A

Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

A1.

The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

A1.a.

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

Description

Hiring categories at Chabot College consist of administration, faculty, confidential/supervisory, and classified employees. The first step in the hiring process is the identification of the need for a resource, which is developed within PR process for both classified and faculty. Within the PR, as part of the planning for improvement and based on program and college need, faculty and staff resources may be requested, through the respective dean or service area manager. These requests are forwarded to the appropriate prioritization committee. Faculty requests must be justified on the basis of enrollment management data, FTES trends, FT/PT ratios, recent retirements, number of students served, and external accreditation demands. The data is readily available to all faculty and staff on the OIR website, and the PR responses are posted on the PRBC site. Deans prioritize faculty requests, and the appropriate prioritization committees reviews and ranks the requests. The Faculty Prioritization Committee, which reports to the Academic Senate, in fall 2014 reviewed and substantially revised its process. The committee reviews pertinent data, then prioritizes the requested positions. The new process for classified staff, which was recently approved, is generally parallel, that is, positions are prioritized based on demonstrated need.

At this time there is no prioritization process for Administrators. Through a careful review of budget and projected staffing levels, working collaboratively, the District and Colleges identify the number of positions, if any based on funding, that can be filled. The BOT all newly created positions prior to posting. The number of positions is matched against the prioritization lists, and the actual hiring process begins.

The people involved in the hiring of personnel are HR personnel, managers, faculty, classified staff, and union representatives. Procedures and forms for the hiring of administrators, classified staff, faculty and supervisory/ confidential staff are posted on the District HR site (**Evidence III-1**).

All job announcements for positions at Chabot College are posted by the CLPCCD. Each one describes minimum qualifications, responsibilities/particular job characteristics, and authority following a consistent format. Desirable qualifications may also be included in job announcements. All permanent positions must be advertised outside the college. Job opportunities are advertised through HR and on the State Chancellor's website, as well as in various periodicals, websites, intracollege and District postings. Depending on the availability of funds and recruitment needs, postings may be done on targeted and diversity websites to ensure a diverse and well-qualified pool of applicants. In addition, jobs in specialized areas may also be advertised informally (word of mouth) or by contacting various associations (Math Association, for example). Deans may also post job announcements through administrative networks. The HR website has advertising procedures and forms for different positions (**Evidence III-1**).

As part of the screening process, HR staff ensure that candidates meet the minimum qualifications, and both first-and second-level committees have access to applicant applications, transcripts, which lists courses and degrees and other specified information as stated in the announcement. Work qualifications and experience are listed in resumes and applications. Qualifications will be verified by contacting listed references. In the case of applicants from non-U.S. institutions, the District seeks evaluation from an outside agency. Foreign transcripts language is included in job posts.

Full-time faculty job descriptions are modified depending on the subject matter and current needs. Members of the discipline requesting a new faculty member may request additional "desirable qualifications" to the minimum qualifications established by the State Chancellor's Office. Job descriptions may be built at the time of announcing the position. A printed brochure that contains both standard information and position-specific information developed by faculty is created for each vacancy. This brochure lists the minimum qualifications and the desirable qualifications, as well as the requirements and characteristics of the job. Position announcements may include requests for letters of recommendation, transcripts, resumes, and supplemental questionnaires. Part-time faculty must meet the same minimum qualifications as full-time faculty. As required by the District, interviews and reference checks are performed for each person hired.

Faculty disciplines also set certain minimum qualifications based on the specific rules of their accrediting bodies, for example, Nursing and Dental Hygiene. Degrees required of all personnel hired must have been granted by accredited institutions. Chabot College follows a set of procedures for granting equivalency. All faculty job announcements include the phrase the "Applicants applying under the 'Equivalent' provision must provide details that explain

at time of application how their academic preparation is the equivalent of the degree listed above." (Evidence III-2) The District equivalency committee, governed by the Faculty Contract Article 22E, reviews requests to hire applicants who do not have the exact degrees required but may meet qualifications in other ways.

District guidelines for the selection of full-time faculty have been governed by BP 4312 (Evidence III-3). These policies were reviewed by the Colleges' Faculty Senates, the District, and the Faculty Union. The District policy states that committee membership will have a majority of faculty and a minimum of one discipline expert. A discipline expert is a faculty member who has an approved Faculty Service Area designation for the subject matter as adopted by the District's BOT. Faculty participate in the hiring process by sitting on hiring committees. They screen the applications, rank the candidates based on their resume and answers to the supplemental questions, and participate in the first-and second-level interviews. Rules of membership in selection committees and the roles of selection committee members are covered in a power-point presentation. The same briefing is given to the hiring committees for all positions. A representative from HR screens all candidates for minimum qualifications.

The faculty selection process consists of a committee process with final approval by the BOT. The first-level committee, made up primarily of faculty from the discipline or division and the area dean, reviews, interviews, and selects applicants based on their full applications. Applications include resumes, responses to supplemental questions (such as a statement on diversity, service to the college, etc.). Members of the hiring committee screen all applications according to a hiring rubric (paper process to score the candidates' applications prior to the interview), and meet formally to discuss each candidate's qualifications. They then develop questions and rubrics to score questions during the first-level interview. The procedures are described in a document posted on the HR website (**Evidence III-1**).

Once the candidates are ranked, the committee decides on the pool to be interviewed, then schedules and conducts a formal interview that includes a teaching or other presentation of 10-15 minutes duration. Candidates are given topics to choose from in advance and are expected to come prepared with detailed information as well as teaching aids, such as Power Point or other technological enhancements. During the first-level interview, selected candidates are expected to answer questions about their teaching philosophy and methods, and to do a teaching demonstration. Faculty within a discipline can evaluate whether a candidate shows proficiency in the discipline. Faculty and staff outside of the discipline are "students" who can evaluate a candidate's ability to relate to them and relay information clearly. The academic qualifications and collegial potential are assessed through the review of the application and responses to interview questions, for example, many candidates will be asked what role they intend to play at within the discipline and college. There is no Correspondence Education instruction at Chabot College, so there is no evaluation in that area. Potential faculty are evaluated and hired first as on-campus instructors. Then, if they wish to teach online or hybrid courses, they must meet qualifications established by the COOL Committee, which evaluates faculty proposals, and provides support to would-be online instructors.

The second-level committee, chaired by the College President, includes a faculty member (from the first-level committee) and the dean, as well as vice presidents. The second-level

committee interviews the applicants sent from the first-level, does reference checks, and submits a recommendation to the BOT for final approval.

Faculty and administrators meet the qualifications for their positions based on the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges," a publication of the CCCCO. These minimum qualifications are provided on the HR website (**Evidence III-1**). The minimum qualifications, also published on the HR website, are different for classified staff. For most positions, there is no degree requirement, but for some, there can be requirements such as degree "equivalent to a Bachelor's degree, etc." and/or "xx years of experience." The CLPCCD hiring packets for Administrators, classified staff, full- and part-time faculty are all provided on the HR website (**Evidence III-1**). There are separate procedures for each group. The procedures outline the philosophy, principles, recruitment activities, and the creation of the job announcement for positions, the application process, as well as the selection committee makeup and responsibilities of the committee. The selection of selection committees is outlined, and the members are given an orientation by a HR Services staff member. College administrators work with HR staff in the development of new classified position descriptions to ensure appropriate education, training, and experience levels relevant to the support of programs and services. Comparisons with similar jobs and job family groups are made to ensure equitable qualification standards for all classified positions.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard.

According to the Spring 2014 Staff Survey ([Evidence OIR-13](#)), the hiring processes for all positions and the criteria used were seen as being fair to all applicants by 55 percent of all staff. Of those who responded, 60 percent of full-time and 52 percent of part-time faculty, 47 percent of full-time and 67 percent of part-time classified, and 64 percent of administrators thought that the hiring processes were fair to all applicants. ([Evidence OIR-35](#)) Hiring processes were seen as advancing the College mission by 57 percent of all staff. Fifty percent of full-time and 68 percent of part-time faculty, 53 percent of full-time and 69 percent of part-time classified staff, and 55 percent of administrators felt that hiring processes are likely to result in hiring personnel who will effectively advance the mission of the College. The percentage of survey participants who felt that teaching effectiveness is the principal criterion in the selection of instructors increased from 60 percent in 2008 to 76 percent of full-time faculty participation in the 2014 survey. In 2014, 66 percent of full-time and 54 percent of part-time faculty, 55 percent of full-time and 67 percent of part-time classified staff, and 50 percent of administrators agreed with the statement.

In 2005, the District agreed to do a classification and compensation study with Service Employees International Union (SEIU), and questionnaire and job evaluation. Because of the state of the economy and the challenges facing the district, there was no funding to implement the study. The Classified Union and the District are in the process of evaluating all classified positions across the District. A separate Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) governs the study (Evidence III-4).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A1.b.

The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Description

Personnel's effectiveness is measured, in part, through evaluations, which seek to assess the work that is undertaken and achieved, according to the job description. Guidelines and forms for evaluation of different types of employees are posted on the HR website (**Evidence III-1**). The Faculty contract contains language about the release of both full-time and part-time faculty as does the SEIU contract (Evidence III-2). In general, the release of an employee is a major and complicated process, and occurs rarely. The faculty and classified professional staff evaluation procedures and policies are a mandatory subject of negotiation and have been incorporated into the collective bargaining agreement between the District and Unions. The Faculty Senate was involved in the process of developing the evaluation procedures, and the entire faculty bargaining unit was asked to participate in providing criteria for evaluation specific to subdivisions and academic considerations.

Untenured faculty have a four-year evaluation process. New faculty hires must write a self-evaluation report each year. Members of their tenure committee assess their proficiency, and teaching and class management methods through class visits. They also collect student evaluations. Recommendations are forwarded to the dean, then to a second-level committee, and to the college president. The recommendation to re-hire (or not hire) an instructor for an additional year is forwarded to the Board. The processes for regular (Tenured) faculty evaluations are established in Article 15 and in Article 18 for part-time faculty of the Faculty Contract (**Evidence III-2**). Tenured faculty are evaluated every three years. The process is documented in student surveys, peer observations, faculty professional review reports, and supervisor reviews. The evaluation process, timing, and criteria used are the same for all types of faculty and are specified in the collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, each type of faculty evaluation (instructional faculty, librarians, counselors, and faculty on special assignments) has additional criteria. The basic criteria for all faculty are excellence in working with students, collegial participation, professional and personal enrichment, and professional responsibilities. Committees to evaluate tenured faculty are made up of peers with administrative oversight.

According to the Faculty Contract, part-time unit members are evaluated during the first semester of employment during the regular academic year. When an adjunct faculty member receives an unsatisfactory or a needs improvement rating on the evaluation, the timeline for

actions to be taken is outlined in the faculty contract. Thereafter, evaluation is conducted at least once every three years of employment. If there is a break in service of two academic years, the unit member is evaluated during the first semester of re-employment. Special evaluations may be performed at any time, if deemed necessary by the Supervisor or Manager. The College is behind on faculty evaluations, but the faculty union and the administration have agreed to timetable for tenured faculty evaluations that will remedy the solution by the end of 2015.

Administrator Evaluations are based on BP 4120, and each administrator is evaluated annually by a procedure developed in conjunction with the administrative staff and approved by the Chancellor (**Evidence III-5**). The Administrator Performance Evaluation System is a two-tiered system consisting of an Annual Performance Evaluation Process and a three-year Comprehensive Evaluation Process (**Evidence III-1**). Primary components of each process include goal-setting, appraisal, and formal feedback. The three-year Comprehensive Administrator Performance Evaluation Process also includes additional multirater or multisource feedback and analysis. The process is documented in three forms: Form A (Annual Goals, Objectives, and Target Dates for Completion), Form B (Goals and Objectives Outcomes Report), and Form C (Administrator Performance Appraisal Summary).

All supervisory, confidential, and classified employees are evaluated on a yearly basis. Classified employees are evaluated according to the SEIU Collective Bargaining Agreement (Evidence III-2). The same evaluation form is used throughout the District. Unit members have the option to prepare a written self-evaluation and submit this to the assigned supervisor or manager prior to the written evaluation conference. In this conference, the assigned supervisor or manager and the unit member discuss the evaluation, including areas of commendation, unsatisfactory performance which requires improvement, and career plans and interest.

The evaluation of the College President is performed by the District Chancellor. The President submits her goals to the Chancellor, who reviews the attainment of these goals. The effectiveness of her performance is evaluated prior to approving continuance of her contract. The evaluation of the District Chancellor is outlined in BP 2435, Evaluation of the Chancellor (Evidence III-6). The BOT conducts the formal evaluation of the Chancellor. The process to be used, the evaluation criteria, and the frequency are part of the employment agreement with the Chancellor.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey several questions were asked about staff evaluation ([Evidence OIR-13](#)). When asked if current evaluation procedures are effective in assessing and improving job performance, 52 percent of all staff felt that the procedures are effective for tenured faculty and 57 percent for non-tenured faculty. The procedures are seen as less effective for administrators (32 percent) and classified or professional staff (42 percent). This perception of the effectiveness of the evaluation procedures has remained the same since 2008 for all except for one group, classified professionals where the effectiveness of the evaluation procedures dropped from 49 percent in 2008 to 42 percent in 2014 ([Evidence OIR-13](#) and [Evidence OIR-35](#)).

Sixty-two percent of all staff responded that the college climate encouraged faculty, staff, and administrators to value and strive for cooperative and mutually respectful working conditions a drop from 71 percent in 2008 (Evidence OIR-21). In 2014, 51 percent of all staff consider that procedures for non-tenured faculty are effective in making recommendations for tenure. (Evidence OIR-13, Evidence OIR-35). Student evaluations of faculty are used in both tenured and untenured evaluation processes. In the spring 2014 Staff Survey, 57 percent felt that current student evaluation forms are adequate in helping faculty members assess teaching effectiveness (Evidence OIR-13).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A1.c.

Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

Description

The evaluation of faculty is guided by the negotiated contract between the District and the Faculty Association. Article 14 (Untenured Faculty), Article 15 (Tenured Faculty) and Article 18.I (Part Time Faculty) concern evaluation. Faculty are responsible for the assessment of student learning. For each active course, CLOs and rubrics have been defined. All of the union contract articles includes criteria where student learning provides evidence of effectiveness. These criteria are found in the sections on Excellence in Working with Students and in the additional specific standards for instructional faculty, librarians, counselors, and faculty on special assignment. Programs also have learning outcomes (PLOs) and rubrics defined.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Specific criteria on SLOs from the faculty evaluation articles include statements:

- Creating opportunities for students to assume responsibility for their own learning

- Assessing program needs and effectiveness
- Challenging students and setting high expectations with full knowledge of the diversity of human qualities and learning styles

- Creating exams and/or other evaluative assignments that test for mastery of course content
- Identifying basic and essential concepts and developing pertinent materials and strategies that will assist students in understanding the core subject matter consistent with the official course outline

Many of the forms used to evaluate faculty have been updated in the past year, and all are posted on the HR Website (**Evidence III-1**). Official Course Outlines of Record contain a section that includes: "Expected Outcomes for Students -upon completion of this course, the student should be able to" and in the curriculum process, course level student outcomes are required. In the program and service area review process, program level and institutional level outcomes are addressed by faculty and all staff. However, the term "Student Learning Outcomes" itself does not appear in the District-Faculty Association contract. Additional specificity with regard to SLO assessment is under negotiation at this time.

Evaluation of Administrators and Classified College personnel, as related to SLOs, are more indirect. The evaluations are targeted at job performance specifically and not to outcomes of students with whom they are in contact. However, through the use of SAOs, which are intended to measure efficacy of service areas with regard to students, the performance of administrators and classified personnel, in the aggregate, is measured.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A1.d. | *The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all or its personnel.*

Description

The AP 2710 establishes a conflict of interest code for the BOT and employee groups which sets the breadth of disclosure required of various district employees (Evidence III-7). The Faculty Senate adopted the Chabot Academic Faculty Senate Professional Ethics Statement on 12/4/2004. There is no separate code of ethics for administrators and classified.

Evaluation

The College meets this Standard.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A2. | *The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes.*

Description

Chabot employs 606 faculty, staff and administrators (Evidence III-8). Full-time faculty represent about one-quarter of the total, and part-time faculty nearly one-half. Full-time classified professionals are about one-fifth of the total, and the rest are administrators. The College employs 162 full-time and 285 adjunct faculty. There is a president, three vice-presidents (Academic Services; Administrative Services; Student Services), seven area deans (1) Applied Technology and Business; 2) Art, Humanities and Social Sciences; 3) Health, Physical Education, and Athletics; 4) Language Arts; 5) Science and Mathematics; 6) Counseling (interim); 7. Special Programs and Services, and five directors (1) Financial Aid; 2) Admissions and Records; 3) Child Care Center; 4) Student Life; 5) Director of Grants (interim). Current staffing levels and trends in job types between 2000-2104 are shown in exhibit (**Evidence III-19**). A new dean position in the office Academic Affairs was recently approved, and the College expects to fill that position during the next few months. The College contracts with the City of Hayward for a police sergeant to administer the College's Safety and Security Department. The College also has an Office of Development and a Foundation with an Executive Director. Other administrative services are provided by the District, which include Fiscal Services and Purchasing, Economic Development and Contract Education, HR, Information Technology, and Maintenance and Operations (M&O).

Evaluating staffing levels for classified staff and administrators is the responsibility of area administrators with recommendations made through PRs submitted by all disciplines, programs, or service areas in a continuous three-year cycle to determine the sufficiency of staffing. Each year, faculty and classified staff evaluate the need for personnel and are asked to provide justification for new and replacement positions as well as other resources based on anticipated improvements in student learning, fulfillment of strategic plan goals, maintenance of safety, and compliance with mandates. Ultimately, requests for positions are evaluated by the PRBC, prioritization committees, administrators within Academic Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services, College Council, and recommendations are sent to the College President.

Decisions about staffing are a product of district and college considerations and processes, for example, the state-mandated, full-time faculty obligation is discussed and defined through the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) and HR. Given prospective (until passed) budget year information and existing staffing levels between the two colleges (given retirements, resignations, or other terminations), the District sets the faculty full-time staffing level for each college. Additional consideration is made by the CEMC, which evaluates the district provided budget and staffing information, including growth funding, PR, institutional research data, and enrollment statistics to make recommendations about faculty staffing. Prioritization recommendations for new full-time faculty and classified positions are made

through the prioritization committees. Initial proposals stem from PR requests, which are supported by enrollment data, and trends in WSCH/FTEF ratios, and additional data provided by the OIR. Recommendations are made to the President, who has the final decision. The allocation of adjunct faculty positions to the colleges is done by the DEMC, CEMC, and administrators.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Responses from the Spring 2014 Staff Survey portrayed a mostly positive attitude about the quantity and effectiveness of staff in supporting college programs and services (Evidence OIR-13). A majority of faculty and staff (57 percent overall) expressed agreement with the statement that "hiring processes are likely to result in hiring personnel who will effectively advance the mission of Chabot College." Part-time staff, both faculty and classified, had a stronger positive response to this statement that full-time staff.

One significant concern revealed in the Spring 2014 Staff Survey was in regard to the institutional planning process and its current effectiveness in integrating staffing decisions with other planning components—educational programs, student services, and the use of physical and financial resources. Only 32 percent of staff agree or strongly agree that these decisions are integrated. A second concern related to Standard IIIA.2 was that current evaluation procedures for administrators may not include sufficient input from the cross-section of personnel under the administrator's supervision or leadership (Evidence OIR-3). However, the survey noted an improvement between 2008 and 2014 in the percentage of staff who believe there is adequate faculty voice in the development of institutional policy (up from 44 percent to 55 percent) (Evidence OIR-1).

