportunities for the counseling team through Distance Counseling Guides, the Art of Mindful Facilitation Diversity Training, Cranium Café Counselor Training, and Counselor Drop In Best Practices as examples. (II.C.5)

The College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission. Information on admission and degree requirements is listed on the College catalog, Admissions webpage and through the online registration system. Processes for programs requiring special admissions are documented on the departmental webpages, for example Nursing and Sherriff Academy. Dual Enrollment admissions procedures are outlined in board policy, Admissions and Records webpage, and concurrent enrollment webpage. (II.C.6)

The College regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments for effectiveness and minimization of biases. Data outcomes are reviewed for compliance, biases, and effectiveness. An example of the College transitioning to multiple measures, including Accuplacer, for AB-705 and the increased accesses and throughput for English and math demonstrated meeting the standard. (II.C.7)

The team confirmed that the College has policies and procedures to ensure that the institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentiality. The College publishes its policies in the catalog and on the website. Records are properly maintained and stored. (II.C.8)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

Standard III

Resources

III.A. Human Resources

General Observations:

The District and College use appropriate hiring policies and practices to employ a sufficient number of qualified faculty, professional staff and administrators that meet the minimum and desirable qualifications to perform duties, maintain high-quality programs and services, and sustain institutional effectiveness. The College and District maintain and make available Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, and collective bargaining unit language. Personnel evaluations are conducted regularly and are designed to lead to the improvement of job performance. Chabot College maintains a professional development program for its employees, designed to meet the needs of personnel with opportunities for faculty, classified professionals, and administrators. The District's EEO plan, and other institutional policies, procedures and practices promote an understanding of equity and diversity. Policies and procedures also outline a code of ethics for all personnel, and address violations of such. Personnel records are securely held, with access limited per district and collective bargaining agreement policies and procedures.

Findings and Evidence:

Chabot College has appropriate Board Policies and Administrative Procedures that govern the hiring of administrators, faculty and staff in a manner that ensures the integrity and quality of its programs and services. Such policies and procedures are made public on the website. Job descriptions reflect the institutional mission and goals, and reflect position duties, responsibilities, qualifications, and experience requirements. (III.A.1)

The College adheres to established minimum qualifications standards for the hiring of faculty and includes minimum qualifications, professional experience, discipline expertise, teaching skills and scholarly activities in its job descriptions. Full-time and adjunct faculty job descriptions also include curriculum development and review, assessing learning outcomes, and committee participation. Rating forms used by faculty hiring committees contain the same criteria as the job announcements. The College also has established procedures regarding the application of equivalency for minimum qualifications. (III.A.2)

Administrators and other personnel responsible for educational programs and services possess the necessary qualifications to perform their duties and to maintain institutional effectiveness and academic quality, as outlined in the applicable job descriptions. Degrees, experience, and qualifications clearly relate to the duties of the position. (III.A.3)

The College's hiring procedures stipulate that required degrees for employees must be from verified accredited institutions recognized by U.S. accrediting agencies, or equivalency must be

established for degrees from non-U.S. institutions. Official transcripts are required of all new hires prior to the start of their employment. The Office of Human Resources reviews and verifies equivalency for non-U.S. degrees prior to the hiring committee's review of the respective application. (III.A.4)

Evaluation procedures for all employee groups are stated in Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, and applicable collective bargaining agreements. Performance evaluations are completed systematically and at stated intervals, in a manner which seeks to assess the effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Special evaluations may also be performed at any time, if deemed necessary. Evaluation processes require that any identified deficiencies be formalized in a plan for improvement with timely and regular follow-up until resolved. The team reviewed evidence confirming that the College works in conjunction and collaboration with the District Office of Human Resources to track and notify senior administration, direct supervisors, and employees of timelines pertaining to pending, currently due, and past due evaluations. The College retains primary responsibility for tracking personnel evaluations for faculty in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The processes and tracking documentation in the form of spreadsheets for faculty evaluations are managed from the offices of the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Vice President of Student Services. The Human Resources department provides ongoing training to both managers and employees on evaluation processes. The team reviewed evidence codifying evaluation practices and documents utilized in evaluation processes. Senior administration and the District Office of Human Resources conduct direct follow-up with supervisors requesting status updates when evaluations are past due. The team verified that the College and District are committed to improving practices that demonstrate continuous improvement in ensuring that all components of employee evaluations are completed on time within each evaluation cycle. The team encourages the College to maintain a focus on efforts in this area. (III.A.5)

Standard (III.A.6) is no longer applicable.

The College utilizes the state's Full-Time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) as a basis for determining a sufficient number of qualified faculty is maintained. Programs may request additional faculty through the program review process. Requests for new and replacement faculty are evaluated by the Faculty Prioritization Committee, based on program and college need and an equity analysis of disproportionately impacted student groups. The committee provides a prioritized list to the College President who then makes the final recommendation for additional faculty hires to the District Chancellor. (III.A.7)

The College provides adjunct faculty with a new faculty orientation and an orientation to Canvas. Department administrators are responsible for the oversight and evaluation of adjunct faculty. Professional development opportunities are available including an invitation to particulate in college-wide Flex Days activities. Adjunct faculty also participate in the shared governance process, having two seats on the Academic Senate. (III.A.8)

The College relies on area administrators, in collaboration with area personnel, to review and ensure a sufficient number of staff and administrators. Requests for new positions are supported through the program review process in which staffing levels are evaluated annually. Requests for new and replacement staff positions are evaluated by the Planning and Resource Allocation

Committee, the Classified Senate Prioritization Committee, and college administration. Requests for new administrators are prioritized by the Administration Prioritization Committee. Following the respective prioritization committee processes, recommendations for new staff and administrator positions are made to the College President who then coordinates with the District Chancellor and Human Resources for hiring. (III.A.9 and III.A.10)

The District has established personnel board policies and administrative procedures. These policies and procedures are available on the district's public website and are reviewed in new employee orientations. Applicable personnel forms are also available on the District's Human Resources webpage and in new hire packets. Effective December 2021, the District put in place an updated review cycle for BPs and Aps that occur every ten years. The team recommends that the College adheres to its review cycle, ensuring its policies and procedures are current and provide for fair, equitable and consistent application. (III.A.11)

The College creates and maintains a variety of programs and services to support its diverse personnel. Additionally, the District's HR website was strategically developed with diversity and equity in mind, with a look and feel that supports a diverse environment. The District's Equal Employment Opportunity Plan is comprehensive and includes an analysis of district workforce and applicant pool demographics, a procedure for complaints of discrimination, the establishment of an EEO Advisory Committee, and methods to support equal employment opportunities. The District regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission, through a review of data in relation to its Environmental Scan, Educational Master Plan, and in various committees and workgroups. (III.A.12)

Chabot College maintains a written code of professional ethics for all personnel, documented in an approved board policy and administrative procedure. The code of ethics also includes consequences for violations, indicating that such consequences will follow established discipline and dismissal processes. (III.A.13)

Chabot College has a Professional Development Committee with representatives from all employee groups. The Committee's responsibilities include developing the college's Flex Day programming; making recommendations on college-wide professional development activities; and reviewing/approving professional development funding requests. The College ensures comprehensive, robust, and ongoing professional development opportunities for all employee groups, tailored to their respective needs. These include both general topics and area specific topics. The Office of Human Resources supplements professional development for administration and classified professionals; an example of which is the Classified Leadership Institute for Professionals, an academic year-long program to empower classified professionals through the development of skills, knowledge, and personal growth to support the college's mission. Professional development activities are evaluated by attendees and the results are used as a basis for identifying additional professional development opportunities. Data reviewed by the team indicates that the college has a strong commitment to professional development of all personnel. (III.A.14)

The District Office of Human Resources maintains the security and confidentiality of all personnel records. Records are kept in secure areas. Employees are allowed access to their

individual employee records by presenting official identification to the Office of Human Resources. Employees have online access to financial records through CLASS-Web. Administrative Procedures and bargaining unit agreements ensure employee access to records. (III.A.15)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

III.B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

The Educational Master Plan (EMP), Facilities Master Plan (FMP), Five-Year Construction Plan and program review process serve as a guide for facility needs to support institutional programs and services and to ensure a healthy and safe physical environment. The CLPCCD Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) plan, the District's Budget Allocation Model, and the College's Integrated Planning and Budget Model reflect a sound connection between facilities and technology planning and resource allocation, providing a long-range approach to ensuring effective utilization of physical assets in a feasible and efficient manner.

