

DATE: 05.18.17

Chabot College Follow-Up Visit Report

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Michael A. White, Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Chabot Community College, April 19, 2017

Introduction:

An evaluation team visit was conducted to Chabot College in October 5-8, 2015. At its meeting of January 6-8, 2016, the Commission acted to require Chabot College to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. A Follow-up Evaluation team chaired by Dr. Michael White, conducted the site visit to Chabot College on April 19, 2017. The Follow-up Evaluation Team also included Dr. Jennifer Vega La Serna, Dr. Anna Badalyan, and Dr. Becky Opsata. The purpose of the four-person team visit was to verify that the March 1, 2017 Chabot College Follow-Up Report prepared by the College was accurate through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution has addressed the recommendations made by the evaluation team, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies (together Commission's Standards).

In general, the team found that Chabot College had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon earlier with the team chair and by assembling appropriate documents in the team meeting room. Over the course of the day, the team met with the President of the College, the Executive Team, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Academic Senate President, and other members of the faculty and staff. The College had prepared additional evidence to the team, found in binders and thumb drives upon the April 19, 2017 arrival. Additionally, the College fulfilled additional requests, as made by the team, throughout the one-day visit.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendation:

College Recommendation 1: As was noted by the 2009 evaluation team, in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College expedite the development, assessment, dialogue and improvement plans related to the course and program learning outcomes. The College needs to ensure that student learning outcomes for all courses and programs are clearly, accurately, and consistently available to students and the public in both print and electronic documents, including course syllabi and the catalog. (Standard II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.6, II.A.6.c, ER 10, ER 19)

District Recommendation 5:

To meet the Standard, the Colleges and District should update and integrate their long range

facilities planning process to reflect the total cost of ownership projections of facilities and equipment. ([III.B.2.a](#), ER 19)

Team Analysis of College Responses to the 2016 Evaluation Team Recommendations

College Recommendation 1: As was noted by the 2009 evaluation team, in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College expedite the development, assessment, dialogue and improvement plans related to the course and program learning outcomes. The College needs to ensure that student learning outcomes for all courses and programs are clearly, accurately, and consistently available to students and the public in both print and electronic documents, including course syllabi and the catalog. (Standard II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.6, II.A.6.c, ER 10, ER 19)

Findings and Evidence: In response to the Commission Action Letter, the College Accreditation Committee implemented a taskforce constituted by the Chair of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Cycle committee (SLOAC), a representative of Staff Development, the Classified Senate President, and the two accreditation committee co-chairs (ALO/Vice President of Academic Services and a Faculty member) to address recommendations.

The team reviewed evidence confirming the College has made significant progress in the development, assessment, dialogue, and improvement plans related to course and program learning outcomes. Due to issues with eLumen (SLO/PLO management software) the College decided to move to Curricunet. In October 2015 the College, guided by the SLOAC and the Office of Academic Services, began the conversion processes. Tutorials for faculty were created and made available online. The College held several training sessions to assist faculty and staff in development and assessment of SLOs and PLOs. To increase capacity and sustain momentum in the SLO/PLO arena, the College hired a Curriculum Specialist who is responsible for the creation and implementation of the configuration of the Curricunet program under the supervision of SLOAC and the Vice President of Academic Services. The College leadership expressed future plans to create an Office of Institutional Effectiveness, which should increase capacity for this work even further.

The team found that SLOs had been transferred to the new Curricunet curriculum management system. In addition, 82.8% of PLOs have been transferred to Curricunet and also reside within manual program review processes, in the College catalog, and on the SLOAC webpage. The team is confident that the College will complete this data migration in short order, and that the College does indeed currently manage Program Learning Outcomes during this transition period. The team suggests the College faculty and administration adopt a College-wide formal definition of a “program” that will guide program learning assessment cycles and accuracy of information for the ACCJC and the public.

In order to further demonstrate its commitment to SLOs/PLO development and assessment processes, the College has included a statement related to outcome assessment in the new 2015-2018 Faculty Contract so that it reads: “Unit members are expected also to fulfill the specific requirements listed below: Participate in program and subject area improvement tasks, such as creating and assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).” This language

has been included for all faculty: Non-tenured Faculty Evaluation, Tenured Faculty Evaluations and Part-Time Faculty.

The College has assessed four of the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Critical Thinking, Global and Cultural Involvement, Civic Responsibility and Communication Outcome. The fifth and final ILO statement related to “Development of the Whole Person”, is scheduled for assessment in Spring 2017.

The College provided the Team with evidence describing how Course Learning Outcomes have been further developed since the initial visit, as demonstrated by evidence found in Curricunet. Program Learning Outcomes are on the SLOAC webpage and in Program Reviews. The College is working to transition Program Learning Outcomes to Curricunet. Since the comprehensive visit, the College has made significant progress on implementing the new Curricunet system. The team suggests the College continue progress towards migrating PLO data into Curricunet, as the current manual processes may be prone to inconsistency and/or inaccuracies. The team validated that course learning outcome assessments have been expedited, as evidenced by Curricunet reports and Program Learning Outcome assessments found in Program Review.