The budget crisis period of 2008-2012 led to reductions in classified staffing and nonreplacement of some faculty and classified positions vacated due to retirements. In the area of technology resources and services (Standard IIIC), the College may lack sufficient technical staff to support day-to-day use of existing technology resources. Only 38 percent of all staff agreed that adequate technical support staff exists, which can threaten the quality of course delivery components that rely on technological tools, as well the maintenance of systems (such as computer labs and classroom audio/visual equipment). Forty-four percent of staff respondents agreed that the college adequate links technology decisions to its institutional planning process (Evidence OIR-16).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A3. | *The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.*

A3.a. | *The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.*

A3.b. | *The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.*

Description

The District HR posts its forms and procedures on its website (**Evidence III-1**). Board policies concerning personnel and all relevant clauses of the bargaining union agreements are adhered to. Personnel files as defined by the California Education Code are kept in a secure location in the District HR Office, and the files never leave the office except under court order. The provisions for security and confidentiality of personnel records along with assurance that these records are private, accurate, complete, and permanent have largely been developed in negotiations between the District and the Faculty Association and with SEIU Local 1021, representing the classified staff. The policy and rules concerning security and confidentiality of personnel records are found in the Faculty Contract, Article 16, and the Classified Contract, Article 10 (Evidence III-2). New HR employees are given explicit directions regarding file confidentiality and are instructed about the circumstances in which employees and managers can review the files. Written authorization and release is required before a third party may gain access (for example, government investigators and auditors). Upon presenting official identification during the District's normal working hours (8:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.), an employee may view his or her file. Employees have online access to their financial records through Class-Web, including: benefits, and deductions, pay information, and leave balances. Five years after the termination of employment, employees' personnel files are archived.

At the time of employment, each new staff member is issued a packet of payroll and personnel information to be completed and returned to HR. This information comprises the foundation of each employee's personnel record. Human Resources reviews the contents of this file using a checklist to ensure that all of the necessary documents are completed, returned, and filed appropriately (**Evidence III-1**). Regular HR training as part of monthly District administrators' meetings covers topics such as employee rights, training, and evaluation, and the prevention and handling of sexual harassment issues.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, 65 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that HR policies and procedures are clearly stated (Evidence OIR-13). Personnel policies conform to the negotiated contracts and board policies. Human Resources provides continuing training to insure fairness in recruitment and evaluation

practices. There is an ongoing dialogue and review of hiring practices and evaluation that leads to performance improvement.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A4.	*The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.*
A4.a.	*The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.*
A4.b.	*The institution regularly assesses that its record in employment equity and diversity is consistent with its mission.*
A4.c.	*The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.*

Description

The District has adopted several written policies designed to ensure equity and nondiscrimination in employment. In Section 4006, the Board elaborates:

> *It is the policy of this district to provide equal opportunity in all areas of employment practices and to assure that there shall be no discrimination against any person on the basis of sex, ancestry, age, marital status, race, religious creed, mental disability, medical condition (including HIV and AIDS), color, national origin, physical disability, family or sexual preference status and other similar factors in compliance with Title IX, Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, other federal and state non-discrimination regulations, and its own statements of philosophy of objectives. The District encourages the filing of applications by both sexes, ethnic minorities, and the disabled. (Evidence III-10).*

BP 4029 prohibits discrimination:

> *In accordance with the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District prohibits discrimination against students and employees with physical or mental disabilities that substantially limit activities such as working, walking, talking, seeing, hearing, or caring for oneself. People who have a record of such an impairment and those regarded as having an impairment are also protected. (Evidence III-11).*

State law requires all administrators and supervisors to receive workplace sexual harassment training every two years. Since this legal obligation has been in place, the District has taken the opportunity to exceed the minimum legal requirement and to train employees on the rights of all individuals in the District to feel safe and valued

at work and school regardless of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical/mental disability, marital status, sex, age, or sexual orientation.

In order to ensure fairness in all employment procedures, the District requires in BP 4012 that "Selection procedures shall be in accordance with the District Faculty and Staff Diversity and Equal Employment Opportunity Plan" (Evidence III-12). This plan provides the basic elements and procedures for the implementation of the faculty and staff diversity policy. To address diversity issues in the hiring process, there are policies and procedures in place for both the applicant and the selection committee members. In the hiring of staff, the District HR has revised its application forms to include the following requirement:

"The successful applicant must demonstrate sensitivity to and an understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural and ethnic backgrounds of community college students, including those with physical and/or learning disabilities. Please provide how you demonstrate this minimum qualification and in ways that are directly relevant to position for which you are applying. Please attach separate sheet (not to exceed one page) should you require …"

The District posts open positions in a wide variety of publications aimed at reaching broad audiences: general, academic, and ethnic. The District uses an applicant tracking software system to better monitor the equity in the application pool throughout the screening and selection process. The District requires that selection committee membership be reviewed by HR to ensure diversity. The selection committees receive additional mandatory training by HR staff, the hiring administrator, or both.

The faculty and classified contracts contain provisions that prevent discrimination and support a diverse staff, such as reasonable accommodations for mental or physical disabilities (Article 9M), pregnancy leave and parental leave (11E and F), and non-discrimination practices (35a-c) and the Classified contract also has articles concerning nondiscrimination: 3.2 Non Discrimination and 20.6 Non Discrimination (working conditions) (Evidence III-2).

Evaluation

The District and the College meet the Standard. The college creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that supports its diverse personnel as evidenced by board policies, contractual provisions and the results of the Spring 2014 Staff Survey (Evidence OIR-19). In the survey, all groups registered high agree/strongly agree opinions about being dealt with honestly and truthfully: faculty 82 percent; classified 87 percent; and administrators 68 percent. When asked if they felt discrimination by other college staff, only 16 percent agreed/strongly agreed while 71 percent disagreed/strongly disagreed (Evidence OIR-19, p. 5).

Student and staff surveys indicate a high level of satisfaction with the respect for differences in race-ethnicity (84 percent student/90 percent staff), gender (84 percent student/89 percent staff), physical disability (84 percent student/91 percent staff), age (83 percent student/86 percent staff), sexual orientation (81 percent, student/88 percent staff), native language (81 percent student/83 percent staff), and religion (79 percent student, 80 percent staff). Only between 2-4 percent of staff and 3 percent of students disagreed with the majority (Evidence OIR-6). Students also report satisfaction with services: 85 percent for DSPS, 82 percent for

EOPS, and 83 percent for the PACE Program for Working Adults. Student satisfaction with the Office of Student Life (clubs, activities, and events) is 82 percent (Evidence OIR-58, p. 2). Seventy-four percent of students also feel that they have a better understanding of diverse philosophies, cultures, and ways of life (Evidence OIR-52).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A5.	*The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.*
A5.a.	*The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.*
A5.b.	*With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.*

Description

The Office of Professional Development (OPD) at Chabot College coordinates with the Staff Development Committee to plan, implement, and assess professional development "Flex Day" activities, as well as, other training opportunities for all staff and faculty. The OPD created its first PR in 2014 which outlines its role on campus (Evidence III-13). The OPD is involved in many development activities such as the New Hire Support for both full and part time faculty. During on campus Flex Days, faculty and staff must attend activities. Their presence is verified via sign-in sheets. The Staff Development committee provides evaluation forms on Flex Days to get feedback and suggestions for future activities. The committee provides a general call for proposals prior to Flex Days to encourage additional workshops. The committee and the OPD have developed PLOs over the past year and developing assessment tools to ensure that they are being met. In 2015, the Center for Teaching and Learning will open in the renovated Building 100. There, the OPD will be able to strengthen coordination and provide additional trainings year-round.

The faculty contract Article 29 outlines the responsibilities that both the Staff Development Committee works under and how faculty can access staff development opportunities (Evidence III-2). Professional development requires both participation in collaborative activities (Flex Days) as well as individual activities, which are self-defined. These "variable flex" days allow faculty to go off campus for conferences, workshops and other development activities. Faculty submit to their deans variable flex activity plans that outline what they will do and then submit activity reports on what they learned. Faculty also have an opportunity to take a sabbatical leave based on the requirements listed in the faculty contract (Evidence III-2).

The Staff development committee creates other campus activities. These activities are driven by the Mission statement and Strategic Plan Goal. To exemplify, Staff Development led the

Chabot Book Club read **What it is Like to Go to War** by Karl Marlantes and discussed the specific needs of veteran students; the entire campus participated in a Fire Drill and debrief meetings to assess the readiness in the event of an emergency; faculty participated in discussions about Public Sphere Pedagogy and The *Great Debate*; employees were trained in several programs in the Microsoft Office Suite; and the District HR provided training and information about updated policies and benefits.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The OPD has created a PR for its operation and will be assessing using these PLOs:

- PLO 1: Employees will demonstrate enhanced teaching, leadership, and job skills.
- PLO 2: Employees will agree they are respected and appreciated at Chabot College.
- PLO 3: Employees will develop and assess progress on comprehensive plans for personal and/or professional development.
- PLO 4: Employees will demonstrate an understanding of the diverse needs of students and community as well as, promote global and cultural involvement.

In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, 62 percent of employees agreed that when (they) started at Chabot, (they) attended orientation/training for their jobs. 32 percent disagreed with that statement. The college strives to improve new employee orientation and to provide professional development for all employees (Evidence OIR-13).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

A6. | *Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.*

Description

Faculty staffing levels are determined through a process involving the analysis of productivity by each discipline, student needs, and the individual requirements of each discipline. The district also follows state guidelines, "the fifty percent law," which states that fifty percent of all educational costs be spent on the hiring of faculty, not including counselors or librarians. The allocation of WSCH per FTEF for the College is determined at the District through the DEMC. This committee's role in planning and the allocation of FTEF is based on the contract (Evidence III-2). The CEMC distributes the college's FTEF allocation based on several criteria: first, the number of current full-time faculty positions in a discipline, and the needs of the discipline according to the FTES and WSCH/FTEF, course fill rates, and planning goals tied to the College Strategic Plan.

Full-time faculty staffing needs are assessed at least once per academic year, beginning with District-compiled data analysis (defining the number of positions), moving through PR (identifying needs), and ending with the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (prioritizing the needs). During these meetings, proposals, including data from PR documents, enrollment management information, and other data provided by the OIR, are reviewed. The PRBC makes recommendations to the Prioritization Committee of the needs of the college. The Faculty Prioritization Committee revised its procedures in October 2014 with advice from the Academic Senate and PRBC. The new process includes quantitative and qualitative measures and a significantly revised application form. A new section for librarian and counselor faculty applications were added to the standard form. Finally, the new process added "emergency replacements" to the process (Evidence III-14).

The CEMC recommends to administrators the allocation of adjunct faculty to all academic departments using criteria including FTES and WSCH/FTEF generated by the discipline, discipline plan worksheets, course fill rates, and planning goals tied to the college Strategic Plan.

Classified staffing requests are included in PR documents submitted by college discipline faculty and deans and service area managers. Hiring for classified staffing needs has been done in a variety of methods due to the impacts of the Great Recession. In 2009, a Classified Hiring Prioritization Process was developed, approved, and piloted in 2009-10. As budgetary constraints increased, the process was not used. In fact, rather than hiring, layoffs occurred and when various positions were vacated, these positions were not filled. The minutes of the PRBC and CEMC for both 2014 and 2015 show an increasing concern that while faculty were being hired, the dire need for classified professionals had not been. A revised process was created during 2014-15, which was approved in November 2014, and used for 2014-15 hiring (Evidence III-15).

Administrative staffing has become a concern. Minutes from PRBC and other shared governance committees shows a concern that no prioritization process exists for, and that given a collective view of the PR responses, that such a process is needed, so that a recommendation for additional administrators could be made, which would support presidential decision-making. Over the past three years, the college has experienced consolidation of two divisions into one (Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities) as well as imposition of new mandates and required functions. The college has reassigned responsibilities within the administrative structure; however, the existing number of administrators may be insufficient to the current managerial responsibilities. Specifically, over the past four years, a strong rationale was created for a new dean's position in the Office of Academic Services. Approved by the Board in April 2015, the new Dean of Academic Pathways and Success will administer and support work on pathways, student learning assessment, student success, and the Library and the Learning Connection. A fully transparent, detailed and ongoing process for assessing and identifying human resource needs at the administrative levels does not exist and needs to be developed.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. According to the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, 50 percent of respondents agreed that Chabot links staffing decisions to its institutional planning with 20

percent in disagreement an increase from 45 percent in 2008 ([Evidence OIR-13](), [Evidence OIR-35](), [Evidence OIR-19](), p. 12). The most fully developed and transparent processes for assessing and filling human resource needs are at the faculty and classified staffing levels. Both faculty and classified processes were revised, approved, and used for academic year 2014-15. Work needs to be done to create a similar process for administrators.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B. | *Physical Resources*

Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

B1.

The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

B1.a.

The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

Description

The Chabot College Facilities and Sustainability Committee was established to be the shared governance body involved in the oversight of its physical resources in support of its educational programs and services, and in the development and implementation of the *Facilities Master Plan* ([Evidence RS-1](#)).

The Facilities Committee has as its specific goals to:

- Recommend construction, modification, and allocation of facilities across campus.

- Recommend sequencing and priority of renovation and construction of projects.

- Coordinate with the Citizens' Oversight Committee.

- Review and adjust facilities planning documents.

- Coordinate with PRBC in development of Chabot's *Facilities Master Plan*.

- Review facilities utilization to increase efficiency.

- Assign responsibility of space to divisions or individuals.

- Coordinate with District M&O concerning College physical plant maintenance and upgrades.

- Assist and support College planning process as needed or requested.

The Facilities Committee meets twice a month and reviews the projects that are in the planning process (Evidence III-16). The committee also is responsible for determining priorities for funding. The committee includes faculty, staff, administration, and students, and is supported by an extensive current website, with handouts and documents provided online. The committee also maintains an active list of reported problems, maintenance requests requiring additional funding, and new small projects to be considered for funding. The onsite construction manager provides the committee with status reports. Appointed Faculty and

Classified Staff representatives as well as everyone in the campus community can attend these meetings to provide input and to obtain information about projects that may affect them and their students, giving them a direct opportunity to participate in the implementation of the *Master Plan* projects. Thus, all Faculty and Staff have the opportunity to provide input about physical resources to support and ensure the integrity and quality of programs and services.

In addition to the College's oversight committees, the District has a Citizen's Oversight Committee whose purpose is to inform the public concerning the expenditure of bond revenues (Evidence III-17). To accomplish this, the committee reviews and reports on the expenditure of the taxpayers' funds to assure voters that the Bond proceeds are expended for the purposes set forth in the original 2004 ballot measure. The main mechanism that this committee uses to determine that the District is in compliance is an audit performed annually by an external independent accounting firm.

Implementation of the Chabot College *Facilities Master Plan* focuses on creating an institution that provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support the College's Mission Statement (Evidence RS-1) and assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery. To achieve effective implementation, College and District processes have been observed, and new processes have been developed as needed. Shared governance committees are in place to provide oversight and input into the evolving implementation of this multifaceted plan.

The original buildings of the Chabot campus were constructed in the 1960s. On March 2, 2004, Alameda County voters and those Contra Costa County voters within the District's boundaries approved Measure B, the $498 million dollar CLPCCD capital improvement (construction) bond that has enabled the College to repair leaky roofs, worn wiring and plumbing, to renovate aging, deteriorating classrooms and the library, and to repair, acquire, construct and equip college buildings and computer laboratories. Chabot College's share of the bond has been ~$264 M, enabling 37 projects to be tackled that were identified as part the original bond proposal and detailed in the *2005 Facilities Master Plan*, and an additional 19 projects paid for through savings in construction costs as well as interest earned on Bond funds during the 9+ years of the construction (Evidence RS-1). The Bond funds enabled renovation of:

- Classrooms in Buildings 300, 500, 800, 900, and 1000
- Building 1400 Industrial Technology Center
- Building 1600 Machine Tools Laboratory Relocation
- Building 1200 Music Computer Lab, Studio, Rehearsal, and Performance Rooms
- Physical Education Complex (Buildings 2500, 2600, 2700, 2800, and 2900
- Building 2200 Dental Hygiene Clinic
- Building 1900 Planetarium/Lecture Halls

- Building 1800 Mathematics, Physics, Computer Science Classrooms, Labs, and Student Study Rooms

- Restoration of the Soccer Field

- Renovation of Athletic Fields and Tennis Courts, including new artificial turf for the football field, and renovation of the swimming pool

- Renovation of the Campus Central Plant serving 14 buildings with HVAC

- Renovation of three campus parking lots (A, B, and G) with lighting, access lanes, security, traffic flow, and landscaping

- Building 100 (Library, Learning Connection, Health Center, Television and Radio facilities)

The Measure B funds also enabled creation of:

- Building 3400 BMW training facility

- Building 4000 Strength and Fitness Center

- Solar Energy Photovoltaic Panels for the Parking Lots (generating ~ 1 Megawatt)

- Building 400 Faculty Instructional Office Building

- Community and Student Services Building 700

And last, but not at all least, the Measure B funds enabled

- New Campus Safety equipment for security on doors, emergency call centers across the campus and parking lots, and improvements to paths of travel across campus for emergency vehicles

- New Public Art installations across the campus.

The current *Facilities Master Plan,* (Evidence RS-1), which was created in consultation with the college's Facilities Committee, and adopted by the BOT in 2012, focuses on the renovation of campus facilities that were not updated through Measure B bond funds identified as in need of renovation, and/or replacement. In addition, the *2012 Facilities Master Plan* continues to emphasize equipping classrooms and laboratory spaces with current technology, creating additional "smart classrooms," coupled with building design to improve long-term energy efficiency. These features combine automated control of various building functions, fast and flexible telecommunication systems, and timesaving conveniences for building occupants. The key concept in smart buildings is that they are physically and technologically adaptable to changing conditions and are therefore easy to modify or expand to meet campus needs.

All of the enhanced building and site improvements and renovations reflect the College's needs as identified by staff, faculty, administration and students and are consistent with the *College's Strategic Plan Goal* (Evidence I-16) and educational goals *Education Master Plan* (Evidence I-17)**.** The majority of the projects identified in the *Master Plan* are also included

in the District's *Five-Year Construction Plan* (Evidence III-18). This district creates an annual maintenance report that it sends to the State (Evidence III-19). This report is reviewed by the M&O Director, and submitted to the BOT for approval. Projects are prioritized based on the needs outlined in the *Educational Master Plan*, the *Facilities Master Plan*, and the professional assessment of the M&O staff.

Annually, larger-scale facilities needs are tracked each year in an updated five-year District Construction Plan that lists major projects underway and planned (Evidence III-18). Strategic and tactical needs for College programs are gathered annually through the PR process. In 2012, the Facilities Committee then led by Tom Clark, Dean of Applied Technology and Business, and Douglas Horner, Director of the Facilities Bond Program, lobbied for and created a separate data input instrument, Appendix F8, which is part of the PR submission, which enabled faculty and staff to specify building and maintenance needs (**Evidence III-20**).

Input from the PR Facilities requests is collated by the PRBC team, and made available to the campus for review online (Evidence III-16). The campus Facilities Committee then consolidates these requests by building and area, and distributes the requests to all members of the committee as well as to the campus for review. The Facilities Committee uses this input to develop its overall recommendations for funding of projects, large and small, which are forwarded to the President. These requests are discussed collegially and prioritized in repeated Facilities Committee meetings throughout the academic year, with input from faculty and staff across the campus).

In addition to these campus efforts, planning and construction of new facilities and renovation of existing facilities to meet program and service needs is addressed through user teams. Chabot College faculty, staff, and administration work together with the Director of District Facilities, architects, planners, and consultants to define facility requirements to meet program needs. In the past year, user teams were created to plan for the renovation of the student tutorials and learning center (Building 100, downstairs), the Library (Building 100, upstairs), Building 1600 (Business) and Building 2100 (Biological Sciences) (Evidence III-16). User teams define and prioritize their program needs and share those with the Facilities Committee. User teams were also formed for each building renovation completed with Measure B funds, and these teams were instrumental in identifying new requirements and technologies that helped to bring Chabot College's campus significantly forward in its capabilities to offer the highest quality education possible.