Findings and Evidence:

The College relies on its program review process to ensure its physical resources are sufficient to support its courses, programs and learning support services. Facility renovation and maintenance needs are also supported through the District Facilities Committee. The College's Campus Safety and Security, and its Health and Safety Committee, are charged with developing and promoting a healthy and safe physical environment, in accordance with the campus emergency plan, the college safety plan, and the CLPCCD Security Master Plan. Inspections and monitoring of fire systems, hazardous materials removal, and trash and debris removal are maintained via contracts with external service providers. Maintenance requests are handled through a district work order system to ensure requests for routine maintenance, custodial and grounds needs are addressed. Additionally, the College's Health and Safety Committee is charged with developing plans and actions designed to address potential safety concerns, locally, and through collaboration and input into the CLPCCD Security Master Plan. The College's Campus Safety Department investigates and responds to reports of potential safety hazards. (III.B.1)

The College uses its Facilities Master Plan (FMP) process to plan and prioritize projects to support its programs and services and to achieve its mission. The College's FMP planning process includes a condition assessment of existing buildings and projects future long-term needs and addresses the sequencing of projects to best serve its programs while also allowing for the least disruption. The College also utilizes off-campus facilities to plan for certain program needs that cannot be addressed within its campus facilities, such as for its police and fire training programs. (III.B.2)

The College uses the results of its program review process, its EMP and FMP, and its Five-Year Construction Plan to inform its assessment of the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting its institutional programs and services. As part of its FMP planning process, the College utilized data of enrollment and housing trends to inform its future facility needs, to ensure a focus on long-term planning needs. Additionally, the College relies on its annual program review process and emergent needs process, working in conjunction with its governance committee structure and its Integrated Planning and Budget Model process, to ensure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources are assessed on an ongoing basis. (III.B.3)

The College uses its EMP, long-range FMP, and its Five-Year Capital Construction Plan to support institutional planning, in alignment with the College's mission. Additionally, the College and District utilize a comprehensive Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) process to ensure physical resources are adequately supported over the long-term. Based on a review of evidence provided by the District and additional inquires, the TCO plan includes data to support a long-range approach to capital planning, rooted in industry best practices following APPA standards. The TCO model strives for a level 3 (moderate) standard of care of its maintenance, custodial and grounds, and ensures the District-wide Budget Allocation Model accounts for funding each college to this level of care. The comprehensive TCO plan includes the following attributes: staffing (including changes in compensation rates) for those employees charged with maintaining facilities; a review of WSCH to evaluate enrollment trends; changes in assignable square footage; and estimates for ongoing utility costs. During the site visit, it was shared that a review of the current budget operating model, based on input from the District Facilities Committee, identified a change in budgeting practices to further support the TCO model, transitioning from an SB361 budgeting model to one which specifically follows the TCO model for funding Maintenance and Operations at each college. This model provides changes in staffing based on Gross Square Footage, allowing for growth as necessary and ensuring a long-range approach to maintaining facilities. In addition to Measure A funding, the District and Colleges utilize other available sources of funds such as: Physical Plant and Instructional Support funding, Prop 39 Energy Conservation funding and other available resources, to maintain facilities. The College also relies on its long-range construction goals related to energy efficiency, LEED Silver Certification planning goals, and its Climate Action Plan, to further support its long-term institutional improvement goals. Additionally, to ensure adequate resources to support the campus' long-range capital planning process, the College strategically aligns its planning processes with the State Capital Outlay funding process, to leverage its local bond resources.
(III.B.4)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

District Commendation 1: The team commends the District for its comprehensive Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Plan, supported by a Budget Allocation Model that informs a long-range approach to capital planning. (III.B.4)

III.C. Technology Resources

General Observations:
Primary oversight of the implementation and maintenance of information and technology resources is centralized under the stewardship of the CLPCCD ITS Department. Through coordination and collaboration with the District, the College provides, maintains, and supports technology related services and resources for campus programs and services. The College has a process that identifies technology needs and links technology planning to resource allocation. The College supports and maintains training programs for both employees and students. Safeguards are in place to protect the information and technology infrastructures, equipment, data, applications, etc.

Findings and Evidence:

Chabot College provides resources, services and professional support to students, faculty, and staff through the Chabot Computer Support (CCS), Audio Visual Department (AV), and Instructional Services Technology Committee (IST). As components of the institutional technology support structure, these entities collaborate with the district Information Technology Services (ITS) on the coordination of campus projects as well as District projects that intersect with both campuses. The District and College maintain an inventory of software, hardware, and facilities (smart classrooms, computer labs, MPOE, etc.) that it deems to be adequate and appropriate to support the institution's management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services. District ITS provides administrative systems, network services, infrastructure, and security support. CCS provides maintenance and support for campus technology equipment and software. The CLPCCD Information Technology Master Plan ITS Detailed Specifications were written in 2004. This Plan details descriptions of servers, desktops, network cabling, wireless, network switches and routers. This document also summarizes changes and new recommendations that have been recently developed as part of the IT Master Planning process. The Chabot College Technology Plan was written in 2008 and addresses items related to support, replacement, maintenance, network systems, backup procedures, disaster recovery, training, assistive technology, etc. During the site visit, the team noted that the District and College recently completed a comprehensive, District-wide Technology Strategic Plan, providing separate plans for the district and for each college. The plans are integrated through shared initiatives. (III.C.1)

The college plans for, updates and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services through a biyearly prioritization process. Technology and software requests are collected and then submitted to the IST Committee for prioritization. Requests are vetted for feasibility and redundancy through the utilization of a standardized rubric and scoring criteria. CCS, AV, IST Committee, and district ITS participate in this process. The planning and prioritization processes include a review of the campus and district technology plans, EMP, FMP, other planning documents, technology requests codified in program review, and annual resource allocation requests. The College and District have collaborated on the establishment of set standards for campus technology. This includes standards that ensure information technology security and protections. The implementation, impact, cost, and feasibility of new technologies is assessed by the IST Committee. The College utilizes a four- to five-year replacement cycle for technology equipment, to ensure that hardware remains compatible with the current infrastructure. The College is currently implementing a more robust

equipment inventory system which will further support the technology replacement cycle and process. (III.C.2)

The College and District work collaboratively to assure that technology resources are implemented and maintained to provide reliable access, safety, and security at all locations where courses, programs, and services are offered. The responsibilities for implementation and maintenance of technology resources are coordinated by the District's ITS department. District and campus functions and areas of operational service and support are outlined in the CLPCCD District-wide Function Map and reflected on the respective District ITS and college CCS websites. The district maintains plans and procedures for the safety and security of administrative systems. Infrastructure improvements and enhancements have been made to improve functionality and security of campus information systems and technology. The district and College utilize generators and UPS units to maintain continuous system availability, and other protective and redundant measures to support critical servers and major enterprise systems. The District and College technology plans adequately address disaster recovery through the implementation of infrastructure, plans, processes, and procedures in place for response, recovery, resumption, restoration and return that ensure continuity of instruction and services in the event of an emergency. (III.C.3)

The College provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators, in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations. Training for employees takes place in collaboration with the Professional Development Committee. Training needs are identified based on periodic surveys. The effectiveness of training provided is assessed and feedback is utilized for continual quality improvement. Student training is provided through the Chabot Student Resource Hub. During the site visit, the team noted that the COOL committee and the IST committee are continuously evaluating a HyFlex Model to support the current teaching and learning environment. (III.C.4)

The district has established policies and procedures guiding the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes. These policies and procedures are accessible on the district website. (III.C.5)

Conclusion:

 The College meets the Standard.

