



August 6, 2009

Mr. Jack Pond  
Accrediting Commission For  
Community & Junior Colleges  
10 Commercial Blvd, Suite 204  
Novato CA 94949

RE: Accreditation Faculty/Staff Survey: Changes between Spring 2008 & Spring 2009

Dear Mr. Pond:

The College Accreditation Steering Committee has included some additional information for the consideration of the team prior to their arrival. This report is submitted by the Chabot College Accreditation Steering Committee to the ACCJC visiting team, describing actions taken by the college to demonstrate its commitment to reviewing and utilizing data for improvements on all aspects of college operations.

In Spring 2008, the Institutional Research Office surveyed the Faculty and Staff on many issues as part of our evidence gathering efforts on accreditation. As the accreditation steering committee and our newly appointed College President analyzed the results, we discovered that responses to knowledge of our college planning processes were in need of improvement. The Institutional Research Office summarized the results in a series of 18 pages of highlights on different topics and on each standard (See the booklet, *Accreditation Survey Results: Spring 2008 Faculty/Staff Survey: Highlights*, or the IR website, <http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/survey08.asp>). We used these summaries for writing our Self-Study Report. One of these pages was labeled "Lowlights: Issues of Concern for Accreditation." The items of most concern on this page and on other pages were in the areas of knowledge by various constituencies of planning, budgeting, and utilization of program review results. Of particular concern was that too many members of the faculty and staff were not familiar with the priorities in the Strategic Plan, did not understand how planning and budgeting were connected, felt involved at the division level in planning but did not understand how all of these intersected at the institutional level.

The College, through the Institutional Planning and Budget Council (IPBC), the administration, and the governance committee structure added as a priority for the Academic Year 2008-2009 the education of our staff on our planning processes and procedures. Subsequently, in Spring 2009, the Institutional Research Office surveyed the staff on these issues to measure how successful our efforts had been over the year.

We are supplying the results from that 2009 Faculty/Staff Survey here for the consideration of the accreditation team. In addition, we would like to also outline the strategies taken to better educate our staff about the College's planning processes,



Jack Pond  
August 6, 2009  
Page Two

including how we also improved the planning processes, procedures, and planning templates as a result.

In Spring 2008, the Institutional Planning and Budget Council (IPBC) was already working to improve the planning process and awareness issues, and during 2008-09 these efforts intensified. By Spring 2009, when the follow-up survey was conducted on the issues of concern, it showed that these efforts had led to an improvement in staff perception of these issues between Spring 2008 and 2009 [see attached summary of survey results]. The rest of this letter summarizes the efforts undertaken during 2008-09 that led to the improved survey results on planning, budgeting, and program review by Spring 2009.

During 2008-09, the Institutional Planning and Budget Council (IPBC) brought to fruition many planning and budgeting processes that had been developed during the previous years – a better integration of the planning and budget cycles, the implementation of program review in administrative services, the use of standardized data in all types of program review, the integration of program review results into the planning cycle, the more conscious use of the mission and vision statements in college planning, more frequent and transparent communication from IPBC and the Budget Committee to the rest of the college, more visibility for the planning cycle, and a greater use of the Strategic Plan goals throughout the college.

In addition, during Fall 2008, the college 3-year Strategic Plan was updated by IPBC in a participatory and expedited process that was based on unit plan objectives, progress on the previous strategic plans, and the latest environmental scan data. The Strategic Plan Goals were then available to be used for the unit planning process in Winter/Spring 2009, in a brochure that included the college mission, vision, and value statements. The more detailed 3-year Strategic Plan was completed by April 2009. Both documents function to inform the local community about Chabot's goals and objectives.

Specific efforts made by IPBC during 2008-09 included the refinement of the electronic forms used for unit planning and budgeting. These forms required processes such as program review, staff hiring, equipment purchasing, budget requests, and grant development to use information generated by the unit plans rather than asking for the information separately. IPBC also developed ways for deans and other supervisors to give faculty and other staff feedback about their unit plans before they were integrated into division plans. IPBC Co-chairs sent out periodic Emails and memos during the planning and budgeting process to inform the campus of progress at the college-wide level. In addition, providing the Strategic Goals along with the mission/vision/values statements early in the unit planning process allowed the faculty and staff to better align their unit plans with the college Strategic Plan, as well as see how the mission statement was connected to planning.



Jack Pond  
August 6, 2009  
Page Three

All these efforts resulted in positive results. Based on a comparison of the Spring 2009 follow-up survey to the original Spring 2008 survey results, substantially more staff and faculty understood the Chabot College planning and budgeting process in 2009 than in 2008. In particular, two-thirds of all faculty and staff were familiar with the Strategic Plan Goals in 2009, an increase of 26 percentage points since 2008. Among full-time faculty, this familiarity increased from 47 percent to 79 percent, or 32 percentage points. This shows that IPBC efforts at communication about the goals and the use of the goals in unit planning had succeeded. In addition, more staff, especially classified staff, understood the role of IPBC and the Budget Committee in the planning process. These results were reflected in the fact that 47 percent of all staff, and more than half of all full-time faculty and administrators, thought that communication about planning had improved during 2008-09.

Increases in understanding of planning by staff and faculty were also evident in their increased perception of the usefulness of program review and their opportunity for input into unit-level planning. About 60 percent of all staff understood the usefulness of program review and had sufficient opportunity to participate in unit-level planning, which reflected an increase of 22 and 14 percentage points, respectively. A high percentage (76%) of classified staff especially saw the usefulness of program review. This indicates that program review in administrative and student services, where most classified staff work, was a participatory as well as useful process.

In the area of college-wide planning and budgeting, there were modest gains in understanding the process, because understanding had started at a much higher level. The percentages of staff who believed that planning is guided by the vision/mission statement and that planning is linked to resource allocation increased seven to nine percentage points, but the end result was that nearly 60 percent agreed with these statements.

In conclusion, we present this additional information as evidence of both action and progress concerning Chabot's commitment to the examination of the effectiveness of college processes and our efforts to improve them, if warranted, after the collection and review of all the relevant data.

Sincerely,

Celia Barberena, Ph.D.  
President, Chabot College

George A. Railey, Jr.  
Vice President, Academic Services

Jim Matthews, Faculty Co-Chair  
Accreditation Steering Committee

Chad Mark Glen, Faculty Co-Chair  
Accreditation Steering Committee