The recently completed Building 1800 project is an excellent example of how user-team collaboration resulted in creation of an exceptional learning space. Today, the building houses flexible new spaces for Computer Science and Physics labs, open study spaces for all students, and advanced lecture theaters outfitted with state of the art distance learning systems. Recognizing current research results in STEM learning, the user team in consultation with the architects identified the need for friendly, comfortable, accessible study areas for STEM students to use. The resulting study areas, enclosed with glass, have proven to be tremendously popular with Chabot's students, and are in use from 7 a.m. until 10 p.m. The success of this facility is a testimony to the potential effectiveness of user-team approaches to building and renovating Chabot's facilities.

The Facilities Committee has put in place additional processes to identify and prioritize emerging issues related to campus safety, construction of new facilities, renovation of existing facilities, and maintenance across the campus. A biweekly Facilities Request log is distributed in the committee and shared across campus, and action taken where possible to address issues with existing resources, and/or investigate prioritizing requests for future allocation of remaining bond or general funds.

Equipment maintenance and service is addressed by District M&O, housed at Chabot College. The Director is directly responsible for reviewing the *Scheduled Maintenance Plan* for existing physical resources. The plan is reviewed and submitted to the State once a year by the M&O Director. Based on the review, a calendar is developed by M&O, which lists the projects that need to be completed, and a report of this review and plan is given to the BOT (Evidence III-19), which is, in turn, used to develop the *Five-Year Construction Plan*, (Evidence III-18) submitted to the state.

Preventive maintenance is scheduled through the School Preventive Maintenance Management System (SPMMS) computer program. This program covers the District Office, Chabot College, and Las Positas College. Each campus has its own maintenance supervisors, while maintenance engineers are shared. Automatic Work Orders are generated through the use of the SPMMS. Industry standards are used to develop replacement and maintenance schedules for equipment such as filters, elevators, compressors, vehicles, and painting.

All other maintenance is initiated by work order requests, which are emailed or called in and are entered into SPMMS by M&O staff. The work orders are printed and assigned by the Maintenance Supervisor. Individual maintenance engineers schedule their work day/week/ month to complete assignments. In cases of facilities damage, the custodial crew will report the damages to the Director of M&O, who generates the work orders for the repairs. The District Office is notified to bill user groups for repairs if necessary.

The PR process is used to evaluate facility and equipment needs and to request upgrades, repairs, or new facilities and equipment. These requests are forwarded to the PRBC for review and collated for the Facilities Committee. These two shared governance committees review and prioritize the requests and make recommendations based on the Strategic Plan goals and objectives.

The ability of the institution to meet these needs is directly related to funding. Facilities funding, through Measure B Bond dollars, has increased the funds available for scheduled maintenance, facility updates, and fixtures, furniture, and equipment. Internally, the institution has scaled back some projects and reassigned funds to other much needed renovations and facilities remodels as new needs are determined. However, outside sources of funding are continually being sought in an effort to find alternative available financial resources needed for project completion.

On the maintenance and operations side, staffing issues adversely affect the College's ability to meet all of the maintenance needs of the aging campus facilities. Vacancies persist in the maintenance, custodial, and grounds departments, and these positions will not be funded in the current academic year. The Director of M&O has a five-year staffing plan that projects the ongoing need for replacement as well as new staff positions, and has identified staffing needs as a consequence of newly constructed facilities.

Evaluation

The District and the College meets the Standard. Chabot College uses its Staff Survey as one means of evaluating satisfaction with the facilities. Because the College has undergone significant renovation in the past nine years, many faculty and staff work and teach in new buildings, while others still are housed and hold classes in older facilities. The M&O Department evaluated its staffing and created a report and recommendations on staffing and under those recommendations the District has approved new hires.

By 2014, almost of the planned buildings and renovations that depended on Measure B funds were completed. The Spring 2014 Staff Survey indicate that 68 percent of faculty and staff in a new or renovated facility feel the facility provides adequate physical space for their discipline/program/service area. Among those faculty and staff in existing, unchanged facilities, only 36 percent agreed with the previous statement. In regards to college facilities for faculty and staff in their area, 72 percent of those in new or renovated facilities agreed that these facilities support student learning in their discipline, program, or service area, but only 28 percent of faculty and staff in existing, unchanged facilities agreed (OIR-15). Further campus renovations or new facilities are needed to support the faculty, staff, and students of Chabot College in other areas.

While most of the College buildings had been adequately maintained, building surveys on the campus by both M&O staff and other campus personnel identified age-related deficiencies in the buildings not renovated by Measure B funds and the need for additional custodial staff to maintain the buildings. Discussions started in 2008-2009 about the revision of the *Facilities Master Plan*, which culminated in the adoption of the current *Facilities Master Plan* (RS-1). Input to the master plan was provided by stakeholders across campus through meetings with the design consultants, and reviewed by the Facilities Committee, which debated, discussed, and prioritized projects. One key aspect of that plan is a new Student Union, which would consolidate the Student Health Center, Veteran's Center, Campus Safety, and Student Government operations. Other areas of concern addressed in the current *Facilities Master Plan* include: address seismic safety concerns, improve pedestrian circulation across the campus as well as visits from and to the community, renovate ten buildings, and further improve instructional facilities and athletic fields.

Just over half of the faculty and staff feel that the facilities are adequately maintained, while most perceive a need for additional personnel in M&O. Sixty percent of the faculty and staff feel that maintenance requests are handled with adequate results, and a slightly under 18 percent disagreed (Evidence OIR-15). This figure is comparable to those last reported in 2008, when 61 percent of respondents felt maintenance requests were handled with adequate results (Evidence OIR-21). More than half of respondents agreed that requests for maintenance and repair of buildings are handled in a timely manner (99 respondents out of 192, almost 52 percent). The Facilities Committee has begun logging requests for maintenance and repair that are shared to the committee, and making the log visible online, with the hopes that even more of the campus will be aware of what maintenance requests have been raised, and completion status. The survey shows that the faculty and staff perceive a need for additional personnel in M&O. In response to the question, "There are sufficient personnel and resources to maintain the buildings and grounds," less than 30 percent of respondents agreed, and almost double that number disagreed.

The Spring 2014 Staff Survey also showed a similar decrease in agreement with the statement that Chabot's facilities are adequately maintained. In 2008, about 55 percent of the faculty and staff responding indicated that the facilities are adequately maintained; the 2014 results showed less than half of respondents (45 percent) agreed with this statement. Somewhat predictably, those disagreeing were more likely to work or teach in buildings that were not new or had not been renovated. Still, almost 30 percent of respondents from new or renovated buildings disagreed with this statement, pointing to the need for increased custodial support among other issues (Evidence OIR-19, p. 14).

Slightly less than one-half of respondents (110 of 223) agreed with the statement, 'Custodial services on campus provide a clean and pleasant environment." Almost one-third disagreed or strongly disagreed. Not surprisingly, almost 45 percent of those in non-remodeled facilities stated their disagreement. In addition to the survey results, the Facilities Committee has heard and discussed, custodial staff underfunding in its meetings, as additional square footage added to the campus has not been met with commensurate increases in custodial staffing. Despite the growth in demand, M&O has fewer staff members. More than 75 percent of respondents felt campus landscaping and playing fields are well maintained (Evidence OIR-15).

Over half of those surveyed feel that the current college facilities provide adequate space for their programs/services, support and ensure the integrity and quality of their program/services, and support student learning. Almost 57 percent of respondents agreed the adequate space is provided and that facilities support the discipline/program, and about 30 percent disagreed. Predictably, more than 55 percent of those working in older unrenovated buildings disagreed with the statements (Evidence OIR-15).

About 57 percent of respondents agreed that current college facilities for my area support student learning in my discipline, and a bit less than one-quarter disagreed. For those working in newer or renovated buildings, more than 72 percent (96 of 133) agreed, and less than 10 percent disagreed. For those working in older buildings, almost one-half predictably disagreed. When the new Biological Sciences facility is constructed, and other major renovations are completed, these numbers should drop.

Slightly more than 70 percent of respondents agreed that the office or work space provided is appropriate. More than 75 percent of respondents in new or updated facilities agreed (111 of 146), while less than 14 percent did not. About 60 percent of respondents in older, non-updated facilities agreed, and more than one-quarter (26 percent did not. Three major faculty office areas were not updated with Measure B funds: Building 1100, which houses Arts and Humanities faculty, Building 2000, which houses Mathematics and Science Faculty, and Building 1500, which houses colleagues in Applied Technology. Laboratory technicians continue to work in the older Biological Sciences area (Building 2100), without windows, and plans for a new Biological Sciences area will remedy this situation. About two-thirds of respondents agreed that supplies have been readily available to support my job or teaching. While 55 percent of respondents agreed, and a bit less than 20 percent disagreed that instructional equipment is readily available and adequately maintained.

To explore how the facilities changes made through the Bond have been perceived by faculty and staff, the Facilities Committee was consulted and proposed that new questions be added to the survey to allowed comparison between those two groups. In particular, the College

wanted to look at how users in new buildings or areas that had been renovated felt about the spaces, and especially about the processes used to develop and evaluate the effectiveness of those designs. The new questions added for 2014, and the results, were:

In the planning, design, and implementation of new & remodeled facilities, the needs of my discipline/area were adequately considered.

Seventy-three respondents (almost 40 percent) agreed with this statement; however, 70 (almost 40 percent) responded disagreed. This level of disagreement may reflect the fact that the Measure B Bond was neither able to provide new offices for all faculty, nor retrofit major classroom and lab areas for Business and Biological Sciences, each supporting very large programs. In addition, renovation of Building 1600 was predicated on State matching funds, which did not materialize. Both of these areas are now being addressed with remaining Measure B funds, with $20M allocated towards a renovation or replacement facility for the Biological Sciences, and up to $2M has been allocated for refurbishing new classrooms in Business disciplines.

If my area is new or was remodeled, the user group was the driving force behind the decisions of what was included.

One-half (50 percent) of the respondents in new or updated buildings agreed or strongly agreed with this statement; one-third (28 percent) disagreed.

If my area is new or was remodeled, the end results met expectations.

Of the 116 respondents in new or remodeled buildings, more than half (~54 percent) agreed or strongly agreed; a bit more than one-quarter (26 percent disagreed).

If my area is new or was remodeled, the end result enhances student learning.

Of the 126 respondents for this question working new or remodeled buildings, seventy-eight (78) agreed or strongly agreed – representing almost 62 percent of those who replied, while just 19 respondents (15 percent) disagreed. The Facilities Committee would like to see this number be even higher; however, the smaller negative reaction could indicate that the recent construction on campus has indeed improved the College's facilities for student learning.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

$B1.b.$ | *The institution assures that the physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning environment.*

Description

The 2012 *Facilities Master Plan* has been developed to ensure that the College's physical resources on campus are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning environment (Evidence RS-2). A reasonable level of safety and security is

maintained across the campus through regular safety inspections and training, traffic enforcement and parking lot patrol, disaster/emergency planning, hazardous materials control and disposal, and construction safety. Campus security officers regularly patrol the entire campus. As new technology to improve safety and security becomes available, it is being adopted, for example, new emergency call phones in the parking lots, a free "Alert You" SMS that texts students and staff about safety-related concerns and incidents on campus, and a change from regular keys to card keys and security cameras for facilities that require extra security. Hazardous waste is dealt with according to state law. Construction—though sometimes an inconvenience—is being handled positively, with clear signage to direct students and staff around the campus. The campus has been regularly inspected by Keenan and Associates, who assess risks and make recommendations for changes. The documents relating their recommendations, given the nature of the report, may be found in the office of the Chancellor.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Spring 2014 Staff Survey included questions about safety and security of faculty and staff that attest to the effectiveness of it processes regarding safety:

Facilities in my area are adequately constructed and maintained to address safety.

A bit over 60 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Still, a bit less than 20 percent of respondents disagreed, with a larger share of those coming from buildings that had not been renovated during the Measure B bond construction.

I feel safe on campus during daylight hours.

This question elicited the highest level of agreement from the facilities-related questions on the survey, more than 90 percent agreeing and just 3 percent disagreeing (Evidence OIR-19, p. 15)

I feel safe on campus during the evening or night.

Close to two-thirds of respondents, 64 percent, agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (133 of 210) Evidence OIR-15).

Campus Safety and Security staff responds quickly in emergency situations.

More than 80 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed (Evidence OIR-15).

It is clear what action should be taken on campus in case of a personal injury.

About two-thirds of the respondents, 141 of 212, agreed with this statement.

It is clear what action should be taken on campus in case of an emergency (fire, earthquake).

About 75 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (Evidence OIR-21, p. 28). Even more, this question shows a significant positive trend from previous Staff Surveys during which 46 percent, 60 percent and 68 percent respectively agreed that annual earthquake drills have been held during the past 4 years, with attention paid to readily

identifiable room and building monitors, evacuation of students with disabilities, improved communications across campus, improved signaling and identification of safety zones, and coordination with city emergency services.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B2.

To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of the physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

Description

The College uses the Accreditation survey as one key assessment of the use and efficacy of its facilities, but that is an infrequent, long-term assessment. Chabot uses the PR process annually for assessment of facility needs, and escalation of deficiencies. On a more immediate level, the Facilities Committee instituted site visit reviews in 2013-2014 for key project proposals, so that attending members of the campus community can see first-hand what is being requested, and discuss different approaches. In the past year, Committee members have held meetings in the Library, a Business classroom, the Music Studio and Computer Laboratory, the Architecture Program laboratory, the Nursing Program classroom, the Biology Buildings and the Student Union, in addition to regular meetings in the new technology-enhanced physics laboratories. The Committee also instituted a campus tour in 2013, taking members across the campus to buildings new and old to personally view what works, and what doesn't. Members have shared that seeing classrooms and spaces in person has enabled them to make more informed and more collegial prioritization decisions.

The *Facilities Master Plan* process and the providing district input to the State's annual FUSION report assists the college in its planning efforts. There are annual updates to the facilities bond measure work done by the Citizen Oversight Committee.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. One direct result of the site visits made by the Facilities Committee was the identification of areas where the design/build process for construction could be further improved by including a professional review component for large projects before bid documents are issued. In a visit to the new music studio, computer laboratory, and rehearsal spaces, the Facilities Committee heard first-hand how such a review might have resulted in catching design errors and inconsistencies between user expectations and actual bid documents that missed key features. From that meeting, the committee began discussing how an extra independent review might be instituted. Another site visit brought home the need for clarification in the proposal process to help faculty and administration estimate renovation costs.

Funding from the Bond Measure for facilities is reviewed annually by the Facilities committee. After it was determined at the District that there was additional funding for facilities at the college, the committee went through a yearlong process to evaluate the list of needs and generated a new list of potential projects. During this process, which involved the committee but also PRBC, the faculty Senate and the college as a whole, projects were either moved up the existing list to be funded such as a project in building 100 or for a new project, partial replacement of the Biology areas.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B2.a. | *Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.*

Description

The recommended building and site improvements and renovations that are gathered through the Facilities Committee and PR process reflect needs identified by staff, faculty, administrators, and students, and are consistent with the College's Strategic Plan. These recommendations are incorporated within additional review and planning processes. The results are expressed in the identified facilities needs and planning, specifically, the Master Education and Facilities Plan, accompanied by the Five-Year Facilities Plan (Evidence RS-1, Evidence III-18, Evidence III-19). The College Facilities and Sustainability Committee is the shared governance entity charged with the oversight of the facilities plan, which provides a schedule for improvements, addresses safety issues, looks for utility savings, and provides for infrastructure upgrades. One key goal of the committee is "to create classroom and laboratory environments that improve teaching and learning by matching current learning theory with facilities and technology design."

Capital planning of larger-scope projects has proceeded by recommendation from the Facilities Committee directly to the President of the College, after significant debate and review as well as public brown-bag discussions with the entire campus community. The cycle of review of programs and services is ongoing, and equipment and facilities needs are considered at every stage of planning. The PR process directly links discipline, program, and service long-range planning with institutional planning, as requests for facilities and equipment are sent to PRBC, the Budget Committee, and the Facilities and Sustainability Committee. Through PR, and given the representative makeup of college governance committees, all voices can be heard in facilities planning for the institution.

The Chabot College *Facilities Master Plan* provides a schedule for improvement, renovation, and repair of deteriorating/outdated facilities, addresses safety issues such as lighting and security cameras, and looks for economic advantage through utility savings (Evidence RS-1). The *Facilities Master Plan* also provides for infrastructure upgrades to accommodate more computers, greater internet access and other emerging technologies. Energy savings and sustainability are key features of the plan. The future cost of maintenance and utilities is an

important factor in remodeling and new construction projects. Because the College expects to occupy these buildings for 50 years or longer, they are designed with consideration for life-cycle costs so as to minimize operating expenses and maximize energy efficiency. Designing energy efficient buildings takes into consideration high-efficiency HVAC systems, demand control ventilation in auditoriums, gymnasiums, and theaters, cool roof systems, high-efficiency photovoltaic (solar) power, direct/indirect lighting, sky-lighting and photocell controls, shading classroom/office glass, and using thermal mass where appropriate. Architects are requested to incorporate these and other ideas into the design or redesign of Chabot's new and existing buildings. All buildings are being constructed to LEED silver standards.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Strategically, the capital planning processes at Chabot resulted in the Measure B bond initiative, the development of the 2012 *Facilities Master Plan*, the five-year Scheduled Maintenance Plan, and the M&O Scheduled Maintenance Plan. Tactically, collegial planning in the Facilities Committee has resulted in the creation of prioritized large-capital and smaller projects lists, coordinated with PR requests, as well as documented maintenance and improvement requests reported through the biweekly log (Evidence III-16).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

B2.b. | *Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.*

Description

The planning process has been a highly participatory one involving the many constituencies of the College. In developing the *Facilities Master Plan*, the planning team worked closely with the Facilities and Sustainability Committee, comprised of key faculty, staff and administrators ([Evidence RS-1](#)). The Committee reviewed the Analysis of Existing Conditions, evaluated a series of Development Options, and made decisions that led to the development of the master plan recommendations. The planning process included a series of Facilities Committee meetings as well as presentations and discussions with the College, the community, and the BOT to broaden the plan's perspective and to enhance the acceptance of proposed developments. Through the PR process and given the representative makeup of College governance committees, all voices can be heard in planning the future of the institution.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. But, there is still more to do to improve the process. In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, Chabot faculty and staff were asked whether they were familiar with the *Master Facilities Plan* as it related to their discipline, program, or service area. Fifty-two percent shared that they agreed or strongly agreed with that statement; but approximately thirty percent (30 percent) shared that they disagreed or strongly disagreed. Everyone on campus should be aware of the current *Facilities Master Plan*, and its features should be communicated well in advance of any opportunity to fund new construction through future bonds or parcel tax initiatives (Evidence OIR-19).

Even more telling is the result from the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, asking faculty and staff whether they had input into the college Facilities Plan as it related to their discipline, program, or service area. Just 38 percent shared that they agreed with this statement, 41 percent shared that they disagreed (Evidence OIR-19, p. 14). The College needs to address this discontinuity, again with greater publicity of the current plan, and scheduled opportunities for staff to offer upgrades and new suggestions to that plan. Examples that have arisen in the 2014 Facilities Committee meetings that illustrate this need includes requests from student groups and staff for unisex bathrooms across campus, requests for hot-water taps in faculty/staff lounge areas, and especially for increased numbers of open, accessible student study spaces.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None.

C

Technology Resources

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

C1.

The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

Description

Chabot College strives to ensure technology support is responsive to the needs of learning, teaching, college communications, research, and operational systems through the shared governance system that has, as its basic principles, open committee meetings and access for recommendations to many levels of technology decision-making. Technology at Chabot College is provided as a shared effort between the College and the District. The institution makes recommendations and decisions about technology services, facilities, hardware, and software by way of various entities such as the Technology Committee and PRBC, and processes, including the PR process and the web-based Request for New Technology form.

District-Managed Local Support

In December 2012, Chabot Computer Support (CCS) was organizationally put under District ITS. Thus, District ITS has responsibility for all technology on campus, with campus and district technology support staff who respond to requests for service and assistance on campus. District ITS provides service and assistance, including network and desktop support, programming, operations, user support and training, district email system, the administrative system (Banner), CLASS-Web, the Zone, and Web for Faculty (Evidence III-30).

