



ACCREDITING COMMISSION for COMMUNITY and JUNIOR COLLEGES
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Barbara A. Beno, President
Steven M. Kinsella, Chair

February 5, 2016

Dr. Susan Sperling
President
Chabot College
25555 Hesperian Boulevard
Hayward, CA 94545

Dear President Sperling:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 6-8, 2016, reviewed the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER), supplemental information and evidence submitted by Chabot College, and the External Evaluation Report prepared by the evaluation team that visited on October 5-8, 2015. College leadership, including the president of the governing board and the college president, certified the ISER which was submitted in application for reaffirmation of accreditation. The purpose of the Commission's review is to determine whether the college continues to meet Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies (hereafter called standards).

The Commission also considered the written response to the evaluation team report that President Susan Sperling submitted prior to the Commission meeting. The Commission listened to testimony that President Sperling and Chancellor Jannett Jackson provided in closed session. The Commission found written response and testimony helpful for its deliberations.

After considering all of the written and oral material noted above, the Commission acted to **reaffirm accreditation for eighteen months** and to require a Follow-Up Report.¹ The Commission also acted to require an evaluation team to visit the College to evaluate the institution's work. Reaffirmation of accreditation for eighteen months indicates that the institution is in substantial compliance with the Commission's standards. Chabot is required to submit its Follow-Up Report by **March 1, 2017**. The report should demonstrate that the College has resolved all deficiencies and meets standards. The Commission finds the College out of compliance with the following: Eligibility Requirements 10, 19 and Standards 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 (College Recommendation 1); ER 19 and Standard III.B.2.a (District Recommendation 5).

Dr. Susan Sperling
Chabot College
February 5, 2016

Need to Resolve Deficiencies:

Accreditation standards represent practices that lead to academic quality and institutional effectiveness and sustainability. Deficiencies in institutional policies, practices, procedures and outcomes which lead to non-compliance with any standard will impact institutional quality and ultimately, the educational environment and experience of students. The evaluation team has provided recommendations that provide guidance for how the institution may come into compliance with standards.

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 and College 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).

The External Evaluation Report provides details of the team's findings with regard to the college's work to meet the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. I advise you to read the Report carefully to understand the team's findings and recommendations. While your institution may concur or disagree with any part of the External Evaluation Report, the accreditation process intends that an institution will use the Report and its own Institutional Self Evaluation Report to assess its practices, assure compliance with standards, and to improve its institutional effectiveness and to excel.

Improving Institutional Effectiveness:

The team report noted College Recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and College/District Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4 for improving institutional effectiveness (improvement recommendations). These recommendations do not identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice, but highlight areas of practice for which college attention is needed. Consistent with its policy to foster continuous improvement through the peer accreditation process, the Commission expects that institutions will consider the advice for improvement offered during the peer evaluation process and report on actions taken in response to the team's recommendations, if any. Failure of an institution to act on these recommendations will not

Susan Sperling
Chabot College
February 5, 2016

itself constitute a deficiency in meeting standards or requirements of the Commission. However, in the Commission's experience, failure to take note of areas of practice pointed out in improvement recommendations may lead to future conditions which limit the college's ability to meet standards. As such, we highly recommend the team's improvement recommendations for your attention.

Additional Information:

Under U.S. Department of Education enforcement regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to terminate the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any standards, or, alternatively, may provide an institution with additional notice and a deadline for coming into compliance that is no later than two years from when the institution was first informed of the non-compliance. With this letter, Chabot College is being provided with notice of the standards for which it is out of compliance and is being provided time to meet the standards.

In its self evaluation process, Chabot College also identified improvement plans it intends to undertake. These improvement plans should be linked to the College's ongoing evaluation and improvement work.

The guidance and recommendations contained in the External Evaluation Report represent the best advice of the peer evaluation team at the time of the visit but may not describe all that is necessary for the college to come into compliance (or to improve). While an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the Report, Chabot College is expected to use the Report to improve educational programs and services. In addition, the college has the responsibility to accept the Commission's action, and to uphold the integrity of the accreditation process by accurately portraying it and helping institutional constituencies to understand the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies pertinent to this Commission action.

I have previously sent you a copy of the External Evaluation Report. The Commission requires that you give the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER), the External Evaluation Team Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to those who were signatories of the ISER, and to make these documents available to all campus constituencies and the public by placing copies on the college website.

Please note that in response to public interest in accreditation, the Commission requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no more than one click from the institution's home page.

Dr. Susan Sperling
Chabot College
February 5, 2016

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express appreciation for the work that Chabot College undertook to prepare for institutional self evaluation, and to support the work of the external evaluation team. The Commission encourages the college's continued work to ensure educational quality and to support student success. Accreditation and peer review are most effective when the college and the ACCJC work together to encourage continuous quality improvement in higher education. Thank you for sharing the values and the work of accreditation.

If you should have any questions concerning this letter or the Commission action, please don't hesitate to contact me or one of the ACCJC Vice Presidents. We'd be glad to help you.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/tl

cc: Dr. Jannett Jackson, Chancellor, Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

¹ Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review *Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission* found on the ACCJC website at: (<http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc>).