III.D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

The District and College utilize a budget allocation model that is tied to institutional planning at the District and College levels, in a manner that ensures transparency with constituent members – following a tri-chair model – providing input on the budget development and resource allocation process. Financial information is widely disseminated by the district through board meetings, web postings and periodic update reports, and by the College through its shared governance committees and web postings. The District and College provided evidence to

support an effective internal control structure is maintained and that financial resources are managed with integrity. The district ensures fiscal stability by: maintaining sufficient reserves in excess of its target reserve level of 8%; effective monitoring of its contractual obligations; and funding its short- and long-term financial liabilities including OPEB.

Findings and Evidence:

Planning
The Chabot Community College District utilizes a budget allocation model to distribute resources to the College and to fund centralized operations that support the College. The district and College manage financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability, as evidenced by clean audit reports with no financial findings. Additionally, the District maintains an adequate reserve balance to support and enhance College programs and services, noting the majority of unrestricted revenues are distributed to support the Colleges and operations. The district ended the 2019-20 fiscal year with an ending fund balance of 12.7%, well above the Chancellor's Office prudent recommended reserve level of 5% and the district's targeted level of 8%. (III.D.1)

The College links its annual budget planning and resource allocation process to institutional planning through the College Resource Allocation Model (CRAM) and Integrated Planning and Budgeting Calendar. This process allows the Program and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) to tie resource requests to planning in support of the institution's mission and goals. The College utilizes the PRAC synthesis statements, aligned with the College Planning Initiatives, to develop a resource prioritization rubric. Financial information is disseminated timely by the district through board meetings, web postings and periodic update reports, and by the College through its shared governance committees and web postings for public review. (III.D.2)

The budget development process is defined in board policy and is driven by the Budget Development Calendar. At the district level, the budget process is guided by the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), and at the College level, the budget allocation process is guided by the PRAC. Both the PBC and PRAC include representation from all constituent groups, following the tri-chair model, to allow for broad participation in the budget development process. Budget information is regularly shared with the PBC and college shared governance committees through status updates, presentations, and other reports. Budget presentations are also provided during College Day and at town hall meetings. (III.D.3)

Fiscal Responsibility and Stability
At the District level, realistic revenue projections begin with a review of FTES and estimated property tax revenue from the County. These revenue projections are based on the Chancellor's Office P2 apportionment report. Expense projections then begin with contractual obligations for employee groups, insurance, utilities, and retiree health benefits first funded at the district level from total available revenues, before allocations are provided to the Colleges. Chabot College's budget planning process ensures realistic projections are maintained through the regular monitoring of revenues, expenses, and fund balances. The vice president of administrative services participates on the College and District enrollment management committees to monitor FTES revenue generation and collaborates with the vice president of academic services to

monitor part-time faculty contracts and the budget for faculty load allocations. Revenues from local sources such as facility rentals and vendor service agreements for the bookstore and cafeteria are also tracked and incorporated into budget development to ensure realistic planning. (III.D.4)

The District and College have a sound internal control structure as evidenced by audit reports with no identified internal control weaknesses reported since June 30, 2016. The District and College utilize the Ellucian Banner enterprise resource planning system for financial transactions, with built-in budget checking mechanisms and multiple levels of approval. Additionally, the District and College ensure wide dissemination of timely financial information through Web for Banner Finance access and through review and discussion through the District and College shared governance committees. (III.D.5)

The institution's financial documents demonstrate a high degree of accuracy and credibility, as evidenced by clean audit reports with no financial findings or internal control weaknesses. Additionally, the Board of Trustees maintains an audit subcommittee to oversee the independent financial audit. The district ensures institutional responses to audit findings are comprehensive, timely and are communicated appropriately. The audits for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2017, and June 30, 2016, noted one finding each, for Las Positas College, in the area of state compliance. In both cases, the findings were addressed and corrected in the following year. Additionally, the results of independent financial audits are reviewed with the Board audit subcommittee and annual audit reports are posted on the district website. (III.D.6, III.D.7, III.D.8)

As of June 30, 2019, the District maintained an unrestricted general fund reserve level of 12.7%; above the Chancellor's Office prudent recommended minimum reserve level of 5% and above the district's reserve target of 8%. Sufficient cash levels are maintained within the unrestricted general fund and cash maintained in other funds is also available should there be a need to respond to financial emergencies or unforeseen circumstances. The district pools its property and liability risk through participation in a statewide JPA with coverage provided for claims above $10,000 and $50,000, respectively. (III.D.9)

The College maintains adequate controls, including a comprehensive approval process, over finances. The vice president of administrative services and the district business office maintain fiduciary responsibility and provide oversight over auxiliary budgets. Financial aid award calculations are completed through the Ellucian Banner ERP system and disbursements are processed by an external third-party provider. Appropriate management-level oversight ensures proper drawdown of financial aid funds from the U.S. Department of Education. The favorable results of the district and Foundation audits substantiate the effectiveness of the College's oversight over all finances including financial aid, grants, auxiliary organizations, foundations, and contracts. (III.D.10)

Liabilities
The district maintains an unrestricted general fund reserve level above its reserve target of 8%, to assure financial stability and to cover short- and long-term obligations. The district also accounts for the accrual of compensated absences and load banking liabilities within its year-end accruals. The district also funds its annual pay-as-you-go cost of OPEB as part of its District

Allocation Model and sets aside an additional portion of its Economic Development and Contract Ed revenues to contribute to its OPEB irrevocable trust, to address its long-term OPEB liability. An actuarial study is completed in accordance with GASB standards, and the district audit reports contain GASB-required disclosure information regarding OPEB and the actuarially determined liability. The district maintains favorable ratings from Standard & Poor's (S&P) and Moody's, as evidence of its sound financial solvency practices. (III.D.11 and III.D.12)

The District and College have not incurred any debt that could have an adverse effect on the financial condition of the institution. The district has issued two general obligation bond measures since 2004. The County of Alameda is responsible for assessing and collecting ad valorem taxes to repay the debt service payments associated with these bonds; therefore, the bonded debt has no impact on the finances of the institution (III.D.13).

The District and College maintain revenues and expenses over all financial resources with integrity and in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source as is evidenced through clean audit reports over district finances including grants and auxiliary activities; clean Proposition 39 audits over the district's two general obligation bond measures; and clean Foundation audits over the Friends of Chabot College Foundation finances. The College also maintains an additional layer of oversight over grant funds, through its Grants and Categorical Committee, to ensure funds are used in a manner consistent with the granting agency's intended purpose. The Citizens' Oversight Committee also serves as an added layer of oversight over the Proposition 39 bond funds. (III.D.14)

The College's director of financial aid contracts with a third-party to manage student loan default rates. The College's current default rate is 19.5 percent (2017) which is below the maximum allowable rate of 30 percent, per current federal regulations. The College also has a plan to reduce the default rate should it exceed the maximum rate. The College manages Title IV of the Higher Education Act funds in compliance with federal regulations, as is evidenced through clean audit opinions and no findings related to the Student Financial Aid Cluster of programs. (III.D.15)

Contractual Agreements
Contractual agreements are governed by Board Policy 6340 which covers procedures for formal and informal bids. The policy stipulates compliance with Public Contract Code is required, as applicable and that all contracts must be approved or ratified by the Board of Trustees to constitute an enforceable obligation. Assurance of compliance to contract and purchasing regulations occurs at multiple levels and begins with the review and approval by College administrative services personnel who then forward approved contracts to the District purchasing manager for further review and approval prior to submission to the District vice chancellor for signature and Board approval. (III.D.16)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

Standard IV

Leadership and Governance

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles & Processes

General Observations:

The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) is comprised of two colleges. Organizationally, the chancellor serves as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the District and reports to the Board of Trustees. A College president serves as the CEO of each campus and reports the chancellor. The chancellor leads and administratively directs District planning, organizing, budgeting, staffing, and institutional effectiveness. The president of Chabot College leads and administratively directs campus planning, organizing, budgeting, staffing, and evaluating institutional effectiveness. The Board of Trustees delegates authority to the chancellor. The chancellor guides the implementation of District policies and administrative procedures. The chancellor delegates authority to the presidents to implement board policies and administrative procedures as well as to guide and improve teaching, learning, and accreditation on the campuses. District Board Policies and Administrative Procedures articulate the responsibilities of the College president in most, if not all, areas that define the position of institutional chief executive officer.