Managed by District ITS, CCS provides local services, including desktop and laptop computer setup and repair, software installation and updates, and phones. They assist with operating system updates, network, and some web and application server issues. CCS also maintains assets and software licensing to ensure all needs and legal requirements are met for the network, servers, phones, desktop and laptop computers for staff and faculty (Evidence III-21).

Chabot Online Learning Support provides assistance with Blackboard and other tools used for online teaching. Managed by District ITS, Audiovisual Services (AVS, formerly Media Services) also serves to meet the technology needs of the campus, notably in instructional areas. They provide training for and support technology-equipped classrooms, media circulation and installation, maintenance of audiovisual systems, video-conferencing, and media equipment. Thanks to funding available through the Measure B Bond funds, the College dramatically increased the number of smart classrooms across campus that integrate networking, computers, and audiovisual technologies to allow multimedia and Internet access. AVS staff maintain and service the equipment and provides support to users onsite,

and AVS monitors the usage trends in order to have current technology available to users and ensure there is enough media equipment to meet instructional needs.

The District Help Desk handles the service needs of technology users on campus. Most requests for service go through the Help Desk via phone, email or a web-based request system. The Help Desk deploys appropriate technology staff to respond based on requested need and tracks or monitors requests using a software program.

Technology Committee and Funding

The Technology Committee is comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators from Chabot College and the District, including key technology personnel such as the Help Desk Coordinator, and representatives from CCS, Online Teaching Support, COOL, Webmaster, and AVS. In addition, each division of the College sends a representative to this committee.

The committee explores, discusses, reviews, and assists with technology-related issues, which often leads to the advising and recommending of regulations and procedures relating to institutional technology. Working with the PRBC through the process of PR, the Technology Committee assists in the identification, prioritization, and review of technology needs with regard to network infrastructure, funding, and equipment capacities.

Chabot's Technology Committee is key to this shared process, working in concert with other governance committees, including the COOL and the PRBC, as well as ITS. In cooperation with the District, district wide standards for networking, computers, general software, procurement practices, and general computing guidelines were established.

The Technology Committee has primary responsibility for technology oversight on campus and make recommendations to and get feedback from District ITS staff. The Technology Committee's charge states that the "committee explores, discusses, reviews and assists with technology-related issues," including the following:

1. Study, review, advise and recommend regulations and procedures relating to institutional technology;

2. Identify, prioritize, and review technology needs with regard to network infrastructure, staffing, funding, and equipment capacities;

3. Develop a college technology plan, including deployment of equipment and coordination of services with ITS;

4. Provide guidelines and leadership in the development of technology for computer-assisted instruction, including curriculum, and assessment of instructional computer use;

5. Coordinate with the COOL; and

6. Assist and support college planning processes as needed or requested.

(Evidence III-22).

The Technology Committee reviews needs and requests initiated from the annual PR process as well as off cycle through use of a technology request form (Evidence III-21). From both

requests and their own observation of needs on campus, the committee makes recommendations that are tied to college strategic plan goals. For example, when it was clear that the campus required a dedicated web presence, they recommended the reinstatement of the webmaster position to PRBC and the President's Office, which has been filled.

Our last accreditation report contained concerns that the college must develop and implement more formalized processes to fully integrate institution assessment of planning for campus technology needs into all levels of planning and allocation of resources. The College agreed, so the Committee has sought to involve the campus in technology planning and to actively participate in other committees of the College. The Technology Committee established a more formal process to assess and evaluate campus technology needs through the use of a new Technology Request form that is centralized through the committee. This process is an effort to provide faculty and staff a voice in technology-related decisions that affect the entire college, and is not intended to replace, but to supplement and support the PR process.

The new Technology Request form and routing process provides faculty, staff and administrators with the ability and process to identify their technology needs. For most on campus, getting their technology needs met, whether new or enhancements, is a process that begins locally. Technology needs in the departmental or divisional structure are evaluated and communicated, using PR to document the needs, which are prioritized locally by the department or division, then more globally through PRBC. These are routed to the technology resources at the colleges and district for their input and technical assessment. During the annual PR cycle, the Technology Request form is submitted from the disciplines since most, if not all, instructional areas now have some technical component associated with the class. The new Chabot Technology Request form can also be submitted throughout the year as major new hardware, software and/or network requirements are identified (Evidence III-21). While the form and process are being used successfully, this is still a work in progress, requiring more "marketing" of process (increasing awareness), and the need to ensure that the Technology Committee's recommendations are acted on by other shared governance committees and District ITS.

As new Technology Request forms are received, they are entered in a database and updated with the latest recommendation and status from the appropriate parties. There are online queries to view the full list of requests or any specific requests for status to ensure a closed loop of communication back to the original requester. When requests are evaluated, the Technology Committee members, in coordination with the CCS and ITS staffs, will either agree with the request as submitted and/or provide alternatives that are compatible with the current technology environment. This may result in newer emerging technologies being introduced into the campus infrastructure. With the review of requests centralized through the Chabot Technology Committee, CCS and ITS, an increased capacity to identify common needs across the campus, which may drive the type of final solution pursued. This streamlined and consolidated process allows the College to take advantage of group purchases for discounts where appropriate and bundle requests for more efficient usage of manpower resources for installation. Periodic reports are available to the ITS staff to track the number of requests and the status of requests. For routine maintenance service requests, the Technology Committee and the District ITS staff implemented a new online problem ticket service through the ITS Help Desk.

Institutional Funding has been extremely limited during the past few years. Measure B has provided critical infrastructure, equipment, and software upgrades. As Measure B ends, a critical step is to replace that funding, either from within the institution or through grants. When funds are not available, the users resubmit through the PR process again at the next opportunity. When funding is available for technology purchases, users are required to consult with the computer support staff and adhere to district standards and guidelines before placing software or hardware orders (Evidence III-23). To ensure that this consultation occurs, the Budget Committee routes all technology requests to the Chabot Technology Committee and ITS groups for review. For the past three years from 2013 through 2015, all the technology requests were reviewed and recommendations were forwarded to the Budget Committee and the requestor. Possible recommendations include: proceed with the request as submitted for funding through the responsible department, submit the request to ITS where Bond funding or District software agreements exist, or a suggestion for a comparable substitute item due to compatibility with the CLPCCD environment. This procedure has integrated the decisions of the Budget Committee and Technology Committee as it relates to the PR needs for technology.

For example, District ITS updates its Technology plans on an annual basis (Evidence III-24). The plan outlines ITS projects and goals concerning Banner and other enterprise system implementations, BOND Measure B Projects," computer hardware and software procurement plans." Chabot faculty and staff have some input into some of those decisions, through membership in committees and user groups. Some Banner users, new project implementation teams and occasional ad hoc user groups such as the one that developed the structure and programming for the state-mandated SSSP regulations are able to help direct technology priorities for the campus and the district. However, gaps can exist between the College and District ITS concerning technology planning and implementation. As part of the district IPBM, the district Technology Coordinating Committee (TCC) began in September 2014 to bring the colleges and district together to eliminate any such gaps through full engagement and transparency in the technology planning processes and to ensure more effective communication across all locations. In addition, the college is in the process of completing their *Education Master Plan* with MIG, Inc. and the new District Strategic Plan which includes technology will be developed by fall 2015 to address the college needs and priorities.

Evaluation

The District and College meet the Standard. The Technology Committee is one place where "big picture" discussions occur, but there is no policy that requires all major technology decisions to flow through this committee. Some recommendations are made through PR inside disciplines, programs, or service areas, the COOL, and District ITS. As a consequence, some recommendations and decisions do not flow directly through the Technology Committee, so multiple, alternative forums exist in which technology planning can and sometimes does occur.

The College evaluates the effectiveness of its technology in meeting the needs of the campus through regular surveys, issued by the OIR and responded to by administrators, faculty and classified professionals. Additional external and student surveys provide insight into

strengths and concerns of the college. Survey results only show a "moment in time," which typically reflect the most recent environment, not necessarily a broad time period.

In some cases, there appear to be improvements or consistency in access and availability of hardware, software and infrastructure. Nearly two-thirds of all faculty and staff felt that students have adequate access to technological resources on campus to support their learning, and more than two-thirds of full-time faculty feel that classroom technology is sufficient to effectively support student learning (Evidence OIR-16). In response to the question "In my classroom, the equipment, software and network connections are sufficient to effectively support student learning," 69 percent of all staff agreed or strongly agreed (significantly higher than 52 percent in 2008). Similarly, 69 percent of all staff agreed or strongly agreed the equipment, software and network connections in their offices are sufficient to effectively carry out may work responsibilities, down from 75 percent in 2008 (Evidence OIR-16, Evidence OIR-39). In 2014, 63 percent agreed or strongly agreed that "in computer labs, the software and network configurations provided me with adequate access to the applications needed to support my courses," down only slightly from 66 percent in 2008. Sixty-three percent (63 percent) believed that students have adequate access to technological resources on campus to support their learning, down slightly from 68 percent in 2008. Only 52 percent of faculty, staff and administrators felt that technology hardware and software were kept current to meet their job or teaching needs, down from 61 percent in 2008 (Evidence OIR-21, p. 29).

Full-time staff are concerned that there is not adequate technical staff to support the use of technology on campus. Sixty-six percent of the responding faculty, staff, and administrators indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that requests for support services to maintain their computers are handled in a timely manner, down from 71 percent in prior survey in 2008 (Evidence OIR-21, p. 29). This could be directly related to a reduction in ITS staffing over the past several years due to budget constraints. Further, growth in numbers of computers and technology-based or supported curriculum has affected services. Additional related questions of "there is adequate technical staff to support the use of technology on campus" with only 38 percent in agreement, and only 42 percent who agree or strongly agree that "I receive adequate training in the use of technology in their office, classroom, or lab" clearly support that concern (Evidence OIR-16). Only 43 percent of faculty believe that they are sufficiently involved in the selection of instructional technology equipment, which is consistent with 2008 results (Evidence OIR-21, p. 29).

Some very specific concerns from the staff survey that need to be addressed are having adequate technical staff to support the technology needs on campus, lack of staff training, linking technology decisions to institutional planning, and having college input in the selection of instructional technology. The District commissioned a report, which highlighted the concern of training for CCS staff, "The budget constraints have resulted in minimal opportunities for training and staff development for the ITS staff and for user training" (Evidence III-27). The report addresses both IT Staff training as well as user training that the survey pertains to and the need for additional staff. To address user and ITS staff training, District ITS subscribed in fall 2014 to the online tutorial Lynda.com for software training on Microsoft Office, Outlook Email, Adobe products, and Java programming. For Banner System training, the District subscribed to the Ellucian On Demand Tutorial for all the Banner modules that the district uses. To address the need for technical staffing, the College

is in the process of adding an instructional computer support specialist to the CCS IT Department in fall 2015. For user training, District ITS plans in fall 2015 to hire one of the two trainers recommended by School Services of CA.

All Technology Services, including the CCS, were reassigned structurally to report to the District ITS to streamline processes, reduce confusion of responsibility, and eliminate duplication of effort. An underlying concern exists that there is an disconnect between the Technology Committee and decisions made by District ITS. The role of the Technology Committee must be strengthened within the planning processes of the College and the District, including sending formal recommendations and prioritization to the appropriate administrators, planning committees, and College Council, as well as clear sharing of information and planning by District ITS with the Technology Committee. With the new district committees, the sharing of information and planning is to be done at all committee levels, both to and from the college and district committees. The District TCC has cochairs for each college and district location so that all locations are equally represented and communicate back to the other committees. The District TCC will provide the opportunity for user groups to become more actively engaged in the process of technology reviews, product selections, and the project implementation phases for new initiatives as well as to assess the effectiveness of the systems that are implemented, including user training. This issue is being addressed by College Council in its review of all shared governance processes.

Concerns of appropriate technology support, training, structure, communication and funding are being addressed by the newly developed CLPCCD TCC, whose broad charge is to coordinate technology related information between the colleges (Evidence III-29).

Specifically, they are to

1. Make recommendations to the CLPCCD PBC for district support for technology planning at the Colleges and the allocation of resources beyond those outlined in the Budget Allocation Model (BAM).
2. Facilitate the coordination, alignment, and integration of college technology planning with district wide technology planning and resources allocation.
   a. Review and evaluate technology planning and maintenance for alignment with district and college educational missions, goals, strategic plans, community expectations, and student learning needs.
   b. Discuss district wide technology projects and issues as they relate to academic, administrative, mandatory regulations and security needs in order to improve and increase communication.
   c. Coordinate information related to the maintenance and improvement of websites.
   d. Provide support, including the identification of resources, to the Colleges to make sure that technology is being implemented in a timely and effective manner.
   e. Assess user knowledge/satisfaction of existing enterprise systems, including hardware and software.
   f. Identify technology needs including training for faculty and staff, as they arise with regard to common enterprise systems, network infrastructure, and equipment.
   g. Research new technologies that better serve students and staff by soliciting and making use of the expertise that is available across the district.

h. Identify user groups that will help select common enterprise systems, including hardware and software.
i. Identify possible funding sources in order to take advantage of purchasing resources through the economies of scale.
j. Provide a forum for discussion and input into the Technology *Master Plans* and the District ITS Strategic Plan.

3. Coordinate compliance to accreditation standards related to technology.
4. Regularly assess committee processes and use assessment results for continuous improvement.

The charge as outlined provides simple, clear directives, and gives clarity to the process both the Colleges and District can be expected to follow. Concerns as outlined above, from both the staff survey and Technology Committee, are being brought forth to the District TCC.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

C1.a. | *Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.*

Description

The central system supporting the college, Banner Enterprise, provides the fundamental systems for Student Services, Academic Services, Human Resources, Payroll, and Business Services. It is housed and supported by District ITS, which provides the network infrastructure to support District wide enterprise services available to students, faculty, and staff through the CLASS-Web system, the Zone web portal and student Zonemail (Evidence III-28). Banner CLASS-Web is a primary system available for use by all students, faculty, and staff. Students utilize CLASS-Web for all student information and registration. Faculty and staff use the system for personal employee information, class rosters, and grade submission.

Other third party software products that interface electronically with the Banner System are also used at the college, including the SARS and STARS systems. These systems are used for positive attendance tracking and Student Services contacts and data collection, SARS eAdvising for online counseling, SARS Call for emailing, CollegeNet for Room Scheduling, and Degree Works for student degree audits and Student Education Plans". Other enterprise systems utilized at the college include Banner Document Management System that provides storage and retrieval of electronic documents for students and employees, Banner Mobile Apps for student grades and course schedules, and the new Argos ad-hoc reporting tool for Enrollment Management.

In January 2015, Microsoft Outlook became the district-provided email system provided to employees. This email system is locally housed and secure, and it is part of the standard Microsoft district license. Plans for the Outlook Email migration were discussed in the Chabot Technology Committee and the District TCC. While college faculty and staff were

not involved in the decision to change to this specific email system, there has been support to change from Groupwise. Besides the email system conversion, the Novell Operating System was converted to MS Active Directory for consistency throughout the district. "The Zone" is a Banner-provided, District-implemented Web Portal that facilitates the navigation of some web-based systems used at the college. Students, faculty, and staff can use the Zone portal through the College or District websites to access information, including CLASS-Web and Blackboard. The Zone is a path to get to these same services with a customized role for a student, faculty, or staff. The "Zone" portal was implemented to ease student access to necessary online services. The campus can provide both directed messages to specific student populations as well as non-specific to all students, depending upon the need, although this feature is not fully utilized. College email accounts provided via Gmail, called ZoneMail, are provided for all registered students and are currently used for official College correspondence to students, including through Blackboard. Student email accounts can be used by the college to reach all or a targeted group of students. Students may forward their ZoneMail email or use a personal email account for Blackboard-generated email.

In conjunction with the District ITS Help Desk, CCS provides computer hardware, software, phone and network support and maintenance to the Chabot campus. Help requests are sent to the District ITS Help Desk, and relayed to the appropriate staff. Chabot students and instructors use technology equipped, or "smart" classrooms. The campus standards for technology-equipped classrooms make state-of-the-art teaching tools easily accessible to faculty. These standards have been implemented for 109 general assignment classrooms and lecture halls. The AVS is responsible for the maintenance of these classrooms in conjunction with CCS. Chabot AVS is also responsible for installation, maintenance, and instruction for usage of technological equipment in the classrooms.

Blackboard is the supported course management system available to faculty for creating an online learning environment for students enrolled in online, hybrid, and traditional courses. The College continues to expand its distance education course offerings. During spring 2014, Chabot offered 120 online and 64 hybrid courses. A total of 769 course sections are set up in Blackboard for spring 2014 (Evidence III-31). The Blackboard service is provided by an outside vendor through an Application Service Provider (ASP) model. The Blackboard ASP has provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security as part of their standard contractual arrangement with the District. The ASP model provides disaster recovery capabilities through their Data center facilities throughout the United States. In addition to user IDs and Passwords, student access is controlled through the automatic interface with the Banner System, so that students must be registered in a course to gain access to that course.

In the effort to support student learning needs and provide greater access to technology, including for online learning via Blackboard, computers are made available to students on campus laboratories, such as in the Chabot Library and Student Services building, These laboratories provide computer access for students to use for college-related purposes such as applying to the college, registration procedures, financial aid applications, Class-Web and course-related computer needs, or for students enrolled in online or hybrid courses or needing help with Blackboard, drop-in, in-person assistance is available.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Spring 2014 Staff Survey asked questions relating to hours, assistance, and maintenance of the Campus IT department, Graphics/Print Shop and Media Services departments.

- Sixty-nine percent of staff are satisfied that "my office, the equipment, software, and network connections are sufficient to effectively carry out my work responsibilities (Evidence OIR-21 p. 30).
- Satisfaction with maintenance of equipment by AVS (formerly Media Services) decreased from 76 percent in 2008 to 63 percent (Evidence OIR-21, p. 30)

- Satisfaction with hours and assistance in AVS decreased from 75 percent in 2008 to 69 percent (Evidence OIR-29, p. 29).

- Satisfaction with hours and assistance in the Graphics/Print Shop departments increased from 81 percent in 2008 to 82 percent.

The Chabot Technology Committee and COOL are both key factors to determining the path of technology at Chabot College. Processes now in place allow the committees to have more input into decision-making, at all levels, involving technology used at the college to ensure that it meets the needs and demands of a learning environment.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

C1.b. | *The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.*

Description

Chabot College strives to provide quality technology training through different college and district entities. The Technology Committee plays a critical role in assessing and addressing training needs on campus by helping to determine the appropriate source of necessary training. College representatives on the District TCC will ensure that they address the charge to "Identify technology needs including training for faculty and staff, as they arise with regard to common enterprise systems, network infrastructure, and equipment," so that new and existing staff are best able to serve students.

The District ITS staff offers training on District technology such as the Banner Enterprise System modules, CLASS-Web for faculty, and Outlook email. Individual departments typically provide their own training for new staff with existing staff, or pay for web-based training or third party consultants. A service of the District, the Help Zone provides assistance to students with the Zone web portal as well as student Zonemail, while assistance

with the CLASS-Web registration system is primarily through Chabot's Admissions and Records Office and via the Online Student Services laboratory staff.

The ITS Help Desk provides learning assistance in response to individual faculty/staff requests or as part of a major rollout of software. Help Desk assistance is available by phone or on-campus through a Customer Center Help Desk online form (Evidence III-21). The ITS Help Desk fields support requests for CCS. The CCS website provides links to resources on using the software that is installed on all campus computers, including Windows and Microsoft Office.

The District may hire vendors to provide training on third-party application systems used by the colleges and District, such as Degree Works for student degree audits and SEPs, Banner Document Management System for storage of digitized documents and College Net for Room Scheduling. For new initiatives, the District uses vendor consultants to provide the initial training and these sessions are recorded; then follow-up training is provided using the "Train the Trainer" model. For example, staff in Online Learning Support received training from other trained Chabot staff and faculty to learn to navigate the *Catalog*, in addition to having third party webinars/tutorials available to them. Departments may pay for third party training or consultants themselves, to train new staff or to prepare for new regulations, programs, and system upgrades. For example, the Chabot Financial Aid Office has paid for training of its new technical staff and ITS programming staff utilizing webinars, System conferences, and third party consultants to ensure the District and College were prepared for multiple regulatory changes and system upgrades.