The District has recently launched a contract education apprenticeship program and the College is in the process of developing and assessing associated course and program outcomes. The team suggests the College further clarify and articulate to all College and District parties, student learning outcome management responsibilities for every course and program launched in the future.

The College Follow-Up Report noted that low enrolled courses may be exempt from regular course assessments. The Team suspects that there may have been a misunderstanding in communication between the 2015 Visiting Team and the College. For example, the team found courses that are scheduled to be deactivated and are appropriately exempted from assessment. Relatedly, the team found some confusion as to how low-enrolled and/or leveled courses are assessed across the various College academic divisions. The team suggests the College clearly define “exemption” status and then develop and articulate a course assessment cycle that includes all courses, regardless of their enrollment patterns. This cycle of assessment should also include low-enrolled leveled courses.

Related to this issue, the team suggests the College develop a deactivation policy for courses not been offered for an extended period of time. The team found several examples of courses still in the system that had not been offered for a number of semesters.

The institution provided evidence demonstrating a systematic and ongoing internal dialogue related to the course and program learning outcomes occurs at Chabot College. The College broadened opportunities and increased its efforts for dialogue on learning outcomes within divisions and disciplines as well as College-wide. The College Staff Development Committee has created College-wide programs and events where the College community discusses the Institutional Level Outcomes. The College provided evidence that there have been multiple Flex Day activities, convocations, discussions at department and division meetings, as well as professional development opportunities related to learning outcomes.

Evidence was provided to the team indicating the College ensures that student learning outcomes for all courses and programs are available to students and the public in both print and electronic documents, including course syllabi and the Catalog. The Institutional Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes are listed in the printed and online Catalog. Student Learning Outcomes have been added to course outlines in Curricunet. These files have been made available to the public through the link on the SLOAC website. In addition, the link to Curricunet, where the SLOs are hosted, is included on the student portal. Program level outcomes can be found under the heading “Quick Links – Courses and Programs” in chart form and in the Program Reviews on the website. The team suggests the College continue progress made in transitioning from a manual process, which may partially account for past informational discrepancies, to the Curricunet management system.

Related to this issue, the team suggests the College systematize the format, accuracy, and editing of information on the website and documents (follow-up report, SLOAC webpage, catalog) to more accurately reflect College progress. For example, the team found that the SLOAC webpage needed updating. Whereas student learning outcomes and program learning outcomes were available to students and the public, the team felt that the College could improve the accessibility and ease of access. The Chabot Institutional Self-evaluation Report (ISER) and Follow-up Report did not do justice to the good work being done at the College, making team visits more challenging than should be necessary.

Conclusion: The College has resolved the deficiencies and now meets the Standard. In a review of College evidence against the Standards and specifically issues identified by the Commission in a February 5, 2016 Action Letter, the team found that the College demonstrated a commitment to improving its existing course and program learning outcome development and assessment processes. The College ensures that student learning outcomes for all courses and programs are clearly, accurately, and consistently available to students and the public.

District Recommendation 5:

To meet the Standard, the Colleges and District should update and integrate their long range facilities planning process to reflect the total cost of ownership projections of facilities and equipment. ([III.B.2.a](#), ER 19)

Findings and Evidence:

During the October 2015 visit, the institution utilized the facilities master planning process to develop its long-range capital plans. The previous and current 2012 Facilities Master Plan is the institutional long-range capital planning document that supports the facilities needs outlined in the program reviews. Also at that time the district was developing their Educational Master Plan that appeared to be in the final stages of development. These long-range capital plans do support institutional improvement goals, however, they did not reflect the total cost of ownership projections of new facilities and equipment as required by Standard III.B.2.a.

The evidence provided during this visit demonstrates the District has updated Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning in order to integrate their facilities long-range planning to reflect the total cost of ownership projections of facilities and equipment. These two documents formalize and make a matter of policy how the institution will update and integrate its long-range processes to reflect the total cost of ownership (TCO) projections for facilities and equipment. It is noted that this policy also states the facilities master plan is updated every six years. Thus the current 2012 Facilities Master Plan expires in 2018. The District has developed a comprehensive Total Cost of Ownership Plan (TCO) for facilities and a second TCO for information technology equipment/systems, which the Board of Trustees approved on February 21, 2017. Both of these TCO plans support the current 2012 Facilities Master Plan and will serve as a model for the development of the next facilities master plan. The District is currently preparing to solicit proposals for facilities master-planning services. In fall 2017, the District anticipates commencing their planning process in earnest to develop a new or updated facilities master plan that will reflect the total cost of ownership projections of facilities and equipment.

Conclusion:

The institution has fully addressed the recommendation, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets the Commission's Standards.