The chancellor ensures the district has and implements a broad-based comprehensive, systematic, and integrated system of planning that involves appropriate segments of the college community and is supported by institutional effectiveness research. At the campus level the College has clearly articulated governance and decision-making processes. Governance roles and responsibilities are defined in policy and the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Manual. The College has implemented an effective tri-chair model that recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success and sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. The designated authority and responsibilities of the governing board, chancellor, and the chief executive officer are clearly delineated. Governance policies, roles, and processes are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The district has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the colleges.

Findings and Evidence:
The team reviewed evidence that confirmed the College has established and implemented policies and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Manual, adopted in 2017, details the systematic participative processes that are used to assure effective planning and implementation. During interviews and forums, the team heard how all constituency groups (faculty, classified, and administrators) are empowered and encouraged to be innovative leaders. In an employee survey completed by the College, 72% of respondents agree or strongly agree governance roles are designed to facilitate innovation and decisions that support improved

institutional effectiveness. In this same survey, 62% of classified professional agree or strongly agree administration supports their role in shared governance. Classified professionals are appointed to fifty-five seats across fifteen committees on campus and five seats on five district-wide shared governance committees. (IV.A.1)

The governance structure, committee purpose and responsibilities, membership, and processes are clearly articulated in the Collegial Consultation Manual. The Manual specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees. The team found that provisions are made for student participation and consideration of student views in those shared governance matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. At the District level a student trustee is appointed by the Student Senate of Chabot College (SSCC) to represent students as a member of the CLPCCD Board of Trustees. At the college level students hold seats on all standing committees and provide policy recommendations through the SSCC. The College provided evidence that indicates that students feel empowered to advocate for themselves. Evidence further indicates the College recognizes, respects, and values the student voice. (IV.A.2)

Administrators, classified, and faculty employees participate in decision-making processes and have a substantial voice regarding policy or significant institution-wide implications. These systematic participative processes are clearly defined and were articulated in the ISER and team visit. The team found that the College's shared governance processes are inclusive with representation and participation from each constituent group. Committees are led by tri-chairs. The tri-chair committee structure ensures faculty, classified professionals, and administrators not only serve on all shared governance committees but have a leadership role in each committee. This model enables the college to support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. The 2021 Employee Accreditation Survey assessed employee satisfaction and perceptions of effectiveness related to "shared governance processes". Responses indicated a high level of agreement that "shared governance processes" fosters innovation and improvement in programs and services. Faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed that administration supports their roles in "shared governance".   This culture of inclusive, "shared governance" empowers faculty, staff, and administrators from all areas and levels of the college to contribute to college wide innovation and continuous quality improvement efforts. The team compliments the College for cultivating an environment where all voices are heard, and all constituents feel as though they are valued members of the governance structure. Discussions during the site visit confirmed an increase in committee participation from classified staff as a result of a sense of being empowered, release time, or compensation pay. During the public forum, the team noted mutual respect among all constituent groups. (IV.A.3)

Through these defined, systematic board and institutional governance processes the College ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations. The team reviewed evidence that confirmed District policy, the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Manual, as well as campus based collegial consultation practices outline the structures, roles, and responsibilities of faculty related to curriculum and student learning programs and services. Board Policy 1300 outlines the academic and professional matters over which the Academic Senate exercises primary purview. This includes curriculum and student learning programs and services. (IV.A.4) (IV.A.5)

The College provided evidence that indicates outcomes as well as other decisions resulting from the collegial consultation processes are documented in committee agendas and minutes which are posted publicly on the college website. President Town Hall meetings are an additional forum where decisions, initiatives, and planning outcomes are communicated. (IV.A.6)

The College's Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Manual outlines the annual process for evaluating leadership roles and the College's shared governance and decision-making policies and procedures. Evaluation outcomes and recommendations for improvement are presented and discussed in the respective shared governance committees and Academic, Classified, and Student Senates. Committee chairs also meet at the end of each academic year to discuss issues and assess intra and inter committee effectiveness. Governance assessment summaries and recommendations for improvement are posted on the governance webpage and utilized as the basis for improvement. In 2020 the College developed an Institutional Innovation and Effectiveness Plan outlining objectives and action steps focused in three areas: refinement of governance processes; communication; and integrated planning and resource allocation processes. The team recommends that College continue to invest time and resources into supporting the work and outcomes of this Plan. (IV.A.7)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard

Commendation 1: The team commends the College for inclusion and strong participation and leadership from classified staff in shared governance in support of innovation and institutional excellence. (IV.A.1, IV.A.3)

IV.B. Chief Executive Officer

General Observations:

The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) is comprised of two colleges. Organizationally, the chancellor serves as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the district and reports to the Board of Trustees. A College President serves as the CEO of each campus and reports the Chancellor. The Chancellor leads and administratively directs District planning, organizing, budgeting, staffing, and institutional effectiveness. The President of Chabot College leads and administratively directs campus planning, organizing, budgeting, staffing, and evaluating institutional effectiveness. District-wide committee structures are in place that facilitate administrative and operational collaboration between the district and colleges on intersecting functions including but not limited to integrated planning and resource allocation processes. The president has ensured an administrative structure to allow for effective leadership, management, and operations through the delegation of operational decision -making to the vice presidents, deans and other administrators over their respective areas as documented in the organizational chart. The president engages in a system of structured meetings with administration, constituent groups, and participatory governance groups to allow for open

discussion and broad participation in institutional planning and evaluation including emphasis on institutional effectiveness, budget, and accreditation.

<u>Findings and Evidence:</u>

The team reviewed evidence that confirms that the President of Chabot College serves as the CEO of the campus and retains the primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The President provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting, and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness at the campus level. "The college president's job description outlines the primary responsibilities including:
- responsible for broad decision making; has administrative authority and leadership responsibility for all aspects of the College's programs and instructional and student services
- supervision and evaluation of all staff
- planning and budgeting
- technology
- outreach and public relations" (IV.B.1)

Board Policy 7250 provides guidance on the employment of educational administrators for CLPCCD. The chancellor plans, oversees and evaluates the administrative structure of the district. The chancellor ensures that the administrative structure of the district is organized and staffed to reflect the district's purposes, size, and complexity. The chancellor delegates authority to the College president, vice chancellors, and other administrators as appropriate. At the college, team found evidence that the College president retains primary responsibility for the quality and effectiveness of the institution. The president plans, oversees and evaluates the administrative structure of the college. The president sets annual performance objectives for the college and assess the achievement of those performance objectives. The president delegates authority to vice presidents and other administrators as appropriate. (IV.B.2)

Board Policies 1300, 1420 and 2430 describe the roles of the chancellor and president in ensuring that the district has and implements comprehensive, systematic, integrated planning through collegial consultation. The president guides the institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment at the college by establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities. Per the job description for the position the college president ensures the college sets institutional performance standards for student achievement and that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal data. The president has established campus practices and procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the college. Institution Set Standards (ISS) are reviewed annually in PRAC and submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) through the Annual Report. (IV.B.3)

Per the position description, College president has the primary leadership role for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. The president delegates administrative oversight of accreditation to the vice president of academic affairs as the accreditation liaison officer. Faculty, staff, and administrative leaders of the institution also have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements through participation on the Accreditation Leadership Team,

Accreditation Steering Committee, and the President's Council. Faculty, staff, and administrators also lead and serve on Standard Teams during the development of ISERs. (IV.B.4)

The team found that the president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures. The president delegates authority for the day-to-day administrative oversight of the college budget to the vice president of administrative services. The vice president of administrative services communicates and collaborates closely with the District Budget Services Department, District PBC, and campus PRAC. (IV.B.5)

The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the College. The president communicates with the college and the community through a variety of forums and venues including Board Report. Townhall meetings, Websites, newsletters, and electronic mail messages and memos. The president also builds and maintains community relationships and partnerships through service on a number of boards and community committees. (IV.B.6)

Conclusions:

The college meets the standard

IV.C. Governing Board

General Observations:

The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) is governed by a seven-member board elected by geographic regions, and two student trustees, one selected by the student body of each college who are nonvoting members. The Board of Trustees (BOT) carries out governance functions in accordance with Board Policies and District Mission Statement. The BOT has authority over and responsibility for establishing and prioritizing policies related to academic quality, integrity, financial condition, and the effectiveness of student learning programs and services of the district and its two colleges. The BOT has authority and maintains appropriate board policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning. The BOT engages in setting priorities and planning and receives regular updates on key indicators of students learning and achievement, institutional plans, and accreditation. The governing board conducts regular self-evaluations and periodic evaluations of the chancellor. The Governing Board is informed and demonstrates that they understand their role and responsibility in the accreditation processes.

Findings and Evidence:

The Board of Trustees (BOT) carries out governance functions in accordance with Board Policy (BP) 1200 District Mission Statement. The BOT has authority over and responsibility for

establishing and prioritizing policies related to academic quality, integrity, financial condition, and the effectiveness of student learning programs and services of the district and its two colleges. Chapter 2 (BP 2010-2750)- Board of Trustee delineates the Governing Board's membership, duties and responsibilities, governance, and decision making. BP 6200 Budget Preparation outlies the criteria upon which the district's annual budget is prepared in alignment with Board a-approved planning priorities and relevant State requirements. (IV.C.1)

The Trustee Handbook, BP 2010 Board Membership, and BP 2200 Board Duties and Responsibilities guide Trustees to act as a whole once a decision is made. The Governing Board meeting minutes demonstrated that the trustees are unanimous with many of their votes and most items are approved on the consent agenda. In reviewing a dozen or more Governing Board meeting minutes, the Trustees appear to speak with one voice. In accordance with BP 2330 Quorum and Voting, board members reach decisions by a majority vote on most matters. Once the Board reaches a decision, each board member agrees to uphold that decision. (IV.C.2)

 The governing board has policies for selecting and evaluating administrators. Board Policy (BP) 2431 Chancellor Selection, BP 7250 Educational Administrators, and the CLPCCD Administrative hiring Procedures delineate the steps involved in hiring educational administrators, including the chancellor and college presidents. BP/AP 7150 Evaluation and the CLPCCD Administrator Performance Evaluation System manual detail the process for evaluating college presidents. (IV.C.3)

The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the quality of the institution's educational programs and services. Trustees are elected by geographic regions representing the interests of the county residents. The governing board advocates for and defends the district and protects it from undue influence or political pressure. (IV.C.4)

  The Governing Board has developed, implemented, and followed policies consistent with the district's mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. BP/AP2410 Board Policy and Administrative Procedure describes this major BOT responsibility. Evidence is reflected in a host of specific Governing Board policies. These policies relate to such processes as curriculum approval, review of institutional effectiveness, and policies ensuring adequate budget capacity to serve its student population. (IV.C.5)

 The governing board publishes bylaws and policies specifying its size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures in Chapter 2 of their Board Policies available on their website. These policies describe the size and composition of the governing board, how members are elected, how meetings are conducted, the duties and responsibilities of governing board members, and the code of ethics/decorum members are expected to follow. (IV.C.6)

Actions taken by the CLPCCD BOT are consistent with its policies and procedures, which are evident in reviewed meeting minutes and actions formally adopted at board meetings. The district has set a ten-year timeline to review and revise Board Policies to bring them up to date with statutes or when policies and/or procedures are amended to help achieve objectives consistent with the district's and its colleges' respective missions. In reviewing BP's most were

revised within the 6-year timeline with a few exceptions (not an exhaustive list)- BP 2310-Regular meetings of the Board, BP 2355 Decorum, and BP 2365 Recording. (IV.C.7)

To keep its focus on ensuring student success, the governing board reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality. Throughout the year, the governing board receives regular scheduled reports on key indicators at their meetings and study sessions from district and College staff members detailing achievement. Governing Board meeting minutes from May 19, 2019, include a review and approval of each college's established Vision for Success goals. Subsequently, at a board retreat held in August 2020, the Board reviewed each college's progress toward achieving its Vision for Success goals as well as efforts and initiatives underway that will enable completion of the goals by 2022. (IV.C.8)

The governing board has comprehensive training for their own education and development that includes an orientation of new board members and ongoing training for improvement in the performance of all board members. The Trustee Handbook contains topics in which all trustee members receive training to support their work at the local level. Trustees receive ongoing professional development at retreats, conferences, and study sessions. Board members participated in Trustee Training and the CCLC Annual Conferences. The February 23, 2019, and March 30, 2021, study sessions included effective trusteeship and best practices. The Board also has a mechanism for providing for continuity of its membership with staggered terms of office. (IV.C.9)

The governing board evaluates itself consistently with the process identified in Governing Board Policy 2745 on an annual basis. As part of a Special Meeting on April 20, 2021, the summary results of the Board self-evaluation were presented and discussed. The Board self-evaluation demonstrated agreement (strongly agree/agree) with meeting evaluation criteria with very few disagree marks. Areas evaluated included: Board Operations, Civility, regulatory requirements, State and national advocacy, accreditation standards, committee work, and more. (IV.C.10).

Governing Board Policy 2715, Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice outlines the commitment of the Board to operating with ethical standards following the principles of service, cooperation, respect, integrity, confidentiality, and openness. Governing Board policy 2710, Conflict of Interest outlines the commitment to avoiding conflicts of interest by the Governing Board members. None of the current board members has employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed through annual filing of the Economic Interest Form (Form 700) under California law. (IV.C.11)

BP 2430 Delegation to the Chancellor states the BOT clearly delegates to the chancellor the executive responsibility for administering the policies adopted by the Board and executing all decisions of the Board requiring administrative action, including but not limited to administration of the colleges and recommending appropriate actions that need to be taken when no written board policy is available. The Board holds the chancellor accountable for the operations of the two colleges and all other sites and locations where the CLPCCD operates. (IV.C.12)

The governing board maintains a focus on accreditation by being informed about Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the Colleges' accredited status through regular and special Board meeting and study sessions. For example, the Governing Board was briefed on the accreditation standards at a workshop in August 2020 and specific Standards IV.C and IV.D were reviewed during a retreat in August 2021. (IV.C.13)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

IV.D. Multi-College Districts or Systems

General Observations:
The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) is comprised of two colleges, Chabot College and Las Positas College. The district Chief Executive Officer (CEO) identified as the District Chancellor, reports to a seven-member Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees selects, and the Chancellor supervises, the college CEOs (College Presidents) and a District office in which several vice chancellors and other administrative staff report to the Chancellor. The district office is an administrative operation that does not directly conduct any educational programs. The two CLPCCD Colleges are accredited separately while the district office is only evaluated through the accreditation review of each College where its operations directly impact the college. The governing board conducts regular self-evaluations and periodic evaluations of the chancellor.

Findings and Evidence:
The chancellor establishes clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the college and the district. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Function Map distinguishes functions for which the district is primarily responsible, those for which primary responsibility rests with the individual colleges, and some for which responsibility is shared in fulfilling each accreditation standard subsection. The chancellor, as district CEO, exercises his leadership in guiding the development of the functional map through the Chancellor's Council.
The chancellor provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations through various channels including the District-Wide Planning Guidance and Coordinating Committee, and an annual management retreat. (IV.D.1)

The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Integrated Planning and Budget Model (IPBM) identifies functions and personnel who provide district-wide services, which support the colleges' mission. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Task Map is a tool that delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibility between the district and college functions. Additionally, the Chancellor's Council, with representation from all constituent groups, collaborates with and helps to inform the decision-making process. (IV.D.2)

A District Budget Allocation Model (BAM) guides resource allocation to the colleges and district support areas. The District Planning and Budget Committee is currently working on a

revised BAM. Both colleges appear to have sufficient resources to support programs and improvement, and the Colleges' budget allocation processes is understood. (IV.D.3)

Board Policy 2430 "Delegation of Authority" delegates to the chancellor the executive responsibility for administering the policies adopted by the Board and executing all decisions of the Board requiring administrative action. The chancellor then delegates authority to the college presidents. AP 7250 Educational Administrators describes the evaluation procedure to measure the president responsible for their performance and contractual obligations. College presidents are evaluated based on an established schedule and evaluation tool. Interviews with the Chancellor and Presidents validated that evaluations are conducted according to the established schedule. (IV.D.4)

The district's integrated planning and budget model (IPBM) supports planning and action agendas specific to all aspects of operations, providing coordinated efforts across the district for evidence-based integrated planning. In 2021, constituent members evaluated the IPBM framework. (IV.D.5)

The District and Colleges have an established communication system to ensure effective operations. Several districtwide committees (i.e., Chancellor's Council, Planning and Budget Committee (PBC), Educational Support Services Committee, Facilities Committee, Technology Coordinating Committee, and District Enrollment Management Committee) address planning, finance, quality of educational programs, professional development, technology, facilities and other areas where efficient District communication and coordination helps ensure timely, accurate, and comprehensive operations. The structured memberships of these committees include representatives from the colleges and district office and faculty, staff and students from both colleges. In addition to the district committees the Chancellor meets weekly with the senior leadership team (SLT), comprised of the vice chancellors (Vice Chancellor of Business Services, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Vice Chancellor of Facilities and Bond Program, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Student Success), the Chief Technology Officer, and the college presidents, to exchange information and coordinate efforts between the District and Colleges. (IV.D.6)

The District and the Colleges have an evaluation process in place to delineate the work of reviewing, updating and refining governance and decision-making processes. The District CEO ensures these roles and functions are effective and ensures the integrity in assisting the Colleges to meet their goals. District committees review their charge and identify areas for improvement. The instrument most widely used is surveys, which are reviewed at District retreats. An accreditation survey is conducted on a six-year cycle to evaluate governance, the decision-making process and delineation of roles and functions. (IV.D.7)

Conclusions:

The College meets the Standard.

Quality Focus Essay

ACCJC's Guide to Institutional Self-Evaluation states the function of the Quality Focus Essay (QFE) as "the opportunity for member institutions to be innovative and to propose new ideas and projects that will improve student learning and/or student achievement at the institutional level." Colleges are asked to "identify two or three areas of need or areas of interest that arise out of the institutional self-evaluation and that focus on student learning and student achievement."

The QFE in the Chabot College ISER clearly defines two projects that are designed to build upon existing programs at the college. The QFE provides detailed plans for both of the projects, and includes anticipated outcomes, impacts and outcome measures for each of the projects, both of which are designed to support student success and equity.

The Chabot College QFE was develop by initially gathering feedback from a variety of campus groups and individuals concerning the areas that they believed could be improved across the college. These campus-wide conversations were organized through a variety of venues and committees including College Day, a college-wide survey, dialogue with the student, classified and faculty senates, and shared governance committees. Data from these sources were given to the Chabot Accreditation Leadership Team (CALTeam) which analyzed the data and determined three potential areas of interest for the QFE. These areas informed the selection process of the QFE project ideas. These QFE ideas were vetted through the Accreditation Steering Committee, the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) and the President's Council.

This college-wide collaborative process resulted in the identification of two QFE projects that were identified as being of significant importance to student success and institutional effectiveness and are also closely aligned with the college's Strategic Planning Objectives, Educational Master Plan and Mission Critical Priorities.

QFE Project 1: Building Upon the Guided Pathways Framework with an Equity and Technology Lens.

Since Fall 2018, Chabot College has worked on a 5-year Guided Pathways plan building program that is grounded in the four pillars of Guided Pathways that have provided national guidance for Guided Pathways. The College states that this first QFE project provides an opportunity to redesign the student onboarding process to correspond with the development of the Learning and Career Pathways at the college. QFE Project 1 includes three major project activities including

- Implementing and Embedding Student Success Teams in Learning and Career Pathways
- Establishing a guided pathways student council and
- Integrating Learning and Career Pathways in current systems.

Each of these three QFE Project 1 activities includes a detailed action plan that defines the Activity, the Responsible Party or Parties, the resources necessary to implement the plan, and a detailed timeline. Project 1 has a timeline that began in Fall 2020 and is expected to be completed by Spring 2025. Each of the three activities in this project are further described and expected outputs and outcomes are described for each of the three activities.

The plan for this project also includes a detailed list of action steps that are designed to help students increase their probability of meeting their degree and transfer goals. These action steps will increase success for a series of eight success indicators/matrices that are clearly defined in the project plan, with a goal of ensuring first-time students will follow intentionally designed processes that will provide an equity-driven onboarding process.

Specific outcome measures include 1) identification and examination of best practices, 2) assessment of gaps that have been identified, and 3) providing students with more opportunities to explore education opportunities with greater guidance and support as they make choices. For example, the plan to establish a Guided Pathways Student Council is designed to give students a greater voice in the establishment or modification of existing or future processes. The team believes that the college could benefit from identifying more specific and measurable outcome measures that would serve as well-defined indicators of how improvements in the areas within Guided Pathways would directly impact student learning and achievement.

QFE Project 2: Further Development of the Black Excellence Collective 10X10 Village Project with a Mental Health and Technology Lens

The second QFE project is designed to expand and build upon the Black Excellence Collective (BEC) 10X10 Village project. The BEC is a collective group of efforts that draws together successful practices from a variety of groups on campus that are led by Black students, faculty administrators and classified staff. Arising from a June 2020 Presidential task force for Black Student Excellence, the BEC 10X10 Villages were launched to scaling successful learning community practices to reach all Black students at the colleges.

The Villages are designed to support the approximately 1,100 Black students at the college. These students are divided into ten villages, with each village consisting of a minimum of ten staff volunteers who work as a team focused on one of the ten village areas. The QFE Project 2 builds on prior campus wide activities designed to increase the success and graduation rates of Black students. The Health and Wellbeing Village (Mental Health) was identified as a top priority by the BEC, and thus became the focus of QFE Project 2. This project along with the work of the other nine villages, has a goal to support equitable success outcomes for Black students from the time they enter the college until they graduate or transfer.

The intention of QFW Project #2 is to build the college's mental health services, paying special attention to Black students. This calls for three project activities in its project action plan:
- Mental Health Outreach and Capacity Building
- Integrating a Mental Wellness Mobile App
- Student Engagement & Mental Health Services

Each of these three QFE Project 2 activities includes a detailed action plan that defines the Activity, the Responsible Party or Parties, the resources necessary to implement the plan, and a detailed timeline. The timeline indicates that work began in Fall 2020 and is scheduled to continue to completion in Spring 2024.

Educational research has showed that students are being affected by a variety of social emotional concerns which can influence their academic achievement in school. In this model, student wellness is treated as an integral part of learning and is interconnected with the work of the other 9 villages in the 10 X 10 Village Project. The work of this project will continue to grow the work and support of the Health & Wellbeing village with the intention of improving students learning and achievement though health & wellness support.

Each of the three project activities has specific outcomes which are explained with expected outputs and outcomes described in detail for each. These include 1) increasing the percentage of black students at the college who agree with the statement that "there is an emotionally supportive climate at Chabot for students with mental health needs", 2) the ability to assess students' perceptions of the impact of the mental health mobile app on their well-being and 3) assessment of the impact of mental health services on student well-being as well as student learning and achievement, including revisions of programs and services as needed.

Supported by cited research, these three specific plans have the potential to truly impact the success and completion rates of Black students. The college will need to ensure that the supports and services will be offered at times and locations that will be accessible for the black students who are in need.

Conclusion:
The QFE clearly provides thoughtful and complete action plans for two different projects that are clearly designed to build and improve on already existing activities at the college. Overall, the team found that the QFE includes ambitious goals that are presented as a well-designed action plan and which has specific outcomes that should be attainable for the college. The action plans and assessment plans should allow the college to continue improvement of the guided pathways program and expanded support for the many Black students on campus which should lead to improvements in student success and equity for students throughout the college. The team applauds the college for continuing its tradition of capturing student voice in order to inform the development and improvement of the various aspects of the Guided Pathways initiative and in making progress in closing equity gaps for its Black students. Overall, the college is encouraged to identify specific benchmarks wherever possible to measure the progress and effectiveness of these plans.

Appendix A: Core Inquiries

CORE INQUIRIES

Chabot College
25555 Hesperian Blvd.
Hayward, CA 94545

The Core Inquiries are based upon the findings of the peer review team that conducted Team ISER Review on February 23, 2022

Dr. Kim Hoffmans
Team Chair

Contents

Chabot College
Peer Review Team Roster
Team ISER Review
February 23, 2022

Dr. Kimberly Hoffmans*, Chair President Ventura College	Dr. Brenda Thames*, Vice Chair Superintendent/President El Camino College
ACADEMIC MEMBERS	
Mr. Howard Eskew, Jr. Associate Professor, Accounting San Diego Mesa College	Dr. Kathryn Nette Chair, Science & Engineering Cuyamaca College
Ms. Sarah Shepard Faculty - Business & Curriculum Chair West Hills College Coalinga	
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS	
Ms. Primavera Arvizu Vice President, Student Services Porterville College	Ms. Claudette Dain* Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services Citrus College
Mr. Leighton Vila Program Evaluator Windward Community College	Dr. Marina Aminy Executive Director California Virtual Campus (CVC)
Ms. Monica Chahal Vice President of Instruction Clovis Community College	
ACCJC STAFF LIAISON	
Dr. Kevin Bontenbal Vice President ACCJC	

* District Team Member

Summary of Team ISER Review

INSTITUTION: Chabot College
DATE OF TEAM ISER REVIEW: February 23, 2022
TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Kim Hoffmans

A ten-member accreditation peer review team conducted Team ISER Review of Chabot College on February 23, 2022, and the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District on February 22, 2022. The Team ISER Review is a one-day, off-site analysis of an institution's self-evaluation report. The peer review team received the college's institutional self-evaluation report (ISER) and related evidence several weeks prior to the Team ISER Review. Team members found the ISER to be an adequate document detailing the processes used by the College to address Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. Due to limited number of examples provided by the College illustrating the outcomes of their processes in practice, the peer review team spent a great deal of time combing through minutes and other documents on the CLPCCD (Chabot Las Positas Community College District) and Chabot College's website to locate evidence confirming compliance with ACCJC Standards. The team verified that the ISER was developed through broad participation by the College community including faculty, staff, students, and administration. The team found that the College provided a thoughtful ISER containing a few self-identified action plans for institutional improvement. The College also prepared a Quality Focus Essay.

In preparation for the Team ISER Review, the team chair and vice chair attended a team chair training workshop on December 1, 2021, and held a pre-review meeting with the college CEO (Chief Executive Officer) on January 13, 2022. The entire peer review team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges) on February 3, 2022. Prior to the Team ISER Review, team members completed their team assignments, identified areas for further clarification, and provided a list of requests for additional evidence to be considered during Team ISER Review.

During the Team ISER Review, team members spent the morning discussing their initial observations and their preliminary review of the written materials and evidence provided by the College for the purpose of determining whether the College continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and US ED regulations. In the afternoon, the team further synthesized their findings to validate the work of the College and identified standards the College meets, as well as developed Core Inquiries to be pursued during the Focused Site Visit, which will occur during the week of October 10, 2022.

Core Inquiries are a means for communicating potential areas of institutional noncompliance, improvement, or exemplary practice that arise during the Team ISER Review. They describe the areas of emphasis for the Focused Site Visit that the team will explore to further their analysis to determine whether standards are met and accordingly identify potential commendations or recommendations. The College should use the Core Inquiries and time leading up to the focused site visit as an opportunity to gather more evidence, collate information, and to strengthen or develop processes in the continuous improvement cycle. During the Focused Site Visit, the

ACCJC staff liaison will review new or emerging issues which might arise out of the discussions on Core Inquiries.

Core Inquiries

Based on the team's analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

Core Inquiry 1: The team seeks to confirm that all instructional programs (SLOs) and student support services (SAOs) are regularly evaluated for effectiveness related to continuous quality improvement.
Standards or Policies: I.B.2 and II.C.2
Description: Program review data was reviewed (both comprehensive and annual) by the team looking for outcome assessment results. Assessment evidence for several instructional programs/courses (math and psychology, for example) and student services programs was not found. Additionally, not all student services programs had SAOs and the assessment timelines for courses/programs were unclear.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
   a. Since submitting the ISER, has the college assessed any additional courses or programs?
   b. Does the college have an updated spreadsheet showing assessments updated to current month/year, and with SLO, PLO and SAO results available?
   c. Is the college following a 3-year or 5-year assessment cycle for SLOs/PLOs and SAOs?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
   a. Updated list or spreadsheet of assessments through current month/year.
   b. Documentation of SLO/SAO assessment results demonstrating improvement.
   c. SAOs for all student services areas.

Request for Observations/Interviews:
   a. Curriculum Committee or SLO Leads
   b. Program faculty/chairs
   c. Student Services faculty leads
   d. OAC members
   e. Student Services deans

Core Inquiry 2: The team seeks clarification about the process used to establish institution-set standards (ISS) and how the College determines it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement.
Standards or Policies: I.B.3
Description: The team reviewed the institution set standards and is seeking additional clarification as to how the ISS were established.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
   a. What methodology was used to establish the ISS and what was the rationale used to support the pursuit of continuous improvement?
   b. What data and evidence were reviewed to establish the institution set standards?
   c. For achievements with a large data spread, e.g., certificates, how do assessment results for these inform the college about needed improvements?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
   a. Is there an explanation/evidence or summary of the methodology followed in establishing the ISS, related to continuous quality improvement?
   b. Meeting minutes where ISS were discussed and assessed.
   c. Meeting minutes documenting the conversations regarding ISS including the data that was reviewed to develop the ISS.

Request for Observations/Interviews:
   a. Lead for Institutional Research and/or Institutional Effectiveness
   b. OIR Coordinator

Core Inquiry 3: The team seeks to confirm that program review occurs on a regular, scheduled cycle and is used to evaluate academic quality and drive continuous improvement, across both instruction and student services.
Standards or Policies: II.A.2, II.A.16 & II.C.1
Description: The team reviewed the college's ISER and website for evidence of regular program review and how results are used for continuous improvement. Information related to program review and examples of ensuring program improvement were in limited supply. The team was unable to determine the full cycle of assessment by program, including comprehensive versus annual review. Further, the team could not identify information on how often courses were evaluated or where dialogue concerning continuous improvement occurred.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
   a. How and where are follow-up discussions to program reviews held?
   b. What documentation is used to show implementation of recommendations emanating from program reviews?
   c. What are the master calendars for the program and curriculum review processes, inclusive of comprehensive and annual reviews?
   d. How does the College review/update CORs?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
   a. Meeting minutes documenting discussions
   b. Master Calendars for program/curriculum review cycles
   c. Evidence of widespread dialogue of the PAR Synthesis Statement. Master calendar for COR reviews.

Request for Observations/Interviews:
   a. PAR Committee chairs/members
   b. Curriculum Committee chairs/members
   b. Deans
   c. Faculty leads/department chairs

Core Inquiry 4: The team seeks to verify that students receive a syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline of record (COR).

Standards or Policies: II.A.3

Description:

The team reviewed sample CORs which contained student learning outcomes, but the team was not provided syllabi for review. As part of the distance education review, the team was provided a random sample of 50 classes and found most of the syllabi in those courses were missing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or contained SLOs that were inconsistent with outcomes on the COR.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
   a. What are the processes used by the College to verify alignment of SLOs with approved CORs outcomes on syllabi?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
   a. Sample syllabi and corresponding COR to review SLOs listed in both places.

Request for Observations/Interviews:
  a. Faculty leads/department chairs
  b. Deans

Core Inquiry 5: The team seeks evidence of effective use/review of delivery modes and teaching methodologies to reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students.

Standards or Policies: II.A.7

Description:

The team found some evidence about overall success and retention rates, but there was no evidence available of data disaggregated by distance education (DE) modality. The evidence for some groups of students (such as UMOJA) was available by demographic group but, not by modality. The team also found that of the distance education classes reviewed, 11% did not have observable evidence of regular and substantive interaction as defined by the institution.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
  a. Is there success or retention data available for DE outcomes?
  b. Is there other evidence which supports regular and substantive interaction between faculty and students?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
  a. Current and trend success and retention data for DE courses
  b. Current and trend data for disproportionally impacted groups disaggregated by different modalities
  c. Expanded access (as opposed to student view) to DE Canvas classes

Request for Observations/Interviews:
  a. COOL Committee/leads (Committee on Online Learning)
  b. OAC members
  c. Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Research

Core Inquiry 6: The team seeks clarification on how library and learning support services are evaluated to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs.

Standards or Policies: II.B.3

Description:

The team was unclear on the methods used to evaluate that the library and learning support services were adequately meeting identified needs of students. Evidence reviewed by the team included surveys; however, those survey did not address whether certain programs (such as the laptop/hotspot loan program, the TutorTrac and TutorLingo programs, and online student tutorials) are used effectively to support students.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
  a. Are the laptop/hotspot resources effectively meeting the needs of students?
  b. Is there an evaluation method and results for TutorTrac, TutorLingo, laptop/hotspot lending, and online tutorials?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
  a. Assessment results documenting that laptop/hotspot lending for students effectively meets the needs of students.
  b. Evaluation methods and data used to assess efficacy of TutorTrac, TutorLingo, laptop/hotspot lending and online tutorials.

Request for Observations/Interviews:
  a. Library chair/dean
  b. Librarians
  c. Learning Center coordinator/lead

College Core Inquiry 7:
The team seeks confirmation that personnel are evaluated systematically and at stated intervals, to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement.

Standards or Policies: III.A.5

Description:

Although the evidence link in the ISER to the Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) was a broken link, the team reviewed the collective bargaining agreements from the District website. The team also reviewed Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, and evaluation forms. However, the team was unable to locate a log or other form of evidence indicating the actual completion of evaluations, and frequency of completed evaluations.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
  a. How does the College ensure personnel evaluations are completed in a timely manner, in accordance with policies/procedures?
  b. If evaluations are not completed, what is the process to follow-up, to ensure completion?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
  a. Evidence demonstrating the tracking of personnel evaluations.

Request for Observations/Interviews:
  a. HR (Human Resources) Administrator responsible for ensuring the timely completion of personnel evaluations.

College Core Inquiry 8:
The team seeks evidence which demonstrates how the College assures safe and sufficient physical resources.

Standards or Policies: III.B.1

Description:

In order to review the safe and sufficient physical resources of the institution, the team reviewed board policies, facility plans, and various documents on the Chabot College and CLPCCD (Chabot Las Positas Community College District) websites. The ISER identified several processes; however, evidence or examples of how the College follows its processes, such as the process for reporting safety concerns/hazards, were not provided or were insufficient in demonstrating how the College meets the Standard.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
  a. How are safety hazards identified, reported, and resolved?
  b. How is the Safety Plan developed, reviewed, and assessed?
  c. Is there a committee that oversees the development of the plan and monitors the progress of goals/objectives/activities identified in the plan?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
  a. Evidence of any logs or work order systems which document safety hazards and track the resolution of such hazards.
  b. The College Safety Plan, and evidence of any minutes of committee meetings that reflect if the plans are systematically reviewed and updated.
  c. Evidence demonstrating how safety concerns are identified, investigated and resolved timely.

Request for Observations/Interviews:
  a. Interview with the Health and Safety Committee
  b. Interviews with administrator(s) responsible for ensuring safe and sufficient physical resources

College Core Inquiry 9: - The team seeks to confirm how the College continuously plans for, updates, and replaces technology.

Standards or Policies: III.C.2

Description:

The team reviewed the technology plans at the College and CLPCCD, and technology committee information, and other related documents. The team was unable to locate evidence that substantiates how the College continuously plans for, updates, and replaces technology. While an equipment inventory list was provided, the ISER referenced equipment is replaced on a regular four-year cycle, but no log or substantiating evidence was provided.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
   a. Does the College have a technology replacement log/tracking system, indicating items for replacement by year, and is the log/tracking system reviewed and updated regularly?
   b. Is the technology replacement cycle reviewed and discussed in any committee meetings?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
   a. Evidence of four-year equipment replacement list/cycle.
   b. Documentation showing where the technology replacement cycle/list was discussed?

Request for Observations/Interviews:
   a. College's Information Technology Services Committee

   b. Administrator(s) responsible for ensuring effective technology resources

---

College Core Inquiry 10: The team is interested in learning more about the college's inclusive tri-chair governance process as an innovation leading to institutional excellence.

Standards or Policies: IV.A.1, IV.A.3, and IV.A.5

Description:

The team reviewed several pieces of evidence, from board policies to institutional survey results, which highlighted the institution's efforts in creating and encouraging broad participation in college governance that has led to innovation and institutional excellence. The team was impressed with the college's shared governance processes which recognize and values the contributions of all constituents, in particular, support provided to classified staff to effectively engage in participatory governance.

Topics of discussion during interviews:

    a. Process utilized to support classified staff participation.

    b. Classified staff perceptions of role in shared governance.

    c. Faculty, admin., student perceptions of classified staff roll in shared governance.

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:

    a. Classified Senate meeting minutes, documents, artifacts.

    b. More information on how the participation of classified professionals is supported through administrative and/or fiscal practices.

Request for Observations/Interviews:

    a. Classified Senate

    b. PRAC Tri Chairs

District Core Inquiries

Based on the team's analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following district core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

District Core Inquiry 1: The Team seeks clarification of how resources at the district are provided to ensure total cost of ownership (TCO).
Standards or Policies: III.B.4
Description: The team reviewed the EMP, FMP, Climate Action Plan, Administrative Procedure 3253 (TCO), five-year construction plan, and the draft 2016 TCO plan. Through its review it was unclear how the district regularly assesses and evaluates its TCO plan to support the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. The team was unable to determine how the TCO plan informs the resource allocation process to provide sufficient resources for ongoing support of College and District facilities.

Topics of discussion during interviews:
  a. Is the TCO Plan final? Based on a review of evidence, the team was only able to locate a 2016 DRAFT version of the plan.
  b. How does the TCO plan inform the planning process for new facilities and equipment?
  c. How does the TCO plan inform the resource allocation process to ensure sufficient ongoing resources are provided to support College and District facilities?

Request for Additional Information/Evidence:
  a. Copy of the final TCO plan
  b. Information to substantiate how the TCO plan informs the planning process for new facilities and equipment and how it informs the resource allocation process to ensure sufficient ongoing resources are provided to support College and District facilities.
  c. Evidence demonstrating how the TCO plan is regularly assessed and evaluated.

Request for Observations/Interviews:
  a. District and College Administrative Services/Facilities Personnel
  b. District and College Facilities Planning Committees