Apart from the overall assessment that technology training is needed per staff surveys, Chabot College directly assesses technology training needs through the work of several committees. The primary sources of assessment of training needs include known factors such as future implementation of new or upgraded software, as well as the needs expressed by faculty, staff, and committees such as Staff Development, Technology Committee, and COOL. Once a needs assessment is done and technology training needs are determined, several entities share the responsibility of training, including District ITS, CCS, Online Teaching Support, and AVS. The AVS assesses equipment and technology-equipped classroom training needs and provides workshops and one-on-one training on an as-needed basis.

To help identify training priorities and topics, District conducted interactive training surveys with administrators and classified professionals in 2014 and plans to do a similar session with the Academic Senate for faculty. In 2014, District ITS subscribed to online tutorial programs available to all staff via the Web. The Online Tutorial Lynda.com covers software training in products such as Microsoft Office, Outlook Email, and Adobe products. The other Ellucian On Demand Online Tutorial is designed for user departments who use the Banner System and covers all the Banner modules used by the district. Currently, District ITS does not have a dedicated trainer on staff for user training. The organizational review conducted by School Services of California in April 2014, identified the benefit of hiring two dedicated trainers to the ITS staff solely for user training and documentation.

At Chabot, Online Teaching Support is provided by two staff positions: the Distance Education Coordinator and the Instructional Designer. To maximize effectiveness, and support the schedule needs of faculty, these support services are focused in online assistance

coupled with in-person appointments. Online training efforts include on-demand videos, instructions for using Blackboard, online teaching resources, a highly-utilized online Help Form, and a monthly newsletter called *The Online Learning Link.* There were 23 instructors trained on Blackboard (online or in-person) in 2012-2013 as first time users, and in 2013-2014 year, the number of new Blackboard faculty increased to 36 instructors. Faculty Support Requests for Online Teaching/Blackboard (online or in-person) has remained steady in recent years. These requests to Online Learning Support staff range from a technical issue to asking how to do something in Blackboard. In fall 2012, 433 requests were received and resolved, spring 2013, 380 requests, fall 2013, 369 requests, and spring 2014, 417 requests.

Since the 2009 accreditation report, a significant development and factor in training concerns has been the loss of the Faculty/ Staff computer laboratory known as the Hub, which is no longer in operation. A new faculty computer laboratory will come online in fall 2015, in Building 100 as a shared College/District ITS training room (Evidence III-33).

Training was impacted by the loss of the College Webmaster position in 2011. Since then, Chabot's web-presence was maintained by ITS and individual divisions and services areas. While the College worked to ensure that students can access information, resources, and education through methods conducive to their needs, the College lacked a key person to provide expertise and guidance for web content, updates and marketing. The lack greatly impacted the currency and relevance of college information and resources online. This position was filled May 2015.

Student technology training is offered by the Online Services laboratory in Room 709, which provides one-on-one help for students with the technology required for applying to the college, registration procedures, financial aid applications, Class-Web and course-related (Blackboard) computer needs. Blackboard training needs for students are assessed as a joint effort between the Online Services laboratory and Online Learning Support. Through a Student Assistant hired by Online Learning and based in the Online Services laboratory, students are provided one-on-one assistance with Blackboard/online learning needs and Online Learning Orientations on a drop-in basis. Students also find a wealth of resources, including an orientation to online learning, videos on how to use Blackboard, and an online Help Form through the Online Learning website (Evidence III-34). In addition to these resources, students enrolled in online or hybrid courses are also emailed information regarding "getting started in online classes" directly by way of the SARS Call communication system (Evidence III-31).

In addition to college-provided student technology training and support, faculty (often with input from transfer universities, business, and industry) identify technology learning objectives for students, then embed the training within the college curriculum. Examples of this kind of in-course training exists in several courses, though most-prevalently in the subject of Computer Application Systems, for example CAS 54A Microsoft Excel I, CAS 58 Intro to Microsoft Access, CAS 72D Intro to Microsoft Word, CAS 72E Intro to Microsoft Excel, CAS 72F Intro to Microsoft PowerPoint, etc. This is often the case for publisher-provided websites and software, as well as courses teaching technology skills.

Evaluation

The District and the College meets the Standard. In 2008, 56 percent of respondents felt that

they received adequate technology training in their offices, which decreased to 42 percent in the Spring 2014 Staff Survey. Again from 2008, 53 percent felt that they received adequate technology training in their classrooms and labs, which also decreased to 42 percent in the survey ([Evidence OIR-21](#), p. 29). Typically, the most effective training involves a mix of various teaching modes and media. However, limited resources, a need for staff, and the resulting lack of access to the latest technologies places severe limits on training possibilities by the District. Staff receive required training as they can, or as their departments and divisions are able to provide. Both the College and District have a goal to provide necessary training, the provider of the training to be determined by the content/subject (**Evidence III-24**). Potential avenues considered to address training needs include the improvement of web resources in an effort to provide self-paced, on-demand trainings to meet the demanding schedules of faculty and staff, and improving communication with faculty about what kinds of training opportunities are available to them from various college or district entities and technology. Departments and divisions can address their need for improved training opportunities for faculty and staff by including it as an objective in PR and requesting the appropriate support or resources.

School Services of California recommended hiring two trainers for user training to the ITS staff; however, this was not possible previously due to budget constraints. In 2015-2016, District ITS plans to hire one of the two recommended trainer positions to the ITS staff. Dependent on the assessment of the trainer position, a second position could follow in the subsequent fiscal year assuming demand continues to increase.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

C1.c.	*The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.*
C1.d.	*The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.*

Description

The CCS and District ITS collaboratively provide support for the management, maintenance, and operation of the technological infrastructure and equipment. Services provided include instructional computing, administrative computing, system design and applications programming, network infrastructure (WAN and LAN), servers, desktop support, Web development and support (Internet and Intranet), hardware and software support, audio visual support for smart classrooms, phone systems, Help Desk assistance, and user training. District ITS provides for the system planning, development, operational control, monitoring, and security of services offered via the District's network infrastructure. The District

establishes vendor maintenance agreements or warranty terms to ensure service levels are sustained for all standard hardware and software.

At the start of the Measure B Bond, the ITS developed a life cycle plan for systematically analyzing equipment needs and determining standardized system specifications, as well as when to retire and replace existing equipment with updated systems. This regular cyclical process spreads out the expense and the staff workload evenly over the life of the bond's technology funding and ensures that faculty, staff, and administrators have the equipment they need to be effective. The life cycle plan identifies equipment life expectancies and refresh as follows:

- Network equipment: 7-10 years
- Desktop computers: 4 years
- Laptop computers: 4 years
- Servers: 5-7 years
- Printers: 5 years
- Audio-Visual equipment and accessories: 7 years

This plan serves the institution because it allows equipment to be replaced before it fails. With these useful equipment life cycles, equipment procured in the last one to two years will continue to provide a robust platform for users for several years in the future. Once the Bond Technology funding expires, and the performance of the technology infrastructure begins to gradually degrade, the College and District operational funds for technology will need to be increased accordingly to cover these technology replacement costs in the future.

The CCS and ITS staffs, in collaboration with the College committees and constituent groups, continue to follow the technology plans as specified in the Measure B Bond Information Technology Plan documents for network and facility infrastructure improvements. The most recent Bond technology plans were "Information Technology Update June 2013 to June 2015" and "Information Technology Measure B Bond Activities – Accomplishment and Future Plans 2005-2017". Each of these technology plans has been completed as planned and has achieved a first-class technology environment with a solid foundation. For the network infrastructure, the emphasis over the last several years was to increase bandwidth for system access, migrate to more wireless solutions, consolidate the data storage for the enterprise servers, and provide streaming media capabilities for the classroom. Project updates for Bond initiatives are provided on a regular basis through standing committees and Bond meetings, including: Bond Oversight Committee reports, the Bond Facility committees, individual Bond Project meetings for specific building construction or renovations where CCS is involved, and Technology Committees where CCS reports monthly on project progress.

District ITS completed a district Disaster Recovery Plan in August 2010 to satisfy the accreditation requirement to protect the District Data Center in the IT Building at LPC, as well as the remote college server rooms. This Disaster Recovery Plan was reviewed and approved in 2010 for the Accreditation Midterm Report. The comprehensive Disaster Recovery Plan reflected the significant changes made for the new District Data Center at LPC, which was fully operational in April 2010. District ITS updated the comprehensive

Disaster Recovery Plan for the college and district in August 2014 (Evidence III-36). The District Data Center at LPC and the College server room have generators and UPS units to maintain continuous system availability, along with alternate failover capabilities through redundancy for critical servers supporting the major enterprise systems.

All data on district and college servers are backed up to tapes and/or disk using industry best-practice procedures. The backup strategy uses a multitiered approach, including disk-to-secondary-disk backup of the production data, secondary disk-to-tape backup to high-capacity tape drives, and tape drive rotation and offsite storage. The tapes are rotated in a daily/weekly/monthly/yearly algorithm with a selection of tapes stored offsite in a separate location from the servers. New tape backup equipment has been installed to consolidate server backups where appropriate.

Keeping Up-to-Date

Effective planning and responsiveness assure that technology resources support programs and services throughout the District. The District Strategic Plan for ITS Requests delineates the project priorities on all campuses for both the Banner Enterprise System projects and the Measure B Bond projects. The District Strategic Plan for ITS Requests was approved by the Chancellor's Cabinet, which reviews new college and district requirements for enhanced or improved system features that benefit the students, faculty, and staff. The District Strategic Plan for ITS Requests is developed in collaboration with the Chancellor's Cabinet, college deans, directors/managers of Banner user departments, college technology committees, and college planning committees. Additions for new critical projects are made as needs arise and include state and regulatory mandates as well as changes to accommodate contract negotiations. Besides consideration of the state and regulatory directives, the Chancellor's Cabinet's prioritization of the Banner projects considers three factors: impact on students, improved productivity, and reduction of costs.

Communication on the status of these development projects for Banner and other enterprise systems implementations occurs on a routine basis in several forums. First, ITS meets with the Banner users to discuss possible new initiatives. These potential projects are discussed with the Technology Committees and user departments that might be affected by the requested change. District ITS is also an active participant in the Technology Committees, where new technology initiatives and progress on current projects are discussed. Once the various groups decide to proceed with a proposed new project, the District CTO presents the new item to the Senior Leadership Team for final review, approval, and prioritization relative to other projects on the task list. Core teams with representation from all impacted locations are established for the major new projects being implemented, and they meet regularly during the project planning and implementation phases. Besides communication with the groups involved in the selection and implementation of the projects, TS communicates with users via email announcements and status updates on the District's websites. In addition to the Banner users and the technology committees, project status updates are also provided by the District CTO to the college presidents, vice presidents, and the Senior Leadership Team when major milestones are reached on specific projects.

The ITS Strategic Plan was initially developed in 2007 and updated in 2009 for the new district initiatives for its enterprise systems and services for a five-year period. A new

revision to the District ITS Strategic Plan for the next five years will be completed in conjunction with the revised *Educational Master Plan* in fall 2015. Fortunately, District ITS has already purchased software needed for the current priority development projects in the District ITS Strategic Plan, so implementations can proceed without any software or hardware cost impact.

Using bond funds, ITS has installed high-performing networks and established a Cisco standard for all switches, routers, and wireless access points. The network equipment consists of switches that connect to the cabling in the walls, and these switches allow computers to connect to resources such as printers and servers. Network routers join the switches to provide a connection outside of the local campus network, either to another district facility or to Internet resources. CLPCCD has completed four vendor bid awards for new switches and routers, and these changes have effectively doubled the size of the networks at each campus since 2005. These switches also expanded the 10 GB fiber connections so that buildings with high-density connections could take advantage of increased uplink speeds to server and Internet resources. The current network has nearly three times the availability and over 1,000 times the performance of the 2005 network.

Computer infrastructure has developed appropriately as application and user demands have increased. Hardware and software for servers that support the District and College critical applications were replaced with standard configurations that provide expanded capacity and meet new stringent performance specifications. Upgrades were required at both the server and desktop level to increase capacity. The ITS and IT groups standardized on Hewlett-Packard servers after a joint industry analysis process at the beginning of the Measure B Bond. Beginning in 2005, servers were migrated to HP DL server platforms in administrative server/data centers. The ITS has migrated to a blade/SANS infrastructure in lieu of dedicated servers. The District ITS upgrades to blade servers, SANS, and VMW represent the implementation of new technologies that balance server CPU, memory, and disk resources across all applications, enabling expansion of the hardware resources with minimal downtime and providing quicker recovery from failures. Chabot purchased faster and more reliable servers, including an enterprise level database server (SQL Server) with a five-year life cycle. Servers that support applications that require a 24/7 operation will also be mirrored using redundant servers when failures occur.

The District achieved its overall network design goal of replacing aging hubs and switches with state-of-the-art 10/100 switching to the desktop, Gigabit (copper) connectivity to the servers, and Gigabit (fiber) backbones to each building. All connections between the colleges and the District were upgraded to the new Opteman metro Ethernet WAN (Evidence III-37). As part of the network infrastructure upgrades, District ITS purchased and deployed higher-performance routers for the internal Opteman WAN links. To keep ahead of the bandwidth demand for site-to-site network communication, District ITS upgraded the port speeds of the LPC campus to 50 Mb.

Over the past several years, ITS has implemented significant expansions in the data connections between the campuses. Since 2009, it transitioned from the old T-1 data lines, which had a maximum bandwidth of 1.5 Mb, to the DS-3 lines, which had 4.5 Mb. In 2009, the District transitioned to the most current Opteman Ethernet connections that began with a bandwidth between campus locations up to 20 Mb. In 2010, the Opteman bandwidth was

increased to 50 Mb between campus locations to support the move of the District ITS Data Center from Chabot to LPC. The new Opteman connections have the added advantage of providing flexible bandwidth options so that as site traffic changes, the bandwidth can be increased accordingly. In 2014, the Opteman WAN data lines were again expanded to support the Valley Care Medical facility used for the Chabot's Nursing program.

In addition to the Opteman connections, ITS also expanded the CENIC Internet connections that are provided by the state from 45 Mb to 1GB speed. This provides substantial room for growth. In the near future, the CENIC connection will expand to 10G, and the District is positioned to take advantage of that Internet speed increase. There is substantial wireless coverage throughout the campus as a result of new building renovations in recent years that have added the cabling infrastructure to support the wireless access points. Older buildings have also been equipped with wireless in areas where the cabling will support wireless access points. The wireless capability is constantly expanding. As of June 2014, Chabot has 91 percent+ coverage with 72 access points throughout 32 buildings, with additional buildings under renovation. District ITS installed a centralized Wireless Management System in 2010 to allow College and District staff to monitor traffic remotely from any location in order to identify and repair problems.

At Chabot College, the previous Fujitsu telephone system was migrated to the newer Avaya system utilizing three phases for the conversion in parallel with the various stages of construction. The first phase migrated the Instructional Office Building and Community Student Services Center, followed by the Applied Technology Building renovations in 2011, and the third and final phase in 2013 for the remaining phones. This Avaya system has been fully operational since 2013 for the entire campus. The District Office at Dublin converted to the same Avaya telephone system in 2013.

Security and Reliability

District ITS and the college technology departments maintain physical security and network accessibility to administrative and instructional servers. The servers are located in a locked room accessible only to appropriate technical staff with key card access and are controlled with alarms after hours in the restricted areas.

The District Data Center that supports the enterprise systems and network infrastructure throughout the district was fully operational in its new location in April 2010. Located on the LPC campus, the data center includes a District Administrative Computer Room, Network Room, LPC Instructional Computer Room, and staff offices for District ITS staff and LPC technology staff. The building is equipped with UPS units, a backup generator for continuous availability, HVAC units with primary and secondary units for redundancy or failover, and an Inergen system for fire suppression. The Central Utility Plant on campus is equipped with a primary and secondary pump/chiller to provide water to the HVAC systems in the IT Building, and if the system fails, the IT building is equipped with a backup chillers. Several levels of control and monitoring within the server rooms, including electrical panels, UPS, building security, server room heat levels, and general EMS monitoring using the campus Allerton system, identify any problems quickly. The building is restricted to IT, security, and Maintenance & Operations personnel. The exterior doors require personalized access cards using card readers. Access to the internal doors to the server and network rooms requires

two-factor authentication using an authorized access card plus a matching PIN number. The building security is based on the AMAG System for access and includes emergency communication and video surveillance monitored by LPC Campus Safety and Security.

The District uses antivirus protection on each desktop to limit the possibility of virus attacks. Another important element of ongoing network security is the monitoring and interpretation of traffic and event logs. The ITS has deployed products for log management and traffic monitoring, such as Intermapper, that has the ability to graph bandwidth usage and provides quick identification of traffic abnormalities, such as high peaks of usage. The ITS monitors and operates Cisco ASA firewalls for daily security protection from network intrusions. The campus has two firewalls in the redundant failover configuration, and this functionally has been successful in maintaining constant Internet access/presence during the infrequent outages that have occurred. Firewall logs are exported and stored to the Manage Engine Log Management server for analysis and trending.

For the Banner Enterprise Student Information System (CLASS-Web), security access for students, faculty, and staff is controlled through a User ID and Password. The User ID is a generated number, and the passwords are user-controlled and must be changed once a year. Besides the login access restrictions, the Banner CLASS-Web system has a timeout of 15 minutes to prevent inadvertent intrusions. For all Banner access, Banner Role Security defines what each user has access to. Banner uses an HTTPS browser that requires server authentication and allows the user's browser session to be encrypted over the Internet.

Some of the major new construction/modernization projects that ITS participated in for Chabot College included the PE Complex, Science and Mathematics Building, Automotive Facility, Mathematics and Physics Building, Instructional Office Building, Community Student Services Center, Social Sciences, School of Arts, and Applied Technology.

Measure B building construction and modernization allowed the District to equip the campuses with new and sophisticated security systems and capabilities. The AMAG system was installed at the College and includes capabilities for access control, video surveillance, and emergency communications. The District has purchased a fire-rated safe and has located it in a remodeled Telecom room IDF that has limited access. This Telecom Room IDF is in a separate building from the server Main Data Facility, and the backup tapes are now stored in this safe.

Technology for Distance Education

The Blackboard Application Service Provider is the Distance Education platform for the College, which allows the Blackboard vendor to house the hardware and software and provide 24x7 service. This District standard has facilitated the expansion of fully online and hybrid course offerings. In addition to the Distance Education courses, College facilities contain technology-equipped or "smart" classrooms that integrate networking, computers, and audiovisual technologies to allow multimedia and Internet access. In some classrooms, the ability to broadcast on-going teaching sessions to the Web in "live" streaming mode is available. Technology improvements are planned to handle video-on-demand as well as streaming multiway audio for faculty and students with connectivity through the Web.

Evaluation

The District and College meets the Standard. Policies and procedures for managing technology infrastructure represent generally accepted best practices, specifically addressing the need to store backup data at an offsite location. For Chabot College, there were two accreditation actions recommended by the prior Accreditation team in 2009. One was a procedural addition to store Chabot tape backups offsite at the District office, which was implemented immediately per the procedures that the District has for other enterprise systems for disaster recovery purposes. The second item was to develop a new Chabot Technology Request form for faculty and college staff to submit at PR planning time as well as throughout the year as technology needs arise, which has been implemented. This new Technology Request form was needed in order to give the Chabot Technology Committee and Chabot and the District IT/ITS better insight into the faculty desires for new technology tools to support their classroom. This allows the Chabot Technology Committee to be more effective in the planning and prioritization of new technology requests across the campus since new technology requests consistently flow through the Technology Committee for evaluation and recommendation. The ITS developed a new online Technology Request form at Chabot, which generates a database for reporting status of requests. It was used in 2013 through 2015 as part of the Chabot PR planning cycle. Routine maintenance requests continue to be processed through the ITS Help Desk, which routes requests either for immediate action or through the Chabot Technology Request form process for nonroutine maintenance items.

According to the Fall 2013 Student Survey (Evidence OIR-56, p. 5), 71 percent of responding students reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the "availability/working order of equipment in labs," which is up from 64 percent from 2011. Students were also satisfied or very satisfied with other computer labs on campus: Library (86 percent), Student Online Services (90 percent), and computer labs found in other departments (89 percent). These figures were consistent (within 1-3 percent increase or decrease) with prior survey in fall 2011 (Evidence OIR-56, pp.11-12).

With the end of Measure B funding, a vital question for the College and the District is how to fund future technology needs on campus and across the district. State instructional funding may return, but that will not address non-instructional expenses. The College and the District must ensure that there is a mechanism for users to request and the College or the District to provide necessary funds to continue to obtain and maintain adequate and necessary technology.

The ITS strategy with the Bond Measure B funding was to upgrade network and computer equipment so that the equipment's useful life spans a few years beyond 2015 when the bond equipment funds are expected to be depleted. The most recent equipment procurements have been forward-looking so as to maximize the life span of the equipment and performance of the infrastructure. The primary equipment for network switches and routers, servers, and audio-visual equipment are adequate for at least seven years. The desktop computers and laptops were updated on a four-year life cycle so there are adequate units available throughout the campus for a few years.

Aside from technical life cycle considerations, IT expects that the state will be funding instructional equipment in the future years in the same manner that they handle deferred maintenance for facilities. With this in mind, the colleges prepared a five-year plan for instructional equipment projections which included computers and audio visual equipment for the classrooms. Therefore, this is an alternate source of funding that can be used to provide technology upgrades for the colleges for the next few years.

Actionable Improvement Plan

College Plan 3: The College commits to developing ways to address the shortfall in equipment and library materials funding for when the Bond funding runs out.

C2. | *Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.*

Description

As part of the Measure B Bond program over the last several years, ITS, under the direction of the District Chief Technology Officer, developed Bond technology plans for the colleges based on input from the colleges on the institutional needs and plans for improvements in the classrooms and labs (Evidence III-28). The most recent technology plan for the Bond technology initiatives "Bond Activities IT Update June 2013 to June 2015" enumerated Bond accomplishments since 2005 and future accelerated plans for the next two-year period through 2015. Previous to this latest Bond Measure B technology plan, ITS developed the "Information Technology Measure B Bond Activities – Accomplishments and Future Plans 2005-2017" and the initial Bond technology plan "Information Technology Master Plan (ITMP)" in 2005 with annual supplements through 2012 to update the projects completed to-date. The purpose of the Bond Technology Plan is to establish technology guidelines that will help direct ITS in the 21st century. The focus for the institutional advancements on campus included converting and maintaining all classrooms to smart classrooms, upgrading computer equipment and audiovisual equipment on a four-year cycle, bandwidth expansion to accommodate streaming video capabilities and online learning applications, and supplemental wireless access points in strategic locations on campus. Gathering input regarding the institutional needs was coordinated through the College Technology Committees and the Distance Education Committees. The Bond Technology Plan was drafted in conjunction with the 2012 *Facilities Master Plan* to accommodate the data infrastructure installations and upgrades to support new construction and renovations at the colleges.

The College Technology Committee recommends new solutions based on program and service needs, and those recommendations are forwarded to the appropriate management for review and final approval. Personnel from ITS participate actively in these committees to ensure the technology solutions are feasible, compatible with the existing environment, and cost effective. Currently, programs and departments prioritize their needs for computers,

software, and other key technologies as they develop their PR, which are reviewed and further prioritized by the dean of each division. These go to PRBC, a shared governance committee, which reviews PR responses. The technology resources requests are vetted both by the Technology and Budget Committees, and if approved, allocation recommendations are submitted to College Council for approval.

Technology for Distance Education

The Blackboard Application Service Provider is the Distance Education platform for the College, which allows the Blackboard vendor to house the hardware and software and provide 24x7 service. This District standard has facilitated the expansion of fully online course offerings and the supplemental hybrid model. In addition to the Distance Education courses, College facilities contain technology-equipped or "smart" classrooms that integrate networking, computers, and audiovisual technologies to allow multimedia and Internet access. In some classrooms, the ability to broadcast on-going teaching sessions to the Web in "live" streaming mode is available. Technology improvements are planned to handle video-on-demand as well as streaming multiway audio for faculty and students with connectivity through the Web

Evaluation

The District and College meet the Standard. Only 44 percent of the respondents in the Spring 2014 Staff Survey agree that Chabot links technology decisions to its institutional planning, down from 49 percent in prior survey ([Evidence OIR-2](#), p. 30). The technology planning and prioritization process can be improved. College technology planning generally originates at District ITS or Chabot Computer Support. Technology planning for individual units originates in faculty and staff PR requests flowing through division deans and department directors to PRBC. Technology needs that occur off-cycle from PR can also be made on the Chabot Technology Committee web sites home page using the "Request for New Technology Form" or may be coordinated directly with ITS or CCS. Faculty and staff often create technology plans for their units based on past budgets and existing technologies without realizing that new technologies may be more apt and available. Sometimes faculty, staff or administrators are unaware of what is possible or feasible. Improved communication by and with District ITS could help resolve this issue by proactively offering options (not necessarily the same as solutions) to the campus for consideration. The new district Technology Coordinating Committee (TCC) will facilitate this process by sharing technology ideas across all locations in making decisions for the good of all.

The Chabot Technology Committee has worked hard to formulate specific, achievable goals. The successful implementation and completion of its charter will give faculty and staff the necessary tools and resources to incorporate technology into instruction and day-to-day operations. Chabot College must remain committed to the advancement of technology in order to provide a productive workplace and an exemplary educational environment where students receive an education that is current both in content and in technology.

The inclusion of the Technology Plan and the TCC into planning during PR rarely occurs, and if it does, it is informal exchanges. Within ITS, however, the Technology Plan is seen as the guide to College technology needs. These two different "realities" needed to be addressed by the College. To this end, the TCC recently shared the Technology Plan with the

administrators developing PRs in collaboration with their faculty and staff. Faculty and staff should be encouraged to share their needs and concerns in frequent and comprehensive institutional surveys as well as in Technology Committee outreach, and those needs should be prioritized, communicated, and championed, first within the College and then to ITS.

The campus Technology Committee began development of a process that will give faculty and staff a voice in technology-related decisions that affect the whole college, while ensuring that the CCS, ITS, and the Technology Committee have a role in reviewing faculty and staff members' technology requests. The annual review of PR technology requests through the Budget Committee and Chabot Technology Committee and the usage of the Chabot Technology Request Form outside of the PR cycle are the processes that the Chabot Technology Committee has put in place. This process must continue to integrate the Technology Plan with PR, so that the whole college can benefit. This will avoid duplication of resources and purchases of hardware or software that the College infrastructure cannot support. Finally, the District TCC should help ensure a balance between ITS expertise and understanding, and the Colleges and provide transparency of the interaction between the College expression of its technology and training needs and district response.

Actionable Improvement Plans

College Plan 1: The College commits to completing the work on the shared governance committee structure and document in the 2015-2016 Academic Year. The College commits to widely communicate and share the completed structure and document. In July 2015 the Office of the President will organize the recommendations into a proposal that will revise Chabot's shared governance structures and procedures. The president will present the proposal, based upon recommendations from the college in 2014-2015, to PRBC and all three Senates for a first reading in early fall 2015. Following consultation and the gathering of any further recommendations, the revised document will be resubmitted for a second reading in fall semester 2015. Following feedback from the second reading, the president will recommend approval of the document to College Council at their final fall semester meeting. Following College Council approval, the final document will be shared with the Board and the new processes initiated in early 2016.

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

D

D1.

D1.a.

D1.b.

Finance
Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.

The institution's mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning.

Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

Description

Chabot College uses a variety of methods in the development and implementation of its financial planning based on college institutional goals and the college mission statement. The college uses its governance committees such as the College Council, the PRBC, the College Budget committee, CEMC and DEMC, as well as its administrative structure for fiscal planning. The PRBC's responsibility is to create strategic goals, to guide PR, and to oversee new initiatives. The Budget Committee implements the planning goals of the college in its work to allocate resources (mostly one time funding from a variety of State sources). The CEMC allocates faculty resources to achieve the necessary funding that the State allocates for the instruction of students. The administrative functions are managed by the Vice President of Administrative Services who oversees all budget matters for the College. The Vice President is the administrative cochair of the Budget Committee (a faculty member serves as the other cochair) and serves on the PRBC, to which the Vice President reports on Budget issues. College Council oversees the entire process and makes recommendations to the College President on issues as they arise. The three governance Senates (Faculty, Classified, and Student) are also informed by the members they appoint to the committees and by formal reports made at senate meetings.

This structure is used to create the college budget in both low and in better revenue years. The college is informed of its revenue allocations, as an output of the District BAM, and its required level of student enrollments by the DEMC, often expressed as FTES. The PRBC creates its strategic goals to achieve the institutional goals of the Strategic plan. The Vice President of Administrative Services is the main conduit between the College Budget Committee and the PRBC. The budgets for the various college entities are created under her oversight.

A variety of groups participate in creating and approving budgets. A brief description follows.

New funding initiatives from the State have necessitated that the college create new "single purpose" funding committees, following on model used for the Basic Skills Initiative. The State requires that the College have identified committees to expend funding from State Equity and SSSP initiatives. The Equity Coordinating Council was organized during fall 2014 to write a proposal to the state that documented the College's plan and measured outcomes for equity funding. The Equity Coordinating Council recommendations moved through the Faculty Senate, College Council, and the BOT for approval. The committee is chaired by the Vice President of Student Services, who also chairs the SSSP funding committee. Examples of past funding initiatives that supported institutional planning include the FIGs, the Pathway Project, the FYE, the Passion and Purpose Project, and various cohort programs.

The CEMC and DEMC are defined in Article 26 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Faculty Association (Evidence III-2). The DEMC is responsible for determining the size of the college schedules in terms of FTEF to meet enrollment targets that are commensurate with the FTES funding available from the State. The ultimate task of CEMC is to determine the FTEF allocation distribution among the divisions. At the discipline level, the need for class offerings is defined within PR. The CEMC considers enrollment and other OIR-provided data, such as fill rates, which areas are have long wait lists, and how well the college is progressing towards meeting its enrollment target. The CEMC works thoughtfully to achieve the funding goal, which is often translated into an "average" productivity level, with the goals of students, which include a mix of classes, some with higher and many with lower levels of productivity. The goal of CEMC is to find the perfect balance between these often opposing goals. Beginning in 2009-10, the State imposed a severe workload reduction that peaked at about approximately 10 percent in 2011-12. Simultaneously, demand for classes was *increasing* dramatically at both colleges. Because enrollment targets were sharply reduced, meeting them was suddenly assured. However, painful cuts to the class schedule would have to be made. At this point, CEMC worked jointly with PRBC to develop a strategy for making the list of classes to be cut. Collaboratively, the committees identified the priorities, then communicated those priorities to the campus. During a fall Flex Day, faculty met as divisions make recommendations. The intent of this collaboration was to ensure that the College would meet the needs of students, to the greatest degree possible.

The College has a long-standing Faculty Prioritization Committee, which includes of all deans and faculty representatives from every division. In fall 2014, the committee reviewed and approved a new process, in consultation with PRBC and the Academic Senate, and the new process was used for prioritizing positions to be hired for fall 2015 (Evidence III-14).

In a parallel process, within PR, each discipline, program, or service area submits classified staffing requests via PR. Under the current process, each area submits their classified staffing requests via PR, and college administrators' work together to create a prioritized list and positions are recommended to the President for funding. During 2014-15, an updated Classified Prioritization process was developed, approved, and implemented (Evidence III-15).

The Facilities Committee (described in Standard IIIB) is responsible for reviewing requests for Capital Outlay expenditures. Projects proposals must address a need which is documented in PR; the Committee's prioritized list of projects is the principal driver for decision-making regarding remaining Measure B funds and other funds as may become available.

The Technology Committee (described in Standard IIIC) is responsible for reviewing requests for technology requests. Project proposals must address a need, which is documented in PR; the Committee's prioritized list of projects is the principal driver for decision-making regarding remaining Measure B funds, and other funds as may become available.

The College Budget Committee reviews and recommends allocations (from PR requests) for Instructional Supplies (restricted lottery funds), Instructional Equipment/Library Materials, Instructional Equipment (Measure B Bond funds) and Perkins (VTEA funds). The Committee assists and supports the planning process as needed or requested. It reviews and make recommendations to the PRBC, College Council and College President.

Evaluation

The District and the College meets the Standard. The College relies on its mission and goals of the institution for financial planning. The financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The College budget is developed annually by the Vice President of Administrative Services, using salaries, benefits and the Maintenance of Effort/Baseline Budget as a base. Increases in general fund allocations above the maintenance of effort/baseline budget are allocated based on the process of PR, prioritization processes, Vice Presidents' recommendations, and College President approval. Restricted Funds, which include Instructional Supplies, Instructional Equipment/Library Materials, and Instructional Equipment (Measure B Bond Funds) are allocated based on the process of PR, Budget Committee review and recommendation, College Council, and College President. Budget increases are based on requests through PR submitted to PRBC, a prioritized list of resource needs, committee review/recommendations and available resources. The SSSP and Equity committees allocate SSSP and Equity monies. The Basic Skills committee allocates funding for basic skills initiatives.

Chabot College has managed its finances judiciously over the past six years—a turbulent period that has seen a significant decline of general apportionment as well as categorical funding levels from the State. A recession throughout California began in 2009-10, and reached its peak in 2011-12; the District and College made necessary adjustments in expenditures, which included a sharp reduction of course offerings commensurate with the workload reductions from the State, coupled with a reduction of non-instructional faculty activities, including counseling and librarian services, and reassign time for program coordinators. Along with the elimination of several dozen adjunct faculty positions, the College was forced to lay off more than a dozen classified professionals, and eliminate (or consolidate) administration positions. Moreover, two waves of early-retirement incentives were coordinated by the District, which further reduced budgetary stress, but substantially winnowed faculty, staff, and administrators, as personnel were not replaced. In many areas, multiple areas of critical functionality were now carried by significantly fewer people. Funding levels are presently on the rise, and the College has embarked on a process of

restoring classes and services through a careful evaluation of where the needs are most critical.

For Fiscal Year 2014-15, the budgeted revenue and expenditures for the District are as follows:

Fund	Revenue	Expenditures	Ending Fund Balance
General Fund	$121,408,544	$121,265,631	$11,836,090
Cafeteria Fund	$79,844	$30,734	$171,517
Child Development	$1,230,545	$1,230,545	$0
Self-Insurance Fund	$6,093,992	$6,089,992	$4,262,165
GO Bond Fund	$141,427	$24,000,000	$76,893,804
Capital Projects	$3,317,619	$1,907,134	$6,510,303
Special Reserve	$3,000	$513,322	$2,832,486

Information presented at the BOT meeting on September 16, 2014 (Evidence III-38). Detailed information may be found in the Adoption Budget for 2014-15 (Evidence III-39).

District finances are managed with integrity in a manner that ensures financial stability. Board policy 6200 states that the District will maintain unrestricted general fund (UGF) reserves at a minimum of 5 percent (Evidence III-40). The district's reserve percentages for the last five years are:

Fiscal Year	Reserve Percentage (UGF)
2009-10	7.08%
2010-11	6.74%
2011-12	6.42%
2012-13	8.19%
2013-14	11.47%

The source of these data are the District's annual financial reports (311 reports) filed with the California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office (Evidence III-41, 311 Reports found in each year's budget reports).

For Fiscal Year 2014-15, the budgeted revenue and expenditures for Chabot College are as follows:

Fund	Beginning Fund Balance	Revenue	Expenditures
Unrestricted	$1,187,360	$ 40,069,995	$ 40,890,606
Transfer In/Out	$	$ 1,115,388	$ 294,777
Restricted	$	$ 9,652,669	$ 9,382,704
Transfer In/Out	$	$	$ 269,965

Detailed information may be found in the Adoption Budget for 2014-15.

In 2014-15 the College and District have sufficient revenues to support educational improvements, as evidenced by the following points:

- We are serving more students: Through a robust faculty-driven enrollment management process, the District has been able to capture a significant portion of restoration dollars available from the state. District funded enrollment levels have increased from 15,889 FTES in 2011-12, to 16,861 FTES in 2014-15. During the same period, funded enrollment at Chabot College has increased from 9,361 FTES to 9,935 FTES. The schedule of classes at the College has been expanded accordingly.

- A planned reduction in average class size: During the recession years, the District asked faculty to take extra students in their classes in order to achieve savings on instruction costs and thereby reduce the need to lay off classified staff. Actual productivity peaked at a level higher than 550 WSCH/FTEF. While planning for 2014-15, the DEMC elected to lower the "main group" productivity assumption to 520 WSCH/FTEF, an adjustment made prospectively. Direct results of this action have been: (a) to make more class sections available to students; and (b) to *reduce* the number of over-enrolled sections.

- Restoration of college functionality: Chabot College has commenced the process of restoring vital functionality lost during the recession. The process is far from complete as many needs have competed directly over the past two years.

- The District has managed its proceeds from Measure B (General Obligation bonds passed by the voters in 2003) so as to reduce encumbrances on unrestricted dollars; thus, more funding was available to support educational improvements. Two significant examples are: (a) installation of three megawatts of solar power arrays at the campuses, which lowered District energy costs; and (b) bond interest earnings used to fund approximately $720,000 of technology-related expenses that were previously charged to the unrestricted General Fund.

Institutional resources are sufficient to ensure financial solvency. Throughout the budget crisis, the District maintained a healthy reserve in the unrestricted general fund.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D1.c. D1.d.

When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

Description

The District monitors its long-term debt and other obligations. On March 2, 2004 Alameda County voters and those Contra Costa County voters within the District's boundaries approved Measure B, a $498 million capital improvement bond that enabled the District to repair, upgrade, acquire, and construct facilities in accordance with the *Facilities Master Plan* (Evidence III-42). In August 2004, the District issued $100 million of Series A bonds. In March 2006 the District refunded a portion of the Series A bonds. In October 2006, the District issued the remaining $398 million bonds as Series B and Series C. In March 2013, the District refunded a portion of the Series B and Series C bonds. The District monitors the financial landscape and refinances outstanding debt to benefit the taxpayers of the district. The Official Statements and other documents relating to the issuance of debt may be found in the office of the Vice Chancellor, Business Services.

Debt is paid by ad valorem taxes; therefore, debt payments have no adverse impact on the operating budget of the District.

In October 2009 and again in April 2011 the Board approved implementation of voluntary Supplemental Employee Retirement Plans (SERP) (Evidence III-43, Evidence III-44). Fifty employees elected to voluntarily retire or resign from the District's employment no later than December 31, 2009 for the first SERP, and 34 employees elected to voluntarily retire or resign no later than June 30, 2011 for the subsequent SERP. The SERP helped the District manage its budget during the recession years; however, funding its provisions required a debt service that is reflected in the subsequent year's budgets. That debt service will be paid off by the end of Fiscal Year 2014-15.

Evaluation

The District and the College meet the Standard. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D2.
D2.a.

To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

Description

The current budget process has the needs of the institution as its primary focus. The yearly operational budget process begins with the adoption of the budget planning calendar. The revenue projections are taken from the Governor's January budget and later revised according to the Governor's May revised budget. The District's Business Services office prepares preliminary revenue assumptions. Since more than 90 percent of the budget is salaries, the position budgets are reviewed very closely, first by District Business Services, College Business Services, then by the College Administrators for their departments. Changes in staffing levels are reviewed by the Faculty and Classified Prioritization Committees, and CEMC, Classified and Faculty Senate, and College Administrators.

Each unit of the College oversees and manages its funds through the Banner system. Each unit has online access to its budget that allows for real-time account analysis and review. The Vice President of Administrative Services monitors all general and cocurricular fund budgets and makes reports to the President and the Vice Presidents of Academic and Students Services and the College Budget Committee. The Dean of Special Projects Student Services has the responsibility for overseeing most categorical funds. The Vice President of Student Services has the responsibility for overseeing SSSP funds. The Interim Director of Grants seeks and oversees grants.

The District's independent auditors issued a positive report upon completion of their audit of the financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2014. Chabot College prepares its budgets in compliance with California Education Code. An independent public accounting firm is employed at the end of each school year to audit the books of the District and to prepare an audit report for the BOT. The audit is conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States (Evidence III-45).

Evaluation

The District and the College meets the standard. The District and the College continues to use the Banner online accounting/financial system, which provides Managers/Administrators with access to financial information.

Financial and budget information is formally communicated through the BOT the Vice Chancellor's Office, Vice President's Office, and the Budget Committee. The deans provide budgetary information to faculty and staff as they develop their PR each year. The deans also work closely with their faculty and staff to oversee particular budgets. Banner Financial

software is used to record all financial transactions. Access to the software is limited to the staff who monitor and make the transactions. These include administrators, classified staff, and faculty coordinators, who use it to manage their budgets and personnel costs. Three committees and the administration share the responsibility to assess the effective use of the College's financial resources. The CEMC evaluates the effective and efficient use of the funding used to teach the courses offered by the College, relying heavily on computer programs developed for this use and data provided by the OIR. The Budget Committee allocates funding for special projects and one-time needs of the institution based on PR.

Like all colleges, most spending at Chabot is on wages and benefits for personnel. These costs are largely governed by collective bargaining. As these practices are conducted with integrity financial resources are used in a manner consistent with the goals of the College. The administration oversees and manages funding for particular programs, services, and classified staffing. The primary demand on the College budget is staffing, mostly faculty. The DEMC recommends faculty in FTEF to the Chancellor. This allocation is largely based on the enrollment target for each college and also gives consideration to both the state's 7/255 faculty ratio rule and 50 percent class room instruction cost rule. Allocation of FTEF to each college is approved by the Chancellor, with recommendations from the college presidents and Vice Chancellor of Educational Service and Planning after consultation with the DEMC.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D2.b.

Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

Description

Resources are allocated at the District and College in a manner that will realistically support the College's stated goals for student learning. Slightly over fifty percent of District apportionment is spent on classroom instruction. Moreover, the processes observed for setting priorities regarding the hiring of full-time staff (faculty and classified), as well as for the renovation and construction of facilities, and the purchase of instructional equipment, are focused on meeting needs expressed in PR.

The PBC was established with a philosophy statement, which asserts that decisions will reflect institutional priorities, specifically student learning, student success, completion of educational goals, and community engagement. Further, resources will be distributed based on clear communication regarding available funding and the needs at each site.

The District has had unqualified/unmodified reports of its financial statements in recent history. The statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of its activities. Audit firms interviewed District management and documented District procedures related to controls over planning, bidding, contracting, expenditure, and financial reporting and determined that controls have been put in place and are working as documented. With respect to the bond program, auditors have determined that the District expended bond funds

for the specific projects developed by the District's BOT and approved by the voters, in accordance with the requirements of Proposition 39, as specified in Section 1(b)(3)(C) of Article XIIIA of the California Constitution (Evidence III-45).

The audits demonstrate the integrity of financial management practices. There are rarely audit findings related to the financial statements, though when findings exist, they are addressed at the highest levels of management. Most audit findings are resolved in the year following the audit. To the extent that any audit findings address internal control issues, they are resolved in the year following the year under audit. Audit findings are discussed at the Senior Leadership Team meetings, comprised of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Presidents, and Chief Technology Officer. In addition, audit findings are discussed at the District Business Officers meetings, comprised of the Vice Chancellor, Business Services; Director, Business Services; and Vice Presidents, Administrative Services.

The 2012-13 audit findings were addressed at the December 9, 2013 Senior Leadership Team meeting. The agenda is filed in the Chancellor's Office. The findings were also discussed at the March 20 and March 27, 2014 District Business Officers meetings. Responses to the audit findings were presented to the BOT at their May 20, 2014 meeting (Evidence III-46, Evidence III-47, Evidence III-48).

The external audit is conducted annually. The external auditors present the financial statements to the BOT Audit Subcommittee, then the BOT, normally at the December board meeting (Evidence III-49, Evidence III-50). In addition, the external auditors present the bond financial statements and the bond performance audit to the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee, normally at their October meeting (Evidence III-51).

Evaluation

The District and the College meets the standard. The College conducts its finances with integrity. Audit findings related to financial statements are rare.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

$D2.c.$ *Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution, in a timely manner*

Description

Financial information is provided to the college through the governance structure including the College Council, PRBC, and College Budget Committee. The Vice President of Administrative Services, who serves on all of these committees, is regularly scheduled on the agendas of these committees. The Vice President also presents financial information to the college at large at the President's Brown Bag Lunches, and at Convocation and Flex Days. The Vice President presents College financial information to District Committees, and to the PRBC, Budget Committee, and College Council. The Vice-Chancellor presents to strategic planning groups, the Senior Leadership Team, and the BOT. Presentations are made when

information is available, for example, the tentative budget is presented after the governor presents the state tentative budget and again after the May revise, and the proposed and final budgets are presented after the state budget has been passed. Information provided to the college includes allocations received, balances, financial projections, strategic issues and budget timelines. The district's reserve balances for the UGF over last five years are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Ending Reserve Balance (UGF)	Reserve Percentage (UGF)
2009-10	$7,180,388	7.08%
2010-11	$6,700,785	6.74%
2011-12*	$5,887,202	6.42%
2012-13*	$7,559,877	8.19%
2013-14*	$10,983,358	11.47%
2014-15 (projected)	$11,532,565	11.47%

* Reserve levels include a loan of $2,489,841, which was repaid in FY 2014-15.

Evaluation

The District and College meets the Standard. The District provides information at regular board meetings. The College provides information through the President and Vice President, and it is discussed in the various governance committees and the BOT.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D2.2. | *All financial resources, including short-and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.*

Description

Extensive process and procedures have been developed and implemented by the College and District to ensure consistent use of resources and alignment with the goals and objectives of the funding source (Evidence III-52, Evidence III-53).

The District monitors its long-term debt and other obligations. The District monitors the financial landscape and refinances outstanding debt to benefit the taxpayers of the district. The Official Statements and other documents may be found in the office of the Vice Chancellor, Business Services. With respect to the bond program, auditors have determined that the District expended bond funds for the specific projects developed by the District's BOT and approved by the voters, in accordance with the requirements of Proposition 39, as

specified in Section 1(b)(3)(C) of Article XIIIA of the California Constitution (Evidence III-45, reports by fiscal year).

Any audit findings, including internal control systems, are addressed at the highest levels of management. Most audit findings are resolved in the year following the audit. Audit findings are discussed at the Senior Leadership Team meetings, comprised of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Presidents, and Chief Technology Officer. In addition, audit findings are discussed at the District Business Officers meetings, comprised of the Vice Chancellor, Business Services; Director, Business Services; and Vice Presidents, Administrative Services

In addition, the BOT' involvement in the budget development process for all expense categories, including salaries, benefits, other operating expenses and capital improvements, processes are in place to align spending with potential funding restrictions (Evidence III-54). For example, personnel costs, which currently account for the majority of total expenses, are dictated by contractual obligations with union groups and by compliance requirements with state regulations.

Capital improvements and other bond-related projects are reviewed and overseen by a community bond oversight committee (Evidence III-42). All significant purchases are processed through a purchase order process, which includes review and vetting by both the Business Office and Purchasing (Evidence III-41).

The BOT approves all grants and budgets to guide grant spending appropriately are loaded to the District's financial accounting system (Banner). Internal audits are conducted as needed to verify that grant spending is consistent with the goals of the funder. For example, Chancellor's Office grants for CTE programs are audited and certified quarterly, for compliance with approved budget allocations and spending restrictions.

Externally funded programs such as financial aid, grant acceptances, and categorical programs require yearly reporting information that is compiled by their appropriate administrators and approved by the Vice-President of Administrative Services. Chabot College is participating in the state-mandated SSSP, Equity, and Basic Skills Initiative Funding. The SSSP focuses on student orientations, assessments, counseling, advising, and other student educational planning services. Reporting requirements are necessary for funding and will include providing a student success and support plan, mid-year report declaring unused funds, year-end expenditure report, and management information systems data reporting. Financial reporting and adherence to program requirements will be completed by the Vice President of Student Services. Equity Funds go through the Equity Coordinating Council, led by the Vice President of Student Services. Proposals and reports on SSSP and Equity have gone to PRBC, the Senates, and been approved by College Council and the College President. Basic Skills Initiative funds are administered by the Basic Skills Committee, who reports to Faculty Senate and PRBC.

Other categorically funded programs that contribute to student success include the Trio Aspire program, EOPS, CalWORKS and scholarships. The Trio Aspire program is federally funded designed to assist low-income, first-generation students transferring to a four-year institution. Trio Aspire offers counseling, workshops, priority registration, and tutoring. The program budget is administered by the Dean of Special Programs and Services. CalWORKS provides Chabot students with employment-focused education programs.

The College Financial Aid Office supports the college mission and strategic plan of assisting students to reach their educational goals within a reasonable time by providing information and support. The original PR cycle recognized that financial aid is vital to student access and retention and a critical component to ensure and facilitate student learning and success. That recognition has only been strengthened with each year. The mission continues to be focused on service to students and stewardship of funds, working with each department and division on campus to coordinate and provide services and information to students. Staff advise on financial and academic eligibility, determine potential and actual eligibility, and award and disburse financial aid funds to eligible students according to multiple layers of federal, state and institutional mandates, regulations, policies and best practices. (Financial Aid is discussed in Standard 3D.3.f.)

The College has a robust grants program, and practices effective oversight of finances, including management of grant funds from the initial grant proposal to actual distribution of the funds. Any full-time member at the College (faculty, staff or administrators) may initiate the grant process by completing a Grant Approval Form and discussing their project with the Grant Development Office. The College currently has several active grants, including grants where the College is the lead fiscal agent and ones where other institutions are the lead. These include CCCCO Nursing grants, HPN, the CPT grant, three federal TRIO grants, and a U.S. Dept. of Labor grant. A list of all state and federal competitive grants can be found in the Annual District Audit report (Evidence III-45). Grant projects are implemented in a manner that is consistent with the intended purpose of the funding. If grant objectives or scope of work are changed and are different than what was initially proposed, prior approval is sought from the state or federal program officer per regulations. Grant projects have demonstrated positive impacts (as evidenced in final reports from grant projects such as Title III) and support college priorities and goals. When a grant is funded, it must be accepted by the CLPCCD BOT. Grants are managed by an administrator, usually named during the Grant Approval Process. For instance, in a faculty-initiated grant, usually the dean of the initiator's discipline is the administrator. In general, faculty coordinate and implement grant activities while administrators provide administrative oversight. An annual district audit is conducted each year as required by state and federal regulations. As part of that audit is an examination of whether or not the district has been compliant with the requirements described in the Federal OMB Circular A-133 for all federal grant programs. This is done also for state grant programs. All findings and recommendations are included in this report and it is made public by posting it on the district website.

The Chabot College Office of Development and the Foundation was re-established in August 2013. The founding of this unit marks a historic moment in the college's creation of a comprehensive, multileveled service unit expressly for the purpose of advancement activities. The goals for the Office of Development and the Foundation include:

- Articulating to the general public and to the campus community a brand rooted in the experience of a community college education and based on the mission, vision, and values of Chabot College and those of the CLPCCD;

- Reaching beyond the boundaries of the college and inviting residents of the Chabot College service area to participate in campus programs, services, and activities;

- Increasing funds available to students, faculty, and staff through revenue generating activities.

Although it is but one element of the work conducted by the Office of Development and the Foundation, the *Friends of Chabot College* (Foundation) has a direct role in the creation of new revenue streams for the college. A volunteer board of directors consisting of nine members governs the *Friends of Chabot College*. Three of the nine members represent the highest levels of executive leadership from the college district and the college including: the President of the BOT for the District, the President of Chabot College, and the Chabot College Vice President for Administrative Services. Their involvement ensures a close working relationship among the foundation, the college, and the district. All board members bring the utmost levels of knowledge, innovation, and creativity to their work on behalf of Chabot College and its students. The Executive Director for the Office of Development and the Foundation has support from an Administrative Assistant, and an accountant, and legal counsel serve as staff. The Executive Director for the Office of Development and the Foundation was hired in December 2013. Her first task was the preparation of an application to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) on behalf of the Foundation, to secure its 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status. That tax exempt status was granted and made effective June 25, 2014.The Foundation books will be audited annually along with all other accounts managed by Chabot College and the District.

The priorities indicated in the formation of the organization's infrastructure include: establishing best practice financial and reporting protocols and processes; surveying and assessing campus climate regarding the needs of the college and the students; and organizing its Board of Directors. The *Friends of Chabot College* plan on undertaking general fundraising activities including: developing strategic and annual operating plans for The Office of Development and the Foundation, as well as launching an annual fund drive, planned giving program, special events, and major capital campaigns, in order to secure funds that will be applied to the advancement of its mission in promoting the interests and general welfare of Chabot College and its student population.

The Office of Development and the Foundation is developing partnerships with government agencies, civic and philanthropic organizations and foundations, trusts, business related groups for the purposes of fundraising and advancing the image of Chabot College and its students in the community. The following summary elaborates on the activities to be undertaken, key participants, location of said activities, and how the activities contribute to the exempt purposes of the organization. This list is posted in order of strategic application, and indicates the stepped process for building Chabot College's advancement infrastructure.

Evaluation

The District and the College meets the Standard. All financial resources include short and long-term debt instruments, such as bonds and certificates of participation; auxiliary activities; fund raising efforts and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.

.

In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, 44 percent of respondents stated that they knew how to initiate the grants process (Evidence OIR-9). Proposed projects are reviewed by the Director of Grants, who ensures the involvement of the initiator's supervisor. Projects are discussed at the Grants Advisory Committee for preliminary approval to move forward with developing and submitting a proposal. The Grants Advisory Committee is a subcommittee of the PRBC and is comprised of the College President, Vice-Presidents, College Foundation Director, the PRBC Chair, the OIR Coordinator, and the Director of Grants. In determining whether or not to move forward with pursuing a grant, a number of factors are considered including alignment and support of the strategic plan, the resources needed internally to support grant implementation, promise for sustainability and overall college/faculty support for the project. (See attached document for criteria.)

In the Spring 2014 Staff Survey, 66 percent of staff indicated that the Grant Development Office writes grant proposals to support major college priorities (Evidence OIR-19, p. 2).

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D2.e.

The institution's internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

Description

The District reviews its internal control procedures annually as it prepares for interim audit in May or June of each year. The District and College Business Office routinely evaluates internal control systems throughout the year. The internal reviews are augmented by independent external examination, since internal controls are part of the College's annual audit by the independent auditors. No material weaknesses related to deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting were found.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. The institution's internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D3.
D3.a.

The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability.
The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and develops contingency plans to meet financial emergencies ad unforeseen occurrences.

Description

District finances are managed with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. Prior to the onset of the fiscal crisis, the District had a reserve of 15.6 percent. The reserves helped the District weather the financial storm over several years, and maintain financial solvency. Board Policy 6200 states the District will maintain UGF reserves at a minimum of 5 percent of total expenditures in the unrestricted general fund (Evidence III-52); as shown above, the District observed this reserve level throughout the recession. These points are evidenced by the annual Board Approved Adoption Budgets (Evidence III-41), Quarterly 311Q reports submitted to the State Chancellor's Office, and financial audit reports (Evidence III-45).

Moreover, District revenues have been restored to the point where resources are sufficient to ensure financial solvency going forward; moreover, resources are managed with integrity in a manner that ensures financial stability. These points are evidenced by the following:

- *The budget is the District's spending plan.* Funding is mainly through general apportionment, specifically the number of students the District will serve and be funded for. The enrollment targets for the colleges are set by the DEMC, s process which involves a careful assessment of the funding levels available from the State. Under the BAM, the apportionment revenue available at each college is based upon the FTES targets determined by DEMC.
- *Deficit spending occurred through planning.* The Adoption Budgets show the levels of deficit spending at each site that were approved by the BOT from 2009-10 to 2011-12. Deficit spending occurred with the consent of the DBSG, that is, the District would spend down a portion of its reserves to minimize the scope of the staff layoffs that would be required in 2010-11 and 2011-12. Further, in year of the greatest workload reduction (2011-12), the District borrowed $2.5 million from the RUMBL so as to maintain the General Reserve balance above 5 percent. This plan was reported to ACJCC on March 28, 2013 (Evidence III-55).
- *Reserve levels are being restored.* The 2014-15 Adoption Budget shows the RUMBL as fully repaid, and the Unrestricted General Fund with a projected ending balance of $11.5 million, or 11.47 percent of budgeted expenditures.

The District tracks its Cash flow through the Banner Financial Management system. The District uses the Banner system to create reports break down all revenue and expense categories and projects the flow of cash from all sources.

Evaluation

The District has emerged from the 2008 recession on a sound financial footing. Depleted reserves are being restored to prerecession levels, and the class schedules are gradually expanding, commensurate with the apportionment available from the State.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D3.b. | *The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations and foundations, and institutional investments and assets.*

Description

The District and the College practices effective oversight of all finances, including management of student financial aid packages, grants, externally funded programs, contracts, auxiliary organizations, and the college foundation. All funds are used in ways that are consistent with the college's overall learning goals and mission, as well as the mission of individual departments. For the 2014-15 fiscal year, the institution reported $64,947,667 dollars in revenue from other revenue sources such as restricted, bond interest and redemption, cafeteria, child development, capital outlay, general obligation bonds, bookstore, associated students, student representative fee, financial aid, scholarships and loans, and cocurricular funds within the ACCJC Annual Fiscal Report (Evidence III-56).

The Banner Financial Software system is utilized by college and district approved staff to monitor program budgets and process appropriate financial documents. Financial functions provide appropriate oversight of fiscal operations ensuring fiscal integrity and compliance with generally accepted accounting principles. Banner allows users to monitor their yearly budgets, past budget years, purchasing paperwork, budget transfers, and up-to-date balances to facilitate sound budgetary decision-making. The Banner system is managed by the District ITS and users can request training as needed. An extension of the Banner System is Web for Finance, which is accessible through ClassWeb. Users can query their current budgets, encumbrances, expenditures, and approved documents quickly and more easily through this platform. Administrators, budget managers, and appropriate college staff have access to all accounts for which their area is responsible. Business Office staff members are quick to help all users when follow-up for document processing is needed or with general budget questions.

A Presidential Task Force has convened to assess and make recommendations for effective facilities rental processes in keeping with statutes governing facilities rentals on a community college campus ("Civic Center Act"). At this time rentals include, but are not limited to, the following: Performing Arts Center, Grand Court, Physical Education/Athletics, Event Center, and Classrooms.

Chabot TV: Comcast 27 — Chabot TV is currently financed through Public, Education and Government funds, under the Digital Infrastructure Video Communications Act (DIVCA). As of 2014-15, the College receives $117,000 per year from Hayward and $150,000 from Fremont.

Auxiliary Organizations

Student Senate of Chabot College — The SSCC (formerly ASCC) develops a budget plan under the guidance of the Office of Student Life and the Advisor each spring for the following fiscal year from the $10 per student per semester student body fee collected through the registration process, which amounts to about $200,000 per year. The SSCC also funds the Chabot College Flea Market, which brings in revenues each month it is held, vending machine revenues, as well as revenues generated from the provision of outreach/marketing tables in the Student Center facility. The income generated has gone toward funding SSCC activities, programs and events, and most recently, the vending and table rental income has been allocated to the Student Life Office. The SSCC funds over $70,000 per year in cocurricular proposals generated by various college departments to further enhance student life and cocurricular learning on campus in partnership with college disciplines and student service areas. The funding of the Flea Market provides a college venue for student clubs and organizations to raise funds through the sale of various foods and other items, then matches these fund-raising efforts. The SSCC also funds between $20-30,000 in student scholarships based on academic merit, leadership, and demonstrated commitment to obtaining a higher education, especially those who have overcome significant challenges.

Cafeteria Services — Campus cafeteria services are contracted with Fresh and Natural Inc. out of Milpitas, California. A percentage of sales are collected as revenue for the college.

Chabot College Bookstore — In October of 2011 Chabot College contracted with Follett Higher Education Group, Inc. for Bookstore services, and Chabot receives a commission of all bookstore sales. Follett has their own manager on site to manage day-to-day operations and the Vice President of Administrative Services effectively oversees the college's contract and revenue from a percentage of sales. In addition to providing a percentage of sales to Chabot, Follett Higher Education Group is contractually obligated to provide $10,000 annually in student scholarships, which are awarded by the Associated Students of Chabot College.

Evaluation

The District and College meets the Standard. All auxiliary budgets are reviewed by the College Vice-President of Administrative Services and by District Business Office staff.

The SSCC does not conduct a formal PR in the same way the college departments and disciplines do. However, the SSCC reviews events and activities outcomes in terms of participation rates, costs and alignment with their organization and college mission statements and strategic goals. The SSCC program budget contributes to student learning in a variety of significant ways. The SSCC cocurricular funding request for proposal process has

funded literally hundreds of noteworthy guest speakers, awareness events, special population recognition activities, outreach events for underserved populations, and more. Guest speakers contribute to the academic environment by providing students with access to renowned scholars, public officials, and artists. The SSCC hosts "destress weeks" leading up to and including finals week with snacks, test Scantron forms and essay books, tutoring sessions in high demand subjects (piloted in fall 2013), and peer encouragement for students to do their best in final exams. Cocurricular programming enable students to participate in learning support programs, participate in and attend conferences and debates, present their research to the wider community, and build academic and life-long learning skills.

Bookstore operations are overseen by a campus Bookstore Advisory Committee chaired by the Vice President of Administrative Services and composed of representatives from across campus who meets the third Tuesday of each month. The College and Follett work together based on the contract.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D3.c. *D3.d.* *D3.e.*	*The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations.*
	The actual plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is prepared, as required by appropriate accounting standards.
	On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.

Description

The District has elected to pay for retiree medical benefits (the liability existing for employees hired before January 1, 2013) on a "pay-as-you-go" basis, as is its right under the law. The most recent actuarial report prepared for GASB 45 reporting was as of June 1, 2013 (Evidence III-57). In addition, the District has set up a self-insurance fund for this purpose, known as the RUMBL. As of June 30, 2014, RUMBL had an ending balance of $4.3 million (Evidence III-38). The RUMBL is not an irrevocable trust, and the District has not set up an irrevocable trust for defined-benefit health coverage for retired employees. The District performs an actuarial report every two years.

Insurance and building maintenance are included in the operating budget as well. The District is a member of four Joint Powers Agreements: Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC), Protected Insurance Program for Schools (PIPS), School Project for Utility Rate Reduction (SPURR), and Community College Insurance Group (CCIG). SWACC provides property and liability insurance; PIPS provides workers' compensation insurance; SPURR provides access to the wholesale natural gas market; and CCIG provides

dental and vision insurance (Evidence III-58, Evidence III-59, Evidence III-60, Evidence III-61).

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. The District has taken decisive steps to mitigate the future growth of unfunded liabilities for retiree health care. Through a significant provision negotiated through collective bargaining, staff members hired after January 1, 2013, in all bargaining units, will not be entitled to lifelong medical benefits from the District. Rather, for each eligible full-time member of this new tier of employees, in lieu of providing a lifelong medical benefit, the District will contribute $200 per month to a Health Retirement Savings Plan/Health Reimbursement Account (HSA), for the explicit purpose of funding the unit member's health benefits upon retirement. Because the HSAs comply with IRS regulations, and constitute a defined contribution plan as opposed to a defined benefit plan, the "Post-13" tier of employees will have zero impact upon the District's future GASB 45 liability (Evidence III-2).

The District's only locally-incurred debt instrument is general obligation bond debt, which is paid by ad valorem taxes, so it has no adverse impact on institutional operations or financial stability. Health benefits for bond-funded positions are included in the operating budget and employees contribute towards the premium cost.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

$D3.f.$ | *Institutions monitor and manage student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal payments.*

Description

As required by Federal regulation, the College must take into account and incorporate all educational funds a student may receive by the institution or external third parties, when determining students' financial aid awards, including TRIO, EOPS, CALWorks, scholarships, etc. Application of professional judgment is required when extenuating or unusual circumstances warrant a change to the federal methodology or to make exceptions for a student's failure to maintain satisfactory academic progress.

Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The College has been compliant with complex administrative requirements for fund management, including recalculation, student repayments and reconciliation, which are typical and frequent audit findings elsewhere.

The Default rates for the past three years are as follows:

3 year official (2011):	23.2%
3 year official (2010):	29.6%
3 year official (2009):	26.8%

The default rate is within federal guidelines; notwithstanding, the college has a plan to reduce the default rate should it exceed federal guidelines. The Financial Aid Office currently utilizes ASA/SALT contracts, is petitioning to remove loans associated with up to ten fraud borrowers, utilizes a CCCCO contract with Peterson and Associates, and plans to hire additional staff to allow the current loan processer to take on new duties related to default management and improved loan advisement including entrance and exit activities.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D3.g. | *Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.*

Description

District manages the Contracts for maintenance agreements, professional services, annual services, facility rentals, and grants. These services assist the College in meeting its objectives. Contracts are first reviewed by the initiating department (District or College), which in turn forwards the documents to the College or District business office for proper vetting then to the district purchasing office for review and submission to the chancellor's senior leadership team for final review. Contracts deemed to meet the institution's goals and objectives are presented to the BOT for approval or (if board policy dictates), are presented to the Vice Chancellor for signature (Evidence III-52, Evidence III-53). Without the signature of the Vice Chancellor, the contract is not valid. Board approval is required for contracts and no dollar threshold is established. Purchases and contract policies and procedures adhere to and are compliant with the California Education Code, the Government Code, Public Contracts Code, and Civil Code.

There are dollar thresholds for certain contract and purchasing processes that are established for the state, the amounts of which are routinely adjusted. Currently, purchases exceeding $72,400 for materials, supplies and services sold or leased must be legally advertised, formally bid, and awarded by the BOT to the lowest responsive bidder. Professional services are exempt from bid requirements and for public works projects the dollar threshold requiring a formal bid process is $125,000.

Assurance of compliance to these contract and purchasing laws is at multiple levels of the organization. Managers are provided necessary information regarding procedures and dollar threshold adjustments; the College administrative services office reviews and approves the forwarding of such agreements to the district office; and the district-purchasing manager approves the agreement prior to submission to the Vice Chancellor for signature (Evidence III-62).

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution governed by institutional policies and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

$D3.h.$ | *The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and the results of the evaluation are used to improve internal control structures.*

Description

The District uses the external audits and any findings to evaluate and improve internal control structures and management practices. Every year during the annual audit, the audit firm tests compliance with federal and state grants and categorical programs. The guidance for testing federal grants is included in OMB Circular A-133. Guidance for testing state grants and categorical programs is set forth in the Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) issued by the CCCCO. Bond expenditures are consistent with regulatory and legal restrictions.

Evaluation

The District meets the Standard. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes and the results of the evaluation are used to improve internal control structures.

Actionable Improvement Plan

None

D4. | *Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement of the institution..*

Description

Financial resources planning starts at the District level. The District receives funding from state, local, federal and grant sources. Allocation planning also starts at the district level. Assumptions on the level of funding from the various sources are done by the Vice Chancellor and discussed in the PBC. Once the funding levels are developed, the Colleges and the district allocate the funding based on the funding source requirements and the District BAM.

The District is now operating under a new BAM, which was approved by DBSG in March, 2013, and implemented starting with the Adoption Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-14. The BAM is based on the aggregated revenue, which includes general apportionment, mandated costs, and other faculty reimbursements, to set district expenses (known as "Step 3A" costs, and includes retiree benefits, gas and electric costs, property and liability insurance, etc.) are taken off the top. Allocations are then made to the District Office and M&O according to set percentages. The remaining revenue is then split between the colleges according to FTES targets.

Evaluation

The District and the College meets the Standard. The BAM represents a much-needed simplification of the old model. Moreover, through the regular review of the BAM, a formal link is forged between educational planning and budget allocation, making for an integrated process. The IPBM represents a major and positive culture shift for the District, though it has not reached full fruition (Evidence III-63). In the coming years, it should become a major factor in institutional improvement, through a meaningful evaluation of program and service needs at each site, with particular regard to how those needs fulfill the college missions and student learning goals.

One of the most significant refinements of the BAM is that a significant funding imbalance between the two colleges has been corrected, largely through the normalization of the FON between the colleges. Specifically, the college split of the District FON will be calculated in proportion to the planned college FTES targets, and thereby aligned to the manner in which FTES revenue is allocated. Ultimately, when the BAM undergoes regular evaluation, the matter ultimately determined will be the level of revenue that is allocated to the colleges in aggregate. The parameters that impact the college revenue are: (a) the actual revenue allocated by the State; (b) the expenditures approved for "Step 3A" (district wide expenses); and (c) the percentages of revenue that are allocated to the District Office and M&O.

Clearly, the scope of this work will expand markedly in future years. In particular, in accordance with the philosophy statement above, the review of the BAM in the years that follow will include a thorough assessment of program and service needs at each site, including services provided by the District Office and M&O, so that those services can be improved. Going forward, such service needs will be weighed and prioritized against the

program and service needs at the colleges. The Committee is also slated to review the planning priorities for each site, to make recommendations regarding planning priorities.

In addition to the PBC, the other IPBM committees will improve the effectiveness of fiscal resources allocation. For example, in fall 2014, the IPBM Facilities Committee conducted a review of M&O staffing levels, which were significantly depleted during the recession, despite the fact that aggregated square footage at the colleges *increased* during that time. Most significantly, the Committee noted the District's lack of a coherent plan to fund operational costs associated with opening new buildings. To deal with such situations is principally why the IPBM exists; within the framework of this structure, such information is formally communicated to the PBC, so that the specific funding requirements can be discussed and incorporated into future reviews of the BAM.

The BAM's structure sets a framework for evaluating the effective use of financial resources going forward. Since the BAM's implementation in spring, 2013 (in time for the development of the 2013-14 Budget) several major points of contention have been raised over the costs included under Step 3A, and the set percentages that determine allocations to the District Office and M&O. Given that such factors were initialized at the height of the recession, when budgets were maximally depleted, the concern was raised that the BAM has indemnified the systematic underfunding of the colleges, which could potentially cripple efforts to improve student learning. Such questions remained unresolved through Academic Year 2013-14, but the District and the Colleges are committed to fully assessing the effectiveness and impacts of the BAM, holding the need for revision and adjustment in mind, particularly during the first few years of implementation. The programmatic consideration of various factors, including program and service needs at all sites, was largely absent in the District allocation and budgeting processes prior to this point. The IPBM has come into existence precisely because District recognized the need for a significant 'culture shift.' As such, there is a considerable volume of work to be accomplished, in order to develop the basic processes by which resource allocation decisions will be made going forward, and how those processes will inform the cyclical assessment of the BAM. The PBC's work in 2014-15 is spread into several areas:

- Through abundant thoughtful dialogue, the PBC is developing a methodology to integrate policy, planning and budgeting across all major areas, in a way that supports student learning.

- The PBC is reconciling "Step 3A" expenses (district expenses taken off the top) which are estimated prospectively during budget development, to the actual costs recorded at the close of the budget year. The review of the 2013-14 Budget was fruitful, as it identified a surplus, a portion of which the Committee has recommended to be released to the sites. On an ongoing basis, the reconciliation will be used to better project such costs during budget development.

- The PBC will review the levels of the District reserves, and make recommendations concerning the reserve levels to be maintained.

- The PBC will make minor adjustments to the BAM, as warranted, in time for development of the 2015-16 Budget.

Actionable Improvement Plan

District Plan 1: The PBC will consider the efficacy of the BAM as required by its charter. In addition, in time for the development of the 2016-17 Budget, and in subsequent years, the regular review of the BAM will expand sufficiently in scope to become a well-informed and systematic process for institutional improvement. In particular, it will incorporate an assessment of the program and service needs at each site, sufficient that the service needs specific to the District Office and M&O can be weighed and prioritized among the program and service needs specific to the colleges.

Evidence

Evidence III-1. Human Resources Website, 2014 Forms and Procedures, http://www.clpccd.org/HR/HRGovForms.php

Evidence III-2. HR Website, Salary Schedules/Union Agreements, http://www.clpccd.org/HR/HRContactsandSalarySchedules.php

Evidence III-3. BP 4312, Selection of Fulltime Faculty, http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/4312_arp.pdf

Evidence III-4. Memorandum of Understanding, CLPCCD and SEIU, Reclassification Study http://www.clpccd.org/HR/documents/MOU-ClassificationStudy.pdf

Evidence III-5. BP 4120, Evaluation of Management Personnel, http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/4120ARP.pdf

Evidence III-6. BP 2435, Evaluation of the Chancellor, http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/AP2435EvaluationoftheChancellorRev.3-19-13_Approved.pdf

Evidence III-7. AP 2710, Conflict of Interest http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/AP2710ConflictofInterestRev.3-19-13_Approved.pdf

Evidence III-8. CC Staff Characteristics, Fall 2014, http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/StaffSatisfaction/ChabotStaffStatstoF14bystafftype.pdf

Evidence III-9. Not used

Evidence III-10. BP 4006, Faculty and Staff Diversity and Equal Employment Opportunity, http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/4006ARP.pdf

Evidence III-11. BP4029, Americans with Disabilities Act, http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/4029Policy.pdf

Evidence III-12. BP 4012, http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/4012Policy.pdf

Evidence III-13. OPD Program Review Submission, http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/2015-16%20Program%20Reviews/Academic%20Services/2015-

2016%20Office%20of%20Professional%20Development%20Program%20Review%20FINA
L.pdf

Evidence III-14. Faculty Prioritization Process,
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/exhibits/facultypositionprocessrev1.5_10.13.05.p
df

Evidence III-15. Classified Prioritization Process,
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/classifiedsenate/Approved%20Classified%20Prioritization%2
0Process.pdf

Evidence III-16. Facilities & Sustainability Committee Website,
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/facilities/

Evidence III-17. Citizens' Oversight Committee Meeting. April 23, 2014.
http://www.clpccd.org/bond/documents/042314COCFullAgendaPacket-Final.pdf

Evidence III-18. 2016-2017 CLPCCD Five-Year Construction Plan
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/facilities/2016-2017%20-Chabot-Las%20Positas%20CCD-
Five%20Year%20Construction%20Plan_Schedule%20Funds.pdf

Evidence III-19. District 2014-2015 Scheduled Maintenance Program,
http://www.clpccd.org/ipbm/documents/MandOFiveYearPlan.pdf

Evidence III-20. Appendix F8: Program Review Facilities Request,
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/prbc/academicprogramreview.asp

Evidence III-21. Chabot Computer Support,
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/computersupport/index.asp

Evidence III-22. Technology Committee Website, http://www.chabotcollege.edu/tech/

Evidence III-23. District Standard for Smart Classroom,
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/audiovisual/Smart%20Classrooms.xls

Evidence III-24. District ITS Annual Plan, http://www.clpccd.org/tech/TechnologyPlans.php

Evidence III-25. Not used

Evidence III-26. Not used

Evidence III-27. The Organizational Review of District Office and Maintenance and
Operations Department, http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/Chabot-LaPositasCCD-
DistrictOfficeandMandOOrgReviewFINAL.pdf, page 8

Evidence III-28. District Information Technology Services Website,
http://www.clpccd.org/tech/

Evidence III-29. District Technology Coordinating Committee,
http://www.clpccd.org/ipbm/TechCoordCommHome.php

Evidence III-30. District Its Infrastructure and Access Services, http://www.clpccd.org/tech/

Evidence III-31. Distance Education Annual Report, 2013-2014
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/cool/resources/Chabot_DE_AnnualReport_2013-2014.pdf

Evidence III-32. Not used

Evidence III-33. Shared College/ITS Computer Training Facility, Bldg. 100,
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/facilities/Program%20Definition%20-
%20Building%20100.asp

Evidence III-34. Technology Training and Support for Students, Exhibit:
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/online

Evidence III-35. Not used

Evidence III-36. Disaster Recovery Plan,
http://www.clpccd.org/tech/documents/CLPCCD_Disaster_Recovery_Plan_NONITS_FINA
L080114.pdf

Evidence III-37. WAN Network, http://www.clpccd.org/tech/Networkdiagram.php

Evidence III-38. District 2014-15 Adoption Budget,
http://www.clpccd.org/Business/documents/Presentation4AdoptionBudget2014-
15BoardMtng9-16-14.pdf

Evidence III-39. District 2014-15 Budget,
http://www.clpccd.org/Business/documents/FINAL2014-
15ADOPTIONBUDGETBOOK.pdf

Evidence III-40. BP 6200, Budget Preparation,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP6200BudgetPreparation_001.pdf

Evidence III-41. District Business Services Website,
http://www.clpccd.org/business/BusinessServicesBudget.php

Evidence III-42. Measure B Website, http://www.clpccd.org/bond/

Evidence III-43. Board Minutes, October 2009,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/MinutesOctober62009_000.pdf

Evidence III-44. Board Minutes April 2011,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2011_0417_Mtg_Minutes.pdf

Evidence III-45. District Business Services, Audits, Website,
http://www.clpccd.org/business/BusinessServicesAudit.php

Evidence III-46. District Business Services, Audit Summary 2012-13,
http://www.clpccd.org/Business/2013-14audit.php

Evidence III-47. District Business Services, Audit Findings,
http://www.clpccd.org/business/13-14Audit.php

Evidence III-48. Board Meeting Minutes, May 20, 2014,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2014_May_20_Minutes_Official.pdf

Evidence III-49. Audit Subcommittee, Board of Trustees, December 9, 2014, Meeting
Agenda,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2014_1209_Audit_SubCmte_Mtg_Agenda_Official
.pdf

Evidence III-50. Board of Trustees, December 22, 2014, Meeting Minutes,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/2014_December22_SpecialMtg_Min_Official.pdf

Evidence III-51. Measure B Oversight Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes, October 22
2014, http://www.clpccd.org/bond/documents/01_102214COCFullPacket_001.pdf

Evidence III-52. Board Policies, Chapter 6,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/BPRevisedChapter6.php

Evidence III-53. Administrative Policies, Chapter 6,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/APRevisedChapter6.php

Evidence III-54. BP 2200, Board Duties and Responsibilities,
http://www.clpccd.org/board/documents/BP2200BoardDutiesandResponsibilitiesRev.4-16-
13Adopted.pdf

Evidence III-55. Response to ACCJC, Request for a Special Report, March 28, 2013,
http://www.clpccd.org/Business/documents/AccreditationLtr..pdf

Evidence III-56. 2014 Annual Fiscal Report to the ACCJC,
http://libraryguides.chabotcollege.edu/ld.php?content_id=9621098

Evidence III-57. 2013 Actuarial Report,
http://www.clpccd.org/Business/documents/2013ActurialReport.pdf

Evidence III-58. Statewide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC),
http://libraryguides.chabotcollege.edu/ld.php?content_id=6731882

Evidence III-59. Protected Insurance Program for Schools (PIPS),
http://libraryguides.chabotcollege.edu/ld.php?content_id=6731876

Evidence III-60. School Project for Utility Rate Reduction (SPURR),
http://libraryguides.chabotcollege.edu/ld.php?content_id=6731875

Evidence III-61. Community College Insurance Group (CCIG),
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/accreditation/exhibits2015/Standard%203D/CCIG_Final_Insu
rance_Audit_Report_2013.pdf

Evidence III-62. Procurement Guidelines,
http://www.clpccd.org/business/documents/Procurement_Guideline_Final_010914.pdf

Evidence III-63. IPBM, http://www.clpccd.org/board/CLPCCDIPBMFINAL.php