### Accomplishments 2007-08

#### Engaging in an On-going Dialog about Learning and Institutional Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Accomplished?</th>
<th>Explanatory Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Goal 26, Objective 26a; Lead Responsibility: College Council | Initiate a conversation about what learning-centered means for Chabot College, including college-wide dialog about the population that the college intends to serve, with participation by 100% of regular fulltime staff, and x% of hourly/adjunct staff. | Learning Centered Conversation: Partially accomplished; In progress. This needs to continue, but this objective needs to be rewritten to reflect the current focus on student learning. | - The conversation about what learning-centered means for Chabot has turned into a wider dialogue on how to improve student learning at Chabot and how to create learning-centered programs. This ongoing dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and what student learning means occurs at many levels of the organization.  
- The Program Review process is one example where ongoing dialogue about student learning is incorporated into the institutional procedures, since all programs must design a project that addresses student learning. In addition, several ad-hoc groups and ongoing committees on campus engage in dialogues on student learning. Grant proposals are the direct result of intense dialogue about what learning-centered means. This year the completion of the Carnegie grant (completed Dec 2007), the Title III grant development process (2007-08), and the Basic Skills Self-Assessment process (April 2008) have all included dialogues about the students we serve, and how we intend to serve them in the most learning-centered way. In addition, the Learning Connection development process has focused on how to improve student learning. The dialogue during the meetings of the Curriculum Committee and the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) routinely center around student learning and how institutional learning-centered. |

#### Document Sources
- Update on Priority Objectives to IPBC from Celia Barberena and Carolyn Arnold
- Standard 1.B.1 draft
- Faculty/Staff survey
- College Council Dialogue on 11/16/07
processes can support it and encourage the writing and assessing of student learning.

- Many convocation flex day programs have initiated dialogue on student learning among the faculty that has continued in relevant committees. Introduction to SLOs were provided at Fall 2005 and 2007 flex day workshops, and dialogue continued this year within the SLOAC committee and began in most programs on campus. A movie (produced by a Carnegie grant for Basic Skills by Chabot students and faculty) shown during convocation on how students do or don’t read for their courses sparked a campus-wide dialogue about the students we do serve and how to increase their learning.

- Dialogues about improving student learning occur most frequently in informal settings. In the Spring 2008 Faculty/Staff Survey, the highest responses of “often” or “sometimes” to the statement “I participate in thoughtful, reflective dialogues about improving student learning at these places and times;” were “in meetings with one or more colleagues (83%)” and “informally, in hallways or offices (82%)” The lowest response was “in college-wide committees (46%).” This implies that even though over 80% of faculty/staff are reflective and interested in discussing and improving student learning, they do not feel this dialogue continues to the institutional level in the committees. This was confirmed at a College Council meeting about campus wide dialogue (a dialogue about dialogues), in which most participants agreed that the most dialogue on learning occurs at the division and program level rather than college-wide (College Council 11/16/07).
### Dialogue on Populations:

**Ongoing; The dialogue on populations the college serves will occur in future discussions on the mission statement**

- A college dialogue about the population that the college intends to serve is part of the continuous process of identifying the needs of underserved populations. For example, dialogues occurred this year in College Council about whether our occupational programs reflect the labor market needs of the community. It was found that training needs for most local high demand/high wage occupation training were being addressed except for one—radiology technology. Partnerships were developed and an exploratory grant was written to provide this program; however it was not funded. Similarly, it was found that 700 high school seniors in Alameda County did not pass the high school exit exam, so a collaborative grant has been written to help the students and the support agencies who serve them to get the students through the exam and into college. More dialogue about the population that the college intends to serve will occur in the upcoming Community Need focus groups and surveys and in the next review of the mission statement, which are both scheduled for 2